

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ADDRESS BY MR. R. BUCKMINSTER FULLER

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the views of Mr. R. Buckminster Fuller are usually original in approach and always stimulating. He gave a very interesting speech at the Navy League's Oceanic Maritime Symposium last February, a transcript of which has just become available. It follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY R. BUCKMINSTER FULLER AT NAVY LEAGUE OCEANIC-MARITIME SYMPOSIUM, FEBRUARY 17, 1970

Thank you very much. I always find it necessary when I am greeted so warmly, and hear myself spoken of in a way that I hardly recognize, to point out that I am confident the only reason I have ever been heard of is because I set out to deliberately be a comprehensionist, in a world that seems to be completely preoccupied with specialization. I became a comprehensionist because, by good fortune, I did go into the Navy and I did get to the Naval Academy in a special course at the time of World War I. One of the things that impressed me very much was that Alfred North Whitehead at Harvard, who had come to us from Europe pointed out that Harvard was instituting a new phase of advanced education. He said that, whereas the advanced scholar at the European University could find the authorities on various specialized subjects—and did make it their business to find them—there were no specialized schools as part of the general university. But Harvard was the first to institute completely separate specialized schools, with separate campuses, separate faculties and separate buildings in graduate schools. Whitehead pointed out that America applauded, and one school after another, first the private schools and then the public schools, copied this specialization.

America liked the idea of all-star teams and felt that the development of advanced expertise would mean that we would have great stars and that this would be very good for the commonwealth. But Whitehead brilliantly pointed out that the stars who were selected for specialization were the brightest ones and we deliberately tried to persuade them to go on to graduate schools. These individuals, particularly the scientists, were specialized, with all their energies focused on their narrow fields. In other words, they went out linearly. Though this gave them great linear acceleration, it also resulted in creating ever increasing separation, one from the other. This specialization did not permit them to integrate their work, which is what society hoped they would do. Thus, because we had deliberately sifted out the bright ones and made them specialists, and the specialists couldn't put their own work together, the task of putting things together was left to the not-as-bright, and that is pretty much the way it is in our world today. The more specialized, the more brilliant the work of the specialists, the less effective and competent seems the ability to make our total world work, since this same brilliant work requires more generalized political positions.

At any rate, at the Naval Academy I found this strategy of education being completely reversed. There, they were sorting out the bright ones and deliberately setting out to

make them generalists, with capabilities in many directions. This made me think a whole lot. It was very clear, for example, that three quarters of our earth was covered with water and that the waters were outside the laws of any of the lands. The water areas of the earth were therefore occupied by whoever was able to master them, since no sovereignty could be expressed over this three quarters of the earth. There would be simply one great master, and great wealth was to be realized through such mastery by those who were simply able to dispose of the others.

As we were brought up in our history, we learned of the great empires, Ghengis Khan, The Roman Empire and Alexander. All these empires grew up when Man was thinking of the earth as a flat surface. An empire in those days was a postage stamp, a rough-edged postage stamp of civilization. Outside of it you encountered very unreliable people, wild people, and then beyond, you came to the dragons.

It was never pointed out to us in our history that the British Empire was the first spherical empire. Nor that the others were planar empires. And because they were planar empires they went to infinity. Because they went to infinity the number of variables that would be operative in an infinite system would be infinite in number and if you didn't like what was going on, there was always a chance you could find one of the gods who would take care of it. People had a whole lot of hope in those days.

160 years ago Thomas Malthus, the first economist in the history of Man, was receiving the vital statistics from a closed system, from the spherical British empire. Because of the closed system, his data showed that humanity apparently is reproducing itself much more rapidly than it is producing to support itself.

Later, in Malthus' second book, printed in 1810, we found that Man seemed to be reproducing himself at a geometrical rate and producing the support only at an arithmetical rate. We have from Thomas Malthus the first closed system, seemingly scientific, statement that there was not nearly enough to go around, and man was designed to be a failure. Only relatively few can survive. Those who survived in those days were the "ins" of their time. They were the masters of what we call the British Empire, not merely the British Isles. They were masters of the world; they commanded the seas. They had the most unsinkable of the fleets.

The British took their scientists around the world to see what resources there were in this closed system. Darwin was amongst them. Darwin was able then, with other biologists, to identify what seemed to be all the living species. He found great interrelatedness among the designs of species, and Darwin developed his theory of evolution.

I want you to realize that Darwin could not have developed a theory of evolution in a planar earth that went to infinity, because he would have had to include dragons to the nth power. You can only have this kind of competent thinking when you realize you have closed systems and know what the closed system is. Thus, we have in the last century Malthus making seemingly scientifically clear that there was nowhere nearly enough to go around in this closed system, and we have Darwin explaining his theory of evolution and survival of the fittest. At this same time, those masters of the earth by virtues of their mastery of the seas were saying that they were apparently the best informed and the most powerful, and therefore the fittest.

After a century and a half of this kind of thinking in state craft, nobody yet knows just how much or how many could really

be supported. Despite various alliances, the working assumption is that Armageddon is inevitable because there is not enough to go around. For the young individuals who had the muscle, it was: better get your sword while you can because if you don't claim yours while you are strong you will rot in the slums where men die at the average age of twenty-seven. Even some at the Naval Academy are still carrying a sword. This precept carried over to the mass organization of States, looking out for the Armageddon each carrying its sword or gun.

Now there have evolved some new conditions for man and strangely enough as a consequence of our own Navy. The fundamental something I find is the great difference between the ways of thinking about the sea and about the land. It is in no way understood by our world's society at large, 99.9% of man being landed. And I find that even though the Navy thinks in a characteristic way, they themselves do not realize the difference in the way they think from the way the landed man thinks.

But I would like to point out that on the land men who had found a place where they seemed to be able to prosper found themselves having to guard it. There were a great many who had not been prospering who came their way very hungry and who would give their life to displace them.

So the great strategy of survival on the land had been by fortification. You built a fortress around a well and put up strong walled granaries. When you saw people coming who were going to bother you, you took all your food inside and left nothing outside. The people arrived hungry and you who were eating well inside watched from your walls. When they were good and weak, then you went out and decimated them. That worked very well for thousands of years. On the land men thought of their security in terms of the width—the heavier the walls and the higher the walls, the bigger the grain bin—the bigger, the bigger—the more secure. And that is still the primary thinking of our fellow men.

But if you went to sea in a stone boat, it wouldn't do you any good. At sea, there is no law outside of your own. If you have two great men, with two great aspirations at sea, clearly whoever wants to run the show sends the other man to the bottom.

Granted that Archimedes discovered his beautiful principle of displacement in a bath tub; on land, men had learned about floating earlier. Two ships of the same size, displacing the same amount of water, were understood to float exactly the same amount of weight. You see your rival building a ship on the ways. He has learned from the sea, as you have, various tricks and knows this to be the right size ship for him, it is going to be a beauty. And you know what the length is, you know what the beam is, you know what the draft is, and, thus, very easily, you know all she can weigh. So, you can build one the same. But, if you know, as a result of sailing around the world, that in a place called Sitka, the spruce trees make better spars, you know that in a place like the Philippines you can get better fibers for your ropes and in Egypt, better sails, your ship need not be quite the same. When you're stalking your enemy forty miles over the curvature of the earth and you wait to make contact, and when it is really blowing and he has to take off the sails because his mast is not as strong and his ropes are not as strong as yours, he is the one who goes to the bottom. Whoever then, with the same weight, could do the most with the least was the one who stays on top. And you never knew until contact who had found the

strongest ropes. In other words, at sea everything depends on doing more with less.

Whoever had the best gear so that in the shortest time sail could be gotten on or off, whoever had most energy in the muscles on board his ship, the most adequate metabolic support, whoever could get the most out of a pound and a minute and an erg is the one who is going to prevail. That's all there was to it then. The Sea was the most extraordinary laboratory of engineering for doing more with less, and really doing more with less was such a fundamental secret of navies that this is the secret you found necessary to hide. Anybody could see the size of your ship but they didn't know what you could do with that kind of tonnage. So this is the most classified thing we had and drawings were methodically done away with as fast as you built your ship. So there is not a book, there is not a chapter, there is not a sentence in any book about economics about doing more with less.

And this is the very essence of the Navy. And then, of course, it became the essence of the air because in the air we had to do even more with less because your aircraft couldn't float. She had to be pulled through the sky at hurricane speed to give her lift. And you had to do more with less weight of engine and weight of fuel and so forth. Once in the air, the doing more with less became an even more prodigious battle.

The doing more with less that came out of Navy and air has changed our world. In this century we've gone from less than one percent of humanity to forty percent of humanity enjoying a higher standard of living than any king we knew of before the 20th century. This is despite the fact that during that time the resources per capita has been continually decreasing. The way we got to taking care of forty percent of the people was by doing more with less. And this is not in the economics books. It is not in general policy either. This is what was hidden away. That is why I want to emphasize the curve of doing more with less today while we are thinking about the seas today and what is opening up on the oceans for mankind. As we get going horizontally around our world, gravity is giving you brakes and stops you. A child learns quickly he can run and stop very fast. When he starts falling out of a tree, gravity is pulling him, there are no brakes. Man is very careful about the vertical coping with nature. With ships we have been obliged to keep this vertical constraint always in mind.

On the land, our automobiles are so ill-designed conceptually that we have killed more people with automobiles in this country than we have killed by all the warring men have done in all history. Just think of it. But the sea's threat of gravity was so great that men designed those ships very, very carefully. And man at sea has been very thoughtful of the other man at sea, the dramatics of that gravity are so great. With airplanes it is even more so. Now we really cope with it vertically in our rocketry, due to the dramatic awareness in our hearts of the power of gravity. The weight and the compactness of what you do has to be so great that we do so much with so little in that rocketry, and we do it so well, that astronauts of the various countries are almost getting into the kind of mileage we have done with air without the loss of one life. Not one life. This is how well it's been done. Just think of what we have accomplished there with so little weight and the reliability that has been established.

So I say that out of the curve of doing more with less, there is a fall-out. We had generators in the Navy for about twenty years before we had enough excess power to begin to sell it to the towns; then they just simply put it back into the candles. This old pattern of the land is simply so archaic, you can't find anybody who knows what a building weighs. I have met with architects all around the world and I say "Would you please tell

me what the building we're in weighs?" Anybody? No hands. "Just roughly within a hundred thousand tons?" No tons. If you don't know what a building weighs, you certainly don't know what your performance per pound is. I just want to point out that in our land economics we are not using any of the thinking that went into the sea. And it has been entirely a fall-out of the sea that is making man a success on the land today. First electricity. We had refrigeration on our battleships twenty years before it came out on the land. We were making steel in the blast furnaces for our ships fifty years before we put a piece of steel in a building on the land. All this great change has come from the sea.

There is great promise here, and the reason I am stressing this is that it bears on how to begin to think about what we are going to do about our world, and our world is in a mess. It is a horrible mess. You find the men on the land very short sighted. People on the land think in terms of agriculture, they think of this year's crop. This year's profit. When you do something at sea, you plan. Preparing a Navy was a design-science undertaking that takes at least twenty-five years; a generation. And there's not a single thing in the Navy you pick off a tree. It all had to be designed. The most extraordinary, comprehensive, anticipatory design.

And now a word on our astronomy. I find our society today talks about predictions as if it were something very new. But the astronomers have been able for a long time to be able to tell just what each one star is going to be doing for many thousands of years. That's why you can have a planetarium. Our universe is fantastically reliable—both macrocosmically and microcosmically. But here is little man on our little planet. The way air travel and air navigation is conducted it doesn't matter whether it is an Ethiopian flying it or an Indian. The power structure goes out the window once you are in the sky. The reliability is just magnificent. The integrity of navigation is absolutely transcendental to the sovereignty of nations. When we land the ground control takes over. There is a little preference given to the airlines over the private plane here. When you go through the customs gate, then all hell breaks loose.

Throughout the universe, the only part that is unreliable is here at the surface of our earth. Man is behaving very badly in his great ignorance. He thinks with the short sightedness of agricultural undertakings when to do anything really important you have to think at least twenty-five years ahead. Our governments come in for four years and so forth. Nobody has the authority to think really in a very big way, except in terms of the defense—outside the country. So, navies did think in big ways. They thought in enormous ways. Their thinking has been magnificent. The point we should remember on our planet earth curve is that all unexpected improvement is fallout of that competent long distance thinking.

We have gotten to the point where forty percent of humanity is being taken care of at a higher standard of living than anybody has ever known. Were it not for the pre-occupation in a negative way of Russia and the United States for arming against each other, Russia's production could have affluence, truly affluence, and they would like to have it, after all their five year planning. Their fine productivity is still going into making weapons against everybody. If Russia is relieved from that, we will have more than fifty percent affluent. The majority of humanity would be affluent for the first time in the history of man. So long as ninety-nine percent were desperate, you always had a revolution. You couldn't help it. But with more than fifty percent successful, we have a very different volition. Where the majority

is successful, they realize they can never be happy till everybody is taken care of and we may have a very different switch in the situation.

We are coming to that critical moment. When we go by the fifty percent point which will be somewhere in the early 70s, if we survive on the earth at all, then we will have politicians beginning to say how do we make the rest of man successful in the very shortest time. Up until now, I think we have been given a very great cushion for our ignorance on earth. I would like you to think a little bit of how ignorant we still are, because man tends to be very, very vain. But as a sailorman, you don't kid yourself. You don't pretend you know how to get through that fog if you haven't got a compass. You don't kid yourself. So I just pointed out to you that scientists had five hundred years to get themselves adjusted to the idea the world was round and they haven't done anything about it. They all still see the sun setting. And does anybody use the words "up and down?" Anybody in this room that doesn't use the words "up" and "down?" Show hands. Okay. The words "up" and "down" were invented to accommodate the concept of a flat earth going to infinity. All lines perpendicular to a flat surface only go in two directions—up and down.

We haven't adjusted at all to that new kind of a world that is a spherical world. We have known this theoretically for a long time, but we don't do anything about it in our senses, nor do we change any of our habits. We say we got on very well like this before, we are going to keep right on. If it is a flat earth, then again it goes to infinity. You have infinite room to pollute. You don't have to worry about pollution. And it has been your experience that it's so big that you always found more resources after exhausting the known ones. But as a closed system, no!

You'd think that with our moon undertaking, we might really have had kind of a breakthrough with our senses. But Conrad spoke to the people of the world about being up here on the moon and the President congratulated the astronauts on going up to the moon and getting back here down to earth. And we hear people saying, "never mind that space up there now, let's get down to earth." You should say "where's that?" "Where is down to earth?" That's our flat concept still coming through. Anybody who says you must be practical, lets get down to earth doesn't know what he's talking about. Don't listen to him, ever.

This is the mood you have to go into here talking about our resources. Man, in his great ignorance has gone on polluting thinking of all that room. With infinite space, it's all right to be short-sighted. For this year's profits, we're out to burn up all of our fossil fuel. But why worry about our great-great grandchildren. It takes a good profit to get re-elected president of the board. The Lord has allowed us to be ignorant up to now so we would have enough experience to really learn something.

By now we should have had enough experience to really learn something: To discover that our strength is not in our muscles; that our strength is in our minds; To discover the principle of leverage; To learn how to put levers one behind another around a wheel, put it under the waterfall; How to organize nature to develop work for us. Because all we mean by wealth is the ability to regenerate life on earth. I have asked many, many audiences around the world the following:

"No matter what you think what wealth is, and I am sure everybody in this room has a little different idea about what wealth is. Is there anybody in this room who will disagree with me when I say that no matter

how much you have of it, you can't alter one iota of yesterday?" I never see any hands.

You can forget about yesterday if you want to think about wealth. It has something to do with today and tomorrow. It is a capability. And all it really means is the ability to regenerate life, this is metabolics. It is the mind, the metaphysical mind, and master of the physical.

We also in our great ignorance talk about the United States as a nation. We are not a nation, we are the most cross-bred phase of humanity. We are beginning to be world man. We are a little of all humanity. There have been pools of cross-breeding world man, India and Mexico before us. And in Mexico you see every shape of face, every shape of head, and every shade of color; there's no race. We have a new world man and cross-breeding on this continent and we have a lot of opportunity now. The resources are so abundant as to allow us to be very ignorant and to make enough experiments to find by trial and error what we really have of any importance. And what we have is a mind. And we are really going to have to start using the mind now or we'll all perish very shortly.

I like to think that with our fellow men around the world we had great friendship until recently. In no time at all that friendship had deteriorated. There is a very negative attitude toward people on this continent. I don't suppose that everybody in America realizes how we've fallen out of esteem because we seem to be so shortsighted. I travel around the world and find this to be the case. Since we are shortsighted, we were very fortunate to inherit all the experience of those before us. Just remember that in China in 400 B.C. they had quaternary alloys. We inherited the information on the isolation of the chemical elements—only two of the 92 chemical elements were isolated in this country. We inherited all those kinds of capabilities. And the world has been looking to us askance, because we are very powerful and seemingly falling into the bad habits of yesterday's sovereignty. Just as the old people who had learned it wouldn't work any more were giving it up, we were seemingly stressing our great power.

I think it is very important to begin to talk more about our oceans. I see our oceans as the great teacher that taught us engineering, taught us navigation, forced us to really develop mathematics, forced us to use the capabilities of the mind. The little man on that boat feels awfully tiny on that sea. If he doesn't really use this thing, he's lost. Now consider all of humanity are passengers aboard our little space ship earth, superbly supplied, superbly designed. So superbly designed that it has been able to support humanity for four million years without even knowing it was aboard ship. That's quite a design! To be foolproof for four million years. But it's not infinitely foolproof.

So it would be very great if the message goes out from America that the world's people are shipmates who have for the moment suffered considerable setbacks simply due to the fact that we have been slow in achieving an adequate wage for humanity so humanity could enjoy universally the benefits. A seaman can think of the kind of things we can do that would be of very great importance. Society, all around the world, is doing all the right things for the wrong reasons. We have been backing up into our future. This is particularly true to the oceans. We have developed the atomic submarine in a very big way, first here and now Russia, for the wrong reasons, to be sure, but another fallout from the sea.

The submarine is a very big affair—you want to take a cargo from Buenos Aires to Europe, you couldn't change anywhere, you couldn't swap your goods and trade at sea. Two ships could not dock beside each other.

They would perish. But with a submarine we get down below the turbulence and we can change cargoes at sea. We could have underwater cities anywhere around our earth. If we begin to have underwater transfer of our world resources, I think all the sovereignties would just break down. Their customs are broken.

Once you realize there are now in your hands the tools to really use the kind of mind you have as a seaman, it is time to begin to try to make the old world work. And I do travel enough around the world to tell you this. I'm sure most of you really know it, but I find myself in meeting with the Russians, with Norman Cousins committee, with the Russian Academy of Science, there is a very good will and the thinker, the intellectual, everywhere agrees as to the will of man to try to cooperate and to try to make things work. Here I think of the sea as a great safety factor, of the great design of man on earth to have still this three-quarters of the earth which was almost unapproachable by man reserved for the last chapter. Having made a mess of the earlier part, the sea is still there and great, even though we have robbed it of so many of those whales and other things.

I am going to discuss a map. As a sailor, I found it important to be able to see our earth without the distortions we get with mercator and polyconics, polar asimuthals and whatever. I found a method of transferring the data from a sphere to a plane without any visible distortion of the relative shape or the relative size of any of the parts, and without any breaks in the continental contours. The dymaxion map. This shows one world island and one world ocean without any visible distortion. If you cut it and round its edges, it makes an icosahedron. If you look at that icosahedron alongside the globe you will find no discrepancy between them. The data, the way it seems to read, reads just the way the globe does. Here some day is one world island and one world ocean, and that one world ocean is then waiting for all of us to find our final great support.

For very long, the poles have been frozen. Man has not thought tactically in terms of the north pole. Even though very spectacular things have been done, we don't think that way very much yet. While we can negotiate the pole very readily today, we have had the enmity between Russia and North America, so we don't think of it in this way. But look again at this map. One can reach ninety-five percent of humanity from anywhere in America without going near the Atlantic or Pacific. Here is one way; this is a "strip map" of our tomorrow.

It is fortunate that in a sense that our oceans will be abandoned. We have already seen passenger ships decline very, very suddenly. And what will be the significance of a Port of New York or of San Francisco in terms of a north-south air axis. There are great investments in a place like New York and San Francisco and they will fight very hard to try to keep traffic coming their way. But it is not in the new traffic pattern; they are side shows. People will get to New York to see the theater but not on their way to Europe. We will learn to accept this new orientation and to see the ocean as a great garden around that one world island.

Coloring is an important dimension of a map. Coloring on my map is the weather. We typically have weather reported to us in its extremes—the highs and the lows, the wetness or dryness or coldness or hotness. But you find the real difference between, one place and another, however, for instance is how cold does it get, not how hot does it get. The cold pole of the northern hemisphere gets as warm in mid-summer at noontime as does equatorial Africa. But equatorial Africa never gets as cold as it does in Northern Siberia. Hot is very universal. Cold is unique and the colder it gets the more an-

nual variation you have, the more kinds of environment you have to adjust to.

So if you are born in Africa near Lake Victoria, you'll invent a boat to cross it. But if you were born in more northern latitudes, in the summer you invent a boat and in the winter you invent sleds and ice skates. Invention is precipitated by the confrontations man has. The central Arctic bullseye, in which is the temperature control, the climate control, of the northern hemisphere affects almost all of humanity. Australia, South America and the bottom of Africa are exempt. All the rest is in the Northern Hemisphere. If I put color dots on the map as the colors of men's skins around the world, you will find they correspond exactly to the weather. The colder it gets, the whiter they get, the hotter it gets, the blacker they get. If you have to hibernate and you have to inbreed as people did for thousands of years under those special conditions, you get bleached out. They also need hair to cover them when they have to take off their clothes, and they're out in the sun. And just look at the African, look at his hands and the bottoms of feet. They're white. And there's no race.

We have men who have been inbreeding for long periods, isolated from one another, getting very special characteristics. And your sailor man kept going around the world, cross-breeding with all of them and he's a kind of swarthy inbetween.

I've spent a long time belaboring these points. I do find it a practical matter with the kind of competence we have today to consider floating cities that are not going with the waves. The waves are simply going through them. A very practical matter. It would be very easy to go down below the turbulence and have submarine cities. Also very easy within protected waters to have floating cities. And we probably will do a lot of that. Cities have been designed completely anarchistically. We have all our urban troubles—and people don't even know what the buildings weigh. Everybody does things independently.

When you design a ship, one man designs it. She's organic. And when she becomes obsolete you melt her up and make a much better one. But we don't have this kind of logic on the land. And that kind of logic is going to have to prevail in the land. I like the kind of thinking that we do as sailors, and as cross-breeding world man. As we talk to our fellow man and the word gets around the way we are thinking, we are not thinking in yesterday's ignorant way. No longer do we believe it's got to be you or me. We have discovered in our kind of technology it is very practical to consider all of us. We are going to all have to survive or none. And the kind of technology and the kind of attitude out of which that will come is the kind of attitude which has come out of the sailor man.

OBSERVANCE OF RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Rumanians throughout the free world celebrated this week the achievement of Rumanian independence on May 10, 1866.

Unfortunately, no such celebration could be conducted in Rumania where the regime has tried unsuccessfully to eradicate memories of the days when Rumanians were truly independent and the masters of their own destiny.

Americans of every background should join in observance of this occasion, and in contemplation of the chain of events that led to the loss of Rumanian freedom following the Second World War.

The tremendous reception given President Nixon by the people of Rumania during his visit there is evidence of the strong bonds of affection that unite our two peoples. It was evidence also of the hope that Rumania may once again be free of Communist imperialism. I share that hope and I trust that the knowledge of our sympathy and moral support gives strength to the people of Rumania.

CAMBODIA WEAKENS U.S. HAND AS SOVIET GAINS IN NEAR EAST

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, last week I spoke out several times against the President's intervention in Cambodia, reflecting my concerns and those of my constituents over a further expansion of the war in Indochina. At that time, I pointed out the dangers of a burgeoning conflict in that area and the impact we are feeling now at home.

The world spotlight, however, can swing too far in one direction. While the Nation struggles with domestic outcry and dissent over Cambodia, we neglect the ominous developments in the Middle East. Israel fights on almost all her borders. Soviet pilots have joined the air forces of Egypt. While we look elsewhere, the Russian fox entrenches himself in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, there is a very real distinction between American involvement in Indochina and our time-honored commitments to the State of Israel. In the first instance, I believe that the United States has mistakenly supported countries and regimes that are unstable or just beginning to develop. In the second, in the Middle East, this country has preserved its friendship with a duly constituted democratic society in Israel since its very foundation in 1948.

Our priorities are very clear, but we have developed a blind side to the dangers that face Israel. The situation worsens by the day in the Middle East, but we remain caught up in the frustrations and anger of Southeast Asia. We must look to our friends.

Mr. Speaker, an excellent column along this line of thought appeared in the Washington Post this morning. I wish at this time to cite the article by Joseph Kraft entitled "Cambodia Weakens U.S. Hand as the Soviets Gain in the Near East" and have it included at this point in the RECORD:

CAMBODIA WEAKENS U.S. HAND AS SOVIET GAINS IN NEAR EAST
(By Joseph Kraft)

The quaint conceit that President Nixon's Cambodian plunge strengthens this country's global stance encounters reality in the Near East. And the result of the meeting is dismal.

For the Russians are blandly deepening

their penetration of Egypt in ways that cause Colonel Nasser to flex his muscles anew. But the United States faces this challenge from a position of weakness unmatched since the Moscow-Cairo axis started abuilding 15 years ago.

The basic facts are well known. In the past few months the Russians have become the mainstay of Egyptian air defense. They have set up new surface-to-air missiles—the SA-3—around Cairo and Alexandria. They have supplied crews to man these weapons.

In addition, Soviet pilots are flying Mig 21 jets on operational, as distinct from training, missions. While the exact nature of these missions is in some doubt, the Soviet pilots are rising whenever Israeli pilots penetrate Egyptian territory beyond the Suez Canal zone. In effect, the Russians are protecting Egypt's hinterland.

Thus protected, Colonel Nasser, after the usual fashion of the gambler, has had a sudden access of confidence and courage. He has stepped up the attrition raids that take such a heavy toll of Israeli manpower. "We've been here for seven thousand years, and we'll be here seven thousand more," he boasted to one recent visitor.

The Israelis have so far been cautious in response. They have not flown sorties in the area now patrolled by Soviet pilots. Defense Minister Moshe Dayan has expressed interest in getting a cease-fire. But this restrained attitude will be maintained only if there is some indication that Israel does not stand alone—that she has American support.

As to Washington, nobody here doubts that the latest Soviet move represents a challenge and a potential threat to the peace. Nobody doubts that Israel will once more act alone if some kind of American help is not forthcoming. Nobody doubts that if Washington sits on its hands there will be some further Soviet move to penetrate Egypt—perhaps the stationing of the SA-3 missiles and their Russian crews in the Canal Zone within easy range of Israeli guns.

But with all these dangers implicit in inaction, Washington has been looking the other way, dodging conclusions, playing for time. Thus a massive intelligence analysis is under way to determine exactly the nature of the new mission assigned to Soviet pilots in Egypt. Moscow was asked by Ambassador Jacob Beame—who doesn't exactly have the clout to make strong demands—for an explanation of the new assignment for the Soviet pilots. When the first explanation was found to be too vague, he was sent back for more.

In the long run, everybody concedes that the President will be obliged to take some action. The best guess is that Israel will be offered more planes and credits, and perhaps a closer working arrangement in defense. But this will be done quietly and with little public stir—slipped over the transom, as it were.

What this means is that the American response in the Near East will be a weak response—slow in coming and almost invisible. No doubt there are good reasons for this weakness.

Delay is necessary because the Nixon administration has been too obsessed with Cambodia to think about anything else. The Congress and much of the country have been so upset by Cambodia that any blaring forth of new undertakings would excite a hostile reaction. But that only says that the weak response in the Near East is rooted in conditions created by the Cambodian strike.

One weak response, to be sure doesn't mean the end of the world. But it shows that the claim about Cambodia strengthening the American hand around the world is contemptible. It is, in fact, only slightly less contemptible than the suggestion that the blame for this country's weakened condition should fall on those who protested, rather than those who undertook, the wholly unnecessary move in Cambodia.

THE NEED FOR HANDGUN CONTROL

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from the April 23, 1970, edition of the Wall Street Journal, by Mr. Alan L. Otten, entitled "Poor Protection." The article concisely summarizes the case that I have already made before this body for comprehensive legislation to put a stop to the senseless proliferation of handguns in our increasingly violence-prone society.

Not only is the handgun the all-time favorite American murder weapon, accounting for two of every three homicides, but it has become the key element in nearly one-third of all robberies. In the latter case the easy availability of second-hand pistols and revolvers virtually insures the professional thief, narcotics addict, or rapist the instant courage he requires. Even those law-abiding citizens who seek assurance of self-protection through the gun in the bureau drawer are tragically mistaken. Statistics show that the most probable victim will be another family member, not the would-be thief, who naturally prefers to work in an empty house or apartment, or relies on the element of surprise.

The legislation I have introduced in this regard, H.R. 16250, would go far to curb the dangerous boom in the production and sale of handguns, which can scarcely be justified for sporting purposes. I pray that we will not need further proof in the form of a rising toll of injuries and deaths, or the spectacular assassination of some public figure, to move the Congress to establish realistic nationwide control over access to handguns. The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 23, 1970]

POLITICS AND PEOPLE: POOR PROTECTION
(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—One of the capital's favorite phrases, often abused, is the one about "an idea whose time has come." Over the years, the time apparently came for such diverse notions as civil rights and nuclear test bans, Medicare and clean air, and scores more.

Somehow, the time has never seem to come for one particular idea: Tough Federal controls over guns, especially handguns. Yet the arguments for few proposals are as solidly convincing as are those for tight restraints on handguns. And to underscore the paradox, the most compelling argument may be the deep danger handguns pose to the very people who buy them for self-protection.

A national gun control law was enacted in 1968, after the assassinations of Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy, but it is narrow and hole-filled. It forbids mail-order and interstate gun shipments to individuals, the importation of cheap foreign guns, gun ownership by the criminally convicted. Basically, though, it leaves to the states and cities such matters as store sales and private transfers of second-hand guns.

Only a few local governments have made any serious gun control efforts, and these have been frustrated by the ease of buying guns in neighboring jurisdictions with weak laws or none at all. Legally or illegally, just about anyone who wants a gun can still manage to get one.

Proposals to control rifles and shotguns are at least debatable; they are used widely for hunting and sports, comparatively rarely in crime. But pistols, revolvers and other handguns have little sporting purpose, and are overwhelmingly the favored weapon for violent crime and violent death.

Two of every three homicides are committed with firearms, practically always handguns; since 1963, the number of gun killings has risen 48%, while the number of homicides with other weapons has increased 10%. Handguns are by far the favored weapons for political assassinations, for killing police. Nearly one of every four aggravated assaults and one of every three robberies now employ guns, practically always handguns, and here, too, the percentage rises year after year.

The reason for this increasing resort to handguns is simply that there are more of them around. Once a standard item of clothing in the Old West, "the great equalizer" gradually became less widely owned. It began to become more common again after World War II, when thousands of GIs brought home captured pistols as souvenirs, and postwar movies and TV made a hero of the man with the gun—the cowboy, sheriff, soldier, spy, even the debonair crook.

But the really big handgun boom has been in the last few years. Between 1962 and 1968, while the annual sale of long guns was doubling, the annual sale of handguns quadrupled. By 1968, there were an estimated 24 million handguns in civilian hands, with another 2.5 million being manufactured or imported each year.

And the reason for the spread of handguns is also obvious: Fear. The man on the street fears for his own safety in the midst of soaring crime and urban rioting. Store owners and other businessmen arm to deter holdups. Families arm to guard themselves and their possessions from the robber, the rapist, the rioter.

These frightened gun buyers now provide a swelling lobby against gun controls, reinforcing the hunters and right-to-bear-arms champions who fear that tight handgun curbs would merely be the entering wedge for curbs on all guns. They argue self-righteously and strenuously that "the criminal will always manage to get a gun, so why shouldn't we have them for our own protection?"

Two things are wrong with this argument, however. First, the criminal won't always manage to get a gun. Experience in the few places that have tough gun laws here and abroad strongly suggests that they may keep many a person from crime, or at least turn him to less deadly weapons. In England and Wales, where there are tough gun controls, only 6% of robberies were carried out with guns in 1967, compared to 37% in the U.S.

The other thing wrong with the "let-us-have-guns" argument is that most guns are no protection at all. The home burglar enters is usually empty or asleep; the burglar, a recent Federal study notes, "is more likely to steal the home-defense firearm than be driven off by it." Most robberies (robberies involve personal contact, whereas burglaries don't) occur away from home; since the gun-owner rarely carries the gun with him, it's not much protection there. Home robbers usually manage to take the resident by surprise, depriving him of any chance to use his gun. "The burglar avoids confrontation, the robber confronts too swiftly," the Federal study declares.

The gun in the bureau drawer is far less likely to protect the owner than to endanger him and his family. The husband riddles the two-timing wife. The mixed-up kid evens the score with the too-tough parent. The drinking buddies' argument comes to a violent conclusion. The gun goes off accidentally while Dad is cleaning it, or while Sonny is showing it off to his schoolmate. Fully half of all gun kill-

ings occur within the family, 80% among family or friends.

Maintains the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, headed by Milton Eisenhower: "The armed segment of our population is paying a heavy price in accidents and in the shooting of family members, friends, and acquaintances for whatever deterrent effect possession of self-defense firearms may be providing."

The Eisenhower Commission is merely the latest in a procession of Presidential and other prestigious study groups recommending tightly restrictive licensing that denies handguns to all but police and other security personnel and perhaps store owners in high crime areas. The Commission also recommended, as others before it, a crash program to develop a nonlethal weapon—one that would instantly incapacitate an attacker for 30 minutes or so while police were summoned, but would not kill or maim.

With such a weapon to rely on, average citizens might gradually swing behind tight gun curbs. Until then, however, new gun control moves will be fiercely fought by frightened men and women who believe that by arming, they add to their own safety.

"The time has come to bring the handgun under reasonable control," Mr. Eisenhower's commissioner conclude. It would be nice to think they're right, but all signs are to the contrary. Gun control is one idea whose time seems to keep slipping further into the future.

PAUL R. HANDLERY DAY

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Paul R. Handlery, president of the Handlery Hotels and prominent civic leader, has been selected as recipient of the 1970 honor award given by the San Francisco Friends of the National Jewish Hospital and Research Center. This recognition is given for his outstanding community service and rigorous effort in behalf of the medically indigent.

The National Jewish Hospital opened its doors on a free, nonsectarian basis in 1899. It operates under the unique motto:

None may enter who can pay . . . none can pay who enter.

The guiding philosophy of its founders and supporters is that pain knows no creed. We in California have benefited from the hospital's philosophy to the extent of 196,000 patient-days of free care for the treatment of emphysema, tuberculosis, asthma, cystic fibrosis, and other chest diseases.

Its program of treatment, research, rehabilitation, and education is dedicated to protecting mankind's birthright to breathe. Because of its contributions in the field of medicine, the World Health Organization of the United Nations has recognized the National Jewish Hospital as its world center for the study of respiratory diseases.

The resolution passed by the senate of the State of California that June 3, 1970, be observed as "Paul R. Handlery Day" in California is a highly deserved tribute to a man who has contributed so much of himself and his resources toward furthering these humanitarian efforts. I

am happy to join with other Californians in honoring Mr. Paul Handlery for his unselfish devotion to such a worthy cause.

NIXON'S POSTAL PLAN FOLLOWS
BRITISH LEAD

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the April 24, 1970, edition of the Arizona Daily Star contained a column by Philip Wagner which compared the current situation regarding reform of the Post Office Department with the experiences over the years of the British Post Office.

In a number of respects, the recent proposals for postal reform that we are now considering follow a course that has already been taken in Britain and their goals and ours are much the same.

We can learn much from the innovations and experiences of the British in this area and I would like to insert this article, entitled "Nixon's Postal Plan Follows British Lead," for the interest of my colleagues:

NIXON'S POSTAL PLAN FOLLOWS BRITISH LEAD
(By Philip Wagner)

WASHINGTON.—The first Nixon effort to reform the postal service fell by the wayside, for two main reasons. One is that Congress has always enjoyed its domination of the Post Office Department—the power to set postal rates, determine various types of postal service (including those that are free), set wage rates and play politics with the rank and file. The other is that postal employees have enjoyed it too, being convinced that they can do better for themselves by lobbying politically than by negotiating with a business-type management.

The postal strike shook those traditional attitudes, on both sides. And in that one respect it may have been a good thing. As the administration was quick to see, it offered postal reform a second chance if the promise of a substantial wage increase were coupled with a second try at revamping the structure of the service.

When the President sent up his special message on the subject last week, most attention was focused on the proposed new 8-cent rate, on the promised raise in postal pay, and on its proposal for collective bargaining with binding arbitration. But the real guts of the message is the plan to abolish the politics-saturated Post Office Department, recognize the postal service for the commercial operation it really is, and give it the autonomy it must have if it is ever to become a self-supporting and accountable operation.

True, it would still not have the legal form of a public corporation. But it would go a long step in that direction. It would have the independent managerial authority and flexibility (including the power to innovate and raise investment capital) which it has never had up to now.

In this respect, the new Nixon plan follows the course of postal reform in Britain, but a third of a century behind. Which is appropriate in a way, because the British have always been the postal innovators.

It was the British who dreamed up the notion of flat-rate postage for letters to and from any part of the country. It was an Englishman, Sir Rowland Hill, who invented the postage stamp—every stamp collector knows about the first postage stamp, the Penny

Black, which went into service in 1840 and so as a by-product founded philately as well.

For nearly a century after that the British Post Office was an ordinary revenue department of the government under the postmaster general. As an organization subject to the whims of politics it suffered the same kinds of disability as our own political postal service until finally, in the early Thirties, the British had the good sense to admit that the Post Office was basically a commercial operation and gave it a degree of financial freedom.

After some twenty years of this, Parliament went further and gave it sufficient authority to balance its income and outgo; and in 1961 it was actually cast loose from the Exchequer, which is to say the Treasury. But it was still a government department, with a political postmaster general, a minister, and close dependence on Parliament.

Finally last fall, and with a minimum of fuss, it was cast loose completely from politics. It became a public corporation, fully accountable for its operations, with a non-political board of directors and a chief executive, under a minister with little more than liaison powers between the corporation and the government. It does not depend on appropriations but must pay its way and make a profit as well. It may set rates, negotiate wages, borrow for capital purposes and even manufacture equipment.

There is one big difference between the British and the American situation. The British embraces more. It not only operates the mails but operates "telecommunications," which is to say the telephone and telegraph system, and it is involved in several other operations as well, notably data processing (for hire) and the GIRO money transfer system. These are basically different from letter carrying, being "capital intensive," whereas letter carrying with its big corps of postmen, postmasters, sub-postmasters and so on is "labor intensive." There is much more chance for technological improvements in the one set of operations than in the other. Hence they are separately administered, and their financial goals are different too. The telephone system is expected to earn an 8½ per cent profit on assets, but letter carrying has the more modest goal of 2 per cent annually on expenditures.

Nevertheless, the new autonomous structure does give the post service an opportunity to move as rapidly as managerial and technical improvements can be devised toward a more efficient and less labor-intensive service—something that has never been possible under the politically dependent and basically irresponsible management of the American system. Assuming that Congress goes along with the President's new set of proposals, we can learn much from the British experience.

ASIAN SPECIALISTS CONDEMN THE INDOCHINA WAR

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed by the statement just released by a few of the Nation's outstanding authorities on Asia. These scholars who have studied the people and the history and the politics of this area for years are deeply aware of the tragic mistake President Nixon is making in that area.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

As specialists on East and Southeast Asia, we are appalled at the statement released Tuesday by twelve professors from George

Washington University and other Washington area institutions declaring full support for President Nixon's recent actions in Indochina.

In Wednesday's *Washington Post*, Professor Charles Moser, a professor of Slavic languages, is quoted as saying that the President's decision to move into Cambodia was "an extremely reasonable one, and deserves the support of reasonable men."

We disagree completely. We believe that the so-called temporary military action in Cambodia can only escalate the scope of the conflict, render less probably any negotiated settlement, make almost impossible efforts at political accommodation inside South Vietnam, and generally promote around the world an image of official American recklessness and irresponsibility.

We call upon all academic area specialists to declare their support for the Hatfield-McGovern Amendment cutting off military appropriations for the Cambodian intervention in thirty days, the war in Laos at the end of 1970, and in Vietnam by no later than June 30, 1971.

George Kahin, Professor of Government, Cornell University, Daniel Lev, Professor of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley, David Marr, Professor of Asian Studies, Cornell University, William Liddle, Professor of Political Science, Ohio State University, Truong Buu Lam, Professor of History, State University of New York, Stony Brook, James Scott, Professor of History, University of Wisconsin, Herbert Phillips, Professor of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, Benedict Anderson, Professor of Government, Cornell University, Donald Voth, Professor of Sociology, Southern Illinois University.

ISRAEL

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on May 15 the State of Israel will celebrate the 22d anniversary of its independence.

Since that community of people has joined the larger community of free men, they have displayed a spirit and a courage that has made possible the preservation of a culture and fulfillment of the dreams of millions.

This Nation, and Israel's friends all over the world, can be proud to have supported that nation from its inception. But we must be continually alert to the present dangers, and their implications, and insure continued assistance to her.

The first 22 years have seen the tiny country move from an underdeveloped desert to a flourishing nation. Marked by such progress, Israel has set an example for all.

But these early years have also been marked by deep and serious challenges. At times that nation has been subject to a state of siege. Presently, the tension in the Mideast has risen to the point where all international order is jeopardized. Our response to this situation should continue to be a policy enlightened by the commitments of this Nation to those people. By continuing to extend support to this embattered nation we will insure her the right to exist; and the

bond of affection between us will continue to grow.

So on celebrating this 22d anniversary, I wish her a future of prosperity and I hope that this spirit of independence and cause of freedom continues to be championed by the American people.

U.S. MOVE TO CLOSE LAKES LAB COULD CRIPPLE ANTIPOLLUTION EFFORTS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is wide concern, finally, about the increasing damage to our environment by pollution in particular, it is distressing to see the Federal Government closing down key antipollution installations.

Yet, such is the case on the Great Lakes where the Department of Interior is literally gutting the work of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, which has been performing an outstanding service on the Great Lakes for some years through its several laboratories and research facilities.

This is the same Bureau whose laboratory developed the vital techniques for controlling the sea lamprey and the alewife which have done appalling damage in the lakes.

The Government has been giving liberal lip service to its antipollution efforts, but the closedown of the Bureau's work on the lakes is an inexcusable step in the opposite direction.

It is a rebuff to the Congress which appropriated funds for biological studies of the pesticide pollution problem, only to have the funds frozen by the administration's austerity program. Other funds have been rechanneled to ocean research.

Despite the obvious pollution crisis in the Great Lakes and the repeated bemoaning of the problem at many levels of Government, the cold fact is that the concern for the Great Lakes pollution problem retains a low priority in domestic considerations of this administration.

The background of the work of the Great Lakes laboratories is well detailed in an article published in the *Michigan Journalist* of the University of Michigan and reprinted in the May 6 edition of the *Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News*, as follows:

U.S. MOVE TO CLOSE LAKES LAB COULD CRIPPLE ANTIPOLLUTION EFFORTS

ANN ARBOR, MICH., May 6.—With increasing concern for the natural environment reflected in public opinion and political rhetoric, it seems inconceivable that the foremost laboratory studying the environmental and fishery problems of the Great Lakes—a lab which developed techniques for reducing the specter of the sea lamprey and the alewife—is about to be sacked.

Yet, if the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries continues its present budgetary and bureaucratic reshuffling, Great Lakes research will at best receive a crippling blow.

The Great Lakes are the world's largest and most valuable freshwater source. Once

their waters welcomed drinking, swimming, commercial and sport fishing, and aesthetic admiration. Man cannot survive without fresh-water. The Great Lakes are dying examples of man's ignorance and knowing abuse of this fact.

DEAD FISH ON BEACHES

Lake Erie is a vast, silent sewer. Atlantic salmon, lake trout, whitefish, blue pike, and yellow perch, useful species which once comprised 85 per cent of the total fish taken in these lakes, now comprise less than 5 per cent and some species have been wiped out. Carp and sucker, low-value "trash" fish, now abound. Alewife dieoffs periodically supply our beaches with millions of pounds of stinking, poisonous meat.

The sea lamprey, after twenty years of parasitic ravaging of native Great Lakes fish, now threatens the recent coho salmon programs in Lakes Huron and Ontario. And, in the spring of 1969, the federal Food & Drug Administration seized 34,000 pounds of commercial Great Lakes salmon, declaring that its high pesticide content was dangerous to human health.

In the midst of this ecological nightmare, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries (BCF) is preparing to break up the most effective, expert scientific force ever to focus on the problems of the Great Lakes.

TO PHASE OUT PROGRAMS

The activities of the BCF, an agency of the U.S. Department of the Interior, in the Great Lakes region are essential to sound, ecological management of these tremendous bodies of fresh water.

The BCF supports the Great Lakes Fishery Laboratory and the Exploratory Fishing and Gear Research facility in Ann Arbor; four research ships on the Great Lakes field stations on Lake Erie, Huron, Michigan and Superior; and an impressive collection of scientific equipment.

In February, however, the BCF initiated action to phase out all of its operations concerned with the Great Lakes. Before July 1, 1970, the budget for Great Lakes' work had to be cut by \$400,000—nearly a third. Ernest D. Premetz, the BCF's deputy regional director for the Great Lakes, said that dismissal notices have been sent to 19 of the 82 people on the research staff. Nine of those receiving notices are professional biologists.

REDUCTIONS ARE MADE

As of July 1, 1970, the regional BCF office in Ann Arbor will be closed; the Great Lakes Fishery Lab will drop from the budget of \$1.2 million to \$376,000; the Exploratory Fishery & Gear Research facility will be all but gutted (one man, \$15,000 budget); all other functions, such as the technology lab in Ann Arbor, will be reassigned to other areas within a year.

William M. Terry, BCF's acting deputy director, said that its Great Lakes research program could not escape reductions. President Nixon's budget for next year, Mr. Terry pointed out, has reduced the agency's budget from \$52 million to \$45 million.

A BCF budget document stated that \$1.5 million of this \$7 million cut in agency funds will be absorbed by "low-priority biological research programs not critical to programs planned for major emphasis."

LAB CUT TO \$350,000

Since commercial fishing on the Great Lakes has been in steady decline, the BCF intends to transfer its responsibilities in the Great Lakes area to the Bureau of Sports Fisheries & Wildlife (BSFW). The BCF can then concentrate entirely on oceanic research. On the surface, this transfer doesn't appear significant.

But the BSFW will have only \$350,000 to run what has been a million dollar operation. The Great Lakes Fishery Laboratory will re-

ceive only \$20,000, a fraction of its previous funds.

In effect, the BSFW will take charge of empty buildings, unmanned equipment, and complicated research projects that have been abandoned midway.

The money Congress has already authorized to the BCF for Great Lakes research is being rechanneled to oceanic research. It is extremely unlikely that the Appropriations Committee will duplicate these funds for the Great Lakes work of the BSFW.

LACKS RESEARCH APPROACH

One Ann Arbor biologist argues that even if the BSFW received a budgetary boost, which is doubtful, the agency doesn't have the necessary research approach.

The traditional research philosophy of the BSFW, he said, has been aimed at sport fisheries only and has tended to focus on immediate problems. The present Great Lakes team of the BCF is concerned with the lakes as a total environment. The BCF team recognizes the lakes as ecosystems.

This basic ecological outlook stresses the inseparable interrelations and interactions, between the living organisms of the lakes and their non-living environment. By studying individual fish as well as fish populations, then the BCF team can often identify subtle but important changes within the lakes themselves. The fish serve as indicators.

The total team approach that has been nurtured by the scientists at the Great Lakes Fishery Laboratory and other BCF facilities around the lakes has enabled them to warn of impending dangers.

TO CUT BUDGET \$244,000

These scientists alerted the public to the sea lamprey threat in the 1930's, the alewife threat in the early 1950's, the pollution threat in Lake Erie in the late 1950's.

Dr. G. Y. Harry, director of the Great Lakes Fishery Lab in Ann Arbor, said that the lab must cut its budget by \$244,000 before July 1, 1970. To comply with the cut, eleven lab employees will be released by May 30.

The history of the Great Lakes Research Lab illustrates the tragic crisis found so often in resource management. Over 30 million pounds of lake herring were taken from Lake Erie in 1924. Two years later, only three million pounds were taken, not nearly enough to sustain the industry. Lake herring were rapidly disappearing from the lake. With the downfall of commercial herring fishing serving as a warning, the federal government recognized Great Lakes Fishery Investigation as a legitimate budgetary item.

The depression of 1933 decimated the budding research movement until about 1947.

LAMPREY FUND BOOSTED

Another crisis was required to rejuvenate interest in the Great Lakes. During the 1940's, the sea lamprey invaded the upper Great Lakes through the Welland Canal.

The lamprey went wild in its new favorable environment and quickly destroyed the populations of lake trout in Lakes Huron and Michigan. Other species were seriously affected by this snake-like parasite. The process was repeating itself in Lake Superior when controls developed by the research lab began to be effective.

In 1950, Great Lakes Fishery Investigations funds jumped from \$32,000 to \$287,000—thanks to the lamprey.

The Great Lakes Fishery Investigation team, which operated from totally inadequate facilities, developed a method of electric shock for handling lamprey, and later a very specific poison in lamprey control.

Finally, in 1963, Congress supplied \$1.5 million to construct a federal Great Lakes Fishery Laboratory on the campus of the University of Michigan. By September 1965, Great Lakes scientists had a functional and complete research unit.

Soon after moving into the new lab, the biologists became concerned about pesticide contamination in Great Lakes fish. In 1965 they began a program to monitor pesticide content in fish.

The program was hardly substantial, but, as Dr. Harry put it, "almost all the information you read about concerning pesticides in the Great Lakes has come from the Great Lakes Fishery Lab."

\$176,000 VOTED FOR LAB

As anxiety increased over pesticides in the lakes, Congress appropriated an additional \$125,000 for biological studies of the problem by the lab. Now this money is being withheld as part of the federal austerity program. The Food & Drug Administration is also withholding Great Lakes salmon from the commercial market because their DDT content is too high.

During the summer of 1967 millions of pounds of alewives clogged the intake waters of industrial plants along the southern part of Lake Michigan and destroyed the recreational value of its beaches. This little fish was an intruder into the Great Lakes from the Atlantic Ocean.

With the destruction of large predator fish by sea lampreys, the alewife was able to realize its great potential for population growth. It was first reported in Lake Michigan in 1949. By the time of the great dieoff of 1967 about one-half of the total weight of all fish in Michigan consisted of alewives.

The massive alewife kill of 1967 convinced Congress that an alewife problem existed. In 1969, Congress saw fit to appropriate \$176,000 to the Great Lakes Fishery laboratory to monitor adequately the abundance of alewives and to determine the factors which caused the dieoff.

Dr. Harry indicated that the lab is just now getting its alewife study of the ground. The recent actions of the BCF guarantee that the lab's alewife program will never become airborne.

THEIR JOBS ON THE LINE

U.S. Rep. Mervin Esch of Ann Arbor is trying to save the BCF's research activities involved with the Great Lakes. His protests alone, understandably tempered by his membership in the Republican party, have not been enough and will not be enough to stop the elimination of these indispensable scientific services.

"Surely this administration does not intend to drain the vitality of the country's only major freshwater research facility," Rep. Esch has said.

As budgetary casualties, the Great Lakes will be here to remind all of us in this region just where the present priorities lie. The fight to alter this ranking will be exceedingly difficult because, as one BCF official who disagrees with the move has said, "Many of the scientists fighting this thing are fighting with their jobs on the line."

MARYLAND COPTER PILOT DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, CWO Robert W. Gardner, 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.

COPTER PILOT DIES IN AIR CRASH
IN VIETNAM

CWO Robert W. Gardner, 22, of Wheaton, was killed when his helicopter was shot down April 27.

"He said he was over so that the kids with long hair could have the freedom to demonstrate here," Donald M. Gardner said yesterday about his son.

"He was home on a 30-day leave earlier this month and there were demonstrations, and I remember him saying that's what he was fighting for—freedom," his father said.

The chief warrant officer had already had two helicopters "shot from under him" and expressed foreboding about his return to Vietnam April 18, his father said.

It was not immediately known to Mr. Gardner where his son's helicopter crashed. All four members of the crew were killed.

Mr. Gardner had been in Vietnam since February, 1969, and was serving an extra six month hitch there when he was killed.

He was a member of the 3d Platoon, of the 281st Assault Helicopter Company, stationed in NhaTrang in the Central Coast region. His unit supplied Special Forces camps.

HOT ROD FAN

Born in Washington, he grew up in Wheaton, where he graduated from Wheaton High School in 1965. He attended Montgomery County Community College and the University of Maryland before joining the Army in 1967.

A hot-rod enthusiast, Mr. Gardner owned a dragster, which he named "Honest Injun." He was a familiar figure at local drag races and in 1967 he raced in the Hot Rod International in Pomona, Calif.

Besides his father and mother, he is survived by three brothers, Ronald Gardner, of Kansas City, Mo., and Steven and Paul Gardner, both at home.

LETTER FROM INDOCHINA

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the steadily worsening situation in Southeast Asia and particularly the introduction of American ground combat troops into Cambodia are both alarming and repugnant. Our invasion of Cambodia can only serve to get us more deeply involved in an unending, enervating, and immoral conflict unless we act now to take back our constitutional prerogatives and to prohibit further involvement in Southeast Asia. In this regard, I would like to bring to my colleague's attention an article by Robert Shaplen entitled "Letter from Indochina" which appeared in the May 9, 1970, issue of the New Yorker magazine.

The article traces the events surrounding the widening conflict which is now being referred to not as American involvement in Vietnam, or the Vietnam war, but a situation so broad that it is termed the Indochina war. It is the thesis of this article that the United States is not moving toward disengagement. Rather, the present Cambodian action sets the stage—indeed necessitates—further attacks of this nature. I share Mr. Shaplen's fears.

The article recounts the abysmal failure of the Nixon administration in at-

tempting to win a war that is subject only to political settlement.

Mr. Shaplen states:

The prospects for peace are . . . gloomier than ever. And what is happening in Saigon today, on the government side, scarcely improves the outlook. The rebellious attitude of South Vietnamese students and war veterans, and the friction between President Nguyen Van Thieu and the National Assembly, which has worsened the already bad economic crisis, threaten to cancel the gains that have been made in the country over the past year.

Mr. Shaplen concludes that the present problems in Saigon can only aggravate the problems surrounding an American withdrawal and more importantly will create a broader war that will further intensify the painful disillusionment of the American people in their Government. This is the real cost of the present action—the alienation of more and more Americans from their system of government. We cannot afford to fight a war abroad which is destroying us at home. The full text of the article follows:

LETTER FROM INDOCHINA

(By Robert Shaplen)

SAIGON, May 2.—In the entire Indo-China area during the last two months, the Communists of Peking and Hanoi have been given, and have employed to their advantage, a whole new set of options and opportunities, which, it seems, President Nixon's use of American strength in Cambodia will do little to alter. The events that have, so far, worked against us began with the overthrow of Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia by pro-Western generals and politicians, then continued with this group's almost immediate errors of judgment and action—particularly its brutal actions against Cambodia's Vietnamese minority and its overeagerness to join battle with much stronger and more experienced Communist forces—and included renewed heavy Communist pressure in Laos and a serious deteriorating political and economic situation in South Vietnam. In that country, although our stated policy of Vietnamization was reaffirmed when the President announced, on April 20th, the withdrawal—against the advice, not surprisingly, of his generals—of another hundred and fifty thousand men in the next year, the "low profile" our policymakers have sought to maintain had been elevated considerably even before the President's speech on Cambodia by our shipment of arms to Phnom Penh and by our troops' increasing involvement in operations around the Cambodian border. When conditions are as volatile as they now are, it is difficult, if not impossible, to be guided by something as vague as the doctrine enunciated by the President on Guam last July, emphasizing our intention of limiting our involvement and depending on Asian initiatives. Now, instead of Vietnamization, we are faced, in effect, with a new Indo-Chinization, including the possibility that both Laos and Cambodia may soon be dominated or controlled by the Communists. This belatedly brings into clear focus the problem we have all along refused to face—the unrealism of fighting an isolated war in one small country in the middle of a large racially mixed area without sufficient understanding of the over-all political or military consequences.

The principal beneficiaries of recent events would appear to be the Chinese Communists. Peking is the military and political bulwark behind the emerging new Indo-China United Front Against American Imperialism, created after a meeting on April 24th and 25th somewhere in China. This hastily called "summit conference of the Indo-China peoples," ap-

parently convened at Sihanouk's instigation, forged an alliance of the New Revolutionary Movement in Cambodia, headed by the ousted Prince, with the Hanoi regime and the already established Communist rebel governments of South Vietnam and Laos.

With their growing support of insurrectionary movements in Thailand and Malaysia, and to a lesser extent, in Burma and the Philippines, the Chinese are now in a stronger position to control the revolutionary apparatus throughout Southeast Asia than they have been at any time since 1965, when the Vietcong were stopped by American troops from winning the Vietnamese war and when the Peking-backed coup in Indonesia failed. The response so far of the non-Communist Asian states to the new crisis has been slow; Indonesia has called for a meeting at which Thailand, Japan, and about fifteen other Asian nations can discuss the matter, but that is all. While the Americans have found themselves being inexorably drawn into Cambodian operations, in which the chances for any sort of decisive military engagement will probably prove as evanescent as they have for ten years in South Vietnam, Peking and Hanoi have determined to gain as much as possible from the confused state of affairs.

There is little reason to expect them to cease doing so, particularly in Cambodia, especially in view of Hanoi's decision, indicated in enemy documents, to "re-guerrillize" the war in South Vietnam and to prolong the conflict there until after the departure of the bulk of American forces. No one with any experience in Vietnam, including Hanoi's top experts, has minimized the difficulties of achieving this goal, but no one doubts the will of the Communists or their patience and endurance. In any event, the recently increasing number, in several South Vietnamese provinces, of young men abducted and sent to North Vietnam for training and indoctrination underlines the long-term approach that Hanoi has again adopted. Another indication of this is the vast amount of matériel that has poured down the Ho Chi Minh Trail from the North during the last several months.

Only about twenty per cent of this traffic has been interdicted by American bombing. The coup in Phnom Penh has momentarily denied the North Vietnamese access to the southern Cambodian ports of Sihanoukville, Kep, and Ream, through which most of the Chinese matériel used in the Mekong Delta of South Vietnam was previously shipped with the agreement and profitable connivance of the Sihanouk regime. However, the Communist forces in Cambodia are showing every intention of trying to regain access to those ports and supply routes. In the meantime, they are already extending the branches of the Ho Chi Minh Trail deeper into Laos; through the border area where Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam come together; and farther into Cambodia, as well as into the Vietnamese Highlands and the Delta.

This extension, though it will be no easy feat, will undoubtedly serve to strengthen the arguments of the American military leaders who have been against halting the bombing of the Trail in Laos—in return for which Hanoi and its local Communist supporters of the Pathet Lao have indicated their willingness to limit military operations in that country and to start political negotiations there, which would inevitably lead to stronger Communist representation in any new coalition government. This is bound to come eventually anyway, and some Americans have felt that a break in the Laotian situation now could produce some movement in the deadlocked peace talks in Paris, and perhaps bring to an end at least some of the fighting in Vietnam. The intense mixture of political accommodation and competition would certainly continue, accompanied by terrorism and guerrilla warfare, but the Americans would be out of it sooner rather than later. The whole series of developments

in Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam scarcely encourages any of the recently expressed hopes for the summoning of another Geneva conference to collectively neutralize the former Indo-China states. The French have once more suggested this, and the Russians briefly put out a similar idea, then backed away from it. Even if the Americans obtain some fresh support from the Russians, who undoubtedly are unhappy about the benefits that Peking is deriving from the new situation, no new Geneva conference could conceivably get off the ground without the participation of the North Vietnamese and the Chinese.

The Cambodian coup must first be viewed in the light of the country's relations with Vietnam and the Vietnamese. The traditional enemies of the Cambodians have always been the Vietnamese, who for centuries threatened to take over the remnants of the once great Khmer Empire and would have done so by the middle of the nineteenth century had not the French moved in to colonize Indo-China. Sihanouk, a member of the Khmer royal family, after winning Cambodia's independence from France in 1953, stepped down as king to become both an active head of state and a father figure to his six million Khmer "children." He built roads and schools, but at the same time he permitted the country to slip deeper and deeper into an economic abyss. He set up a series of inefficient state-run enterprises, including everything from a gambling casino to cement factories and banks, but a large share of whatever profits there were went into the pockets of Sihanouk's friends in and around the royal palace. Politically, the bouncy Prince ran the nation with the help of a few relatives and associates, while his hand-picked Sangkum, a nationalist "movement" that convened twice a year, dominated the National Assembly. He failed to create any firm administrative lines between the palace and the Sangkum, on the one hand, and the people, on the other. Between there was a growing political gap, increasingly filled by discontented civil servants, students unable to find jobs, and a small group of powerless intellectuals. The thirty-thousand-man Army, controlled at the top by pro-Sihanouk officers, was both restive and resentful in the middle and lower echelons. It engaged in little or no military activity—in fact, it hardly kept its mixed array of weapons clean—and this is an important reason for its present inability to contend with the Communists.

Until two or three years ago, when the Vietnamese Communists and Chinese Communists, working through a handful of Khmer agents, incite local rebellions against his rule, Sihanouk countenanced with silence or bland denials the use of Cambodia as a haven for North Vietnamese Communist troops, who moved back and forth at will between Cambodia and South Vietnam. He sought to distract his people's attention from the Vietnamese incursions by denouncing the United States and by touting "the unity of the Indo-China people." He frequently described China as his "greatest friend," though his relations with Peking cooled somewhat after the Communist-inspired uprisings.

As Hanoi and the Vietcong became more brazen in their use of Cambodia, building hospitals, rest camps, and complex jungle bases there, Sihanouk had to admit what was going on. By mid-1969, he was forced to acknowledge that between forty and fifty thousand Communist troops were spread out over eight or nine Cambodian provinces, about half of the troops in the usually deserted northeastern border areas and the rest farther south, particularly in the mountainous region of the Elephant Range, just northeast of Sihanoukville and across from Vietnam's Mekong Delta. He then denounced the Communist incursions and showed less hostility toward the Americans;

in fact, he even called upon them to maintain "a presence in Southeast Asia" after the end of the Vietnam war.

Secretly, he accepted American intelligence obtained in various ways—including infrared aerial photographs, electronic sensors on the border, and reports by agents and prisoners—which enabled him to pinpoint Communist troops and installations, and he used this material in making diplomatic complaints to the Vietcong and to Hanoi, both of which, along with an impressive list of Communist and non-Communist nations, maintained legations in Phnom Penh. (The United States was allowed to send a small mission back there last year after a four-year hiatus.)

However, through Chinese middlemen, he continued to sell the Vietnamese Communists large quantities of rice and medicine, and he also allowed the arms traffic between Sihanoukville and Vietcong areas in South Vietnam to continue, siphoning off—as a cut in kind—about twenty per cent of all the Chinese-made AK-47 automatic rifles and ammunition that passed through the country. In spite of his growing displeasure over the Vietnamese incursions, Sihanouk had given the diplomatic representatives of the Vietcong embassy status, equal to that of the North Vietnamese government. Meanwhile, characteristically, he was saying privately that once the Communists took over his country he would be finished but that if the Cambodians had to live under some form of Communism the Chinese variety would be better than the Vietnamese.

Sihanouk's alternating moods of euphoria and despair proved both emotionally and physically debilitating—to him as well as to his associates. Increasingly, he showed signs of hysteria. He travelled annually to France to rest for a month or more and try to lose weight. Through the years, he had often used these absences for political purposes, playing off his left-wing and right-wing opposition against each other back home. In the spring of 1967, for example, when the head of the present government, General Lon Nol, was Prime Minister, and when left-wing disturbances in several provinces had led to a crack-down of sorts, Sihanouk came home, fired Lon Nol, and took over as head of a "special government." He thereby averted what at that time might have developed into a coup.

A serious automobile accident suffered by Lon Nol may have delayed its happening. Sihanouk then named three members of the Assembly—Hu Nim, Khieu Samphan, and Hou Youn—as leaders of a Communist conspiracy against him. The three men soon fled, either into the jungle, to North Vietnam, or to China. What is now interesting is the fact that these same three men, described by Sihanouk as his bitter personal enemies, have been mentioned by Peking as "leaders" of the movement against the new Lon Nol government, and are probably now somewhere in Cambodia. This offers further evidence that Sihanouk is more a captive of Peking today than a spearhead of an independent government-in-exile, or that at best he is regarded by the Chinese as a useful figurehead—albeit somewhat of a nuisance. Peking is obviously aware of Sihanouk's deep-seated hatred and fear of all Vietnamese. Despite his temporary collaboration with Hanoi and the Hanoi-controlled Laotians and South Vietnamese, the Chinese are also aware that the North Vietnamese or the Vietcong would destroy Sihanouk at their convenience.

It is in the perspective of this brief history of Sihanouk's role that the events of the last two months must be analyzed. Last September, a month after Lon Nol had agreed to become Prime Minister again, but with stronger powers, Sihanouk sought to test his own prerogatives as chief of state by getting four ministers who were sympathetic to him to resign. He expected this to lead to the fall

of the government, but Lon Nol balked. He conferred more and more frequently with his former classmate and longtime friend Prince Sisowath Sirik Matak, a cousin of Sihanouk's, who, after ambassadorial tours of duty in Tokyo and Manila, had returned to Phnom Penh last summer to become First Deputy Prime Minister.

There is considerable evidence that Lon Nol and Sirik Matak had been scheming together for at least three years to overthrow Sihanouk, but the actual hard planning for the current coup probably began last December. By that time, Sirik Matak and Lon Nol had further clipped Sihanouk's wings by putting into effect a number of new legal measures, including one that brought tax receipts directly into the government treasury instead of into the office of the chief of state, and another shutting down the Phnom Penh gambling casino, which had long been a source of profit for the palace. Early this January, Sihanouk announced that he would leave for France. He anticipated that Lon Nol would find it impossible to deal with the country's growing economic crisis and would box himself in politically, thereby leaving the way open for Sihanouk, the indispensable man, to return and once again take over. But this time it didn't work out.

To begin with, Lon Nol and Sirik Matak moved to dismantle a number of state enterprises that Sihanouk had established. They also liberated from government shackles a good part of the foreign trade, eased domestic trade restrictions, and allowed various foreign nations to open banks. And they created a new currency issue, which would prevent the Vietcong from using counterfeit Cambodian money to buy supplies. On March 8th and 9th, demonstrations broke out against the Vietcong in the eastern province of Svay Rieng, where villagers, with the help of Cambodian troops, seized weapons from Vietnamese guerrillas. On March 11th, there were demonstrations against the North Vietnamese and Vietcong Embassies in Phnom Penh. In the next few days, as Sihanouk's supporters began to rally, Sirik Matak emerged as the strong man of the coup, and insisted on settling the issue of Sihanouk's future role as quickly as possible. Meanwhile, on a French television program, Sihanouk denounced the campaign that he said was being mounted to take his country into the American "imperialist camp" just when he was planning to visit Moscow and Peking en route home in order to urge the Russians and the Chinese to persuade the Vietnamese Communists to quit Cambodia—an unlikely eventuality under any circumstances.

At this juncture, however, Sihanouk panicked. Lon Nol and Sirik Matak had sent him word in Paris that they were dispatching two emissaries to see him there. These men were supposed to tell him that he could return to Phnom Penh in the role of chief of state if he accepted what had already been implied as early as the previous summer and was now made explicit—that he would no longer run things single-handed in his old manner. Sihanouk responded by cabling that he would not receive anyone, and was off to Moscow and Peking. Had he returned to Cambodia and appealed directly to the public, or had he simply stayed in Paris for the time being, he would have stood a better chance of regaining at least part of his power. By March 18th, the coup was given formal approval by a well-staged vote of the National Assembly, before which Sirik Matak played a recorded speech of Lon Nol's listing Sihanouk's sins. Unanimously, the Assembly dismissed Sihanouk as chief of state and named Cheng Heng, the head of the Assembly, in his place. Sihanouk had by now been in Moscow four and a half days. He received the news of his deposition from Premier Aleksei Kosygin a few hours before he left for Peking. He took it calmly, and spoke vaguely about forming a government-in-exile. His mission to Moscow

had, predictably, been a failure. While the Russians had given him a royal welcome and had commended his professions of continued Cambodian neutrality, they had shown no willingness to intercede with the Vietcong and Hanoi, which were already about to close their embassies in Phnom Penh.

In Peking, Sihanouk rapidly slipped further into the Communist camp. He labelled his dismissal as chief of state illegal, insisting that it could take place only by national referendum. He denounced the actions that had been taken in his absence as motivated by the "personal ambitions and greed" of his rivals and as backed by the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States, which had long been his *bete noire*. (There is no evidence that the Americans participated in the coup or that they were even apprised of it until a few hours before it took place, although they were undoubtedly aware of what might happen and did nothing to try to prevent it.)

In Saigon, there was considerable difference of opinion among American officials as to whether the effects of the coup would be advantageous or disadvantageous. (These doubts mounted even as joint South Vietnamese-Cambodian military operations were launched in Cambodia.) As the Cambodians began massacring Vietnamese residents of Cambodia, and demonstrating their growing inability to handle the rapidly deploying Communists—who dispersed over a wider area both for their own protection from South Vietnamese air and ground attacks and in order to mount fresh assaults against the ill-prepared government in Phnom Penh—the American doubts about the usefulness of the coup and about the ability of the Lon Nol government to sustain itself grew even stronger.

In Peking, Sihanouk, typically poured forth a series of frenzied and contradictory statements. "I have absolutely no intention of seeking to resume power, which, in fact, I have lost, or of retaining the now absurd title of head of state of Cambodia," he said first. Then he pledged himself to "participate in the sacred struggle our people will wage from inside and outside the country to obliterate this coup d'etat and restore legality and democracy." A few days later, he said, "I am an unlucky man, with a bad destiny," and excoriated "the reactionary group of Lon Nol, Sirik Matak, Cheng Heng, and their American masters." In this message, he called not only for a new government but for a "National Liberation Army," which he promised to support.

Sihanouk's Chinese hosts played it cool. They received him and praised him without embracing him. Premier Chou En-lai expressed their attitude clearly when he said, early in April, "The Chinese government and people firmly support the just stand taken by Prince Norodom Sihanouk . . . and they consistently support the policy of independence, peace, neutrality, democracy, and defense of state sovereignty and territorial integrity pursued by him." This could hardly have given Sihanouk the sort of encouragement he sought; nor could he have been pleased by an announcement that the Chinese had designated the same three Cambodian assemblymen he had denounced three years before as members of this New Revolutionary Movement.

It is to the Prince's credit that he was able so quickly to arrange the summit meeting in the last week of April with Prince Souphanouvong, head of the Laotian Patriotic Front; Nguyen Huu Tho, chairman of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam; Pham Van Dong, the Premier of North Vietnam; and some fairly sizable and impressive delegations. Following long diatribes against United States imperialism, the leaders of the conference pledged "reciprocal support" while promising to respect each one's policies concerning "the liberation and defense of his country." This was broad

enough to satisfy all those present without committing them to anything drastic or new. Despite the show of solidarity, Sihanouk remained, ideologically, the odd man out, in more ways than one, and he must have sensed it. Whether or not he secretly makes a visit to Cambodia over the next few weeks, he has little choice right now but to spend most of his time either in Peking or, if the Chinese let him go there, in Paris. In either case, as he continues to orbit in Communist-controlled space, his chances of ever reassuming his special neutral role in Cambodia are slight. Should the Lon Nol government fail to survive, Sihanouk may gain the satisfaction of having his previous intricate balancing act, with all its acrobatics, justified by history, but there will probably be no encores.

While the situation in Cambodia is, at best, precarious for Lon Nol, the situation in Laos remains perilous for the neutralist government. Since Premier Souvanna Phouma's rejection last June of an indication from Hanoi that if the Americans stopped bombing the Ho Chi Minh Trail it would be willing to talk about a military and political settlement, the Communist military forces have attacked more strongly than at any time since 1962. Having replied to the North Vietnamese ambassador's proposal in May by saying that the North Vietnamese would have to withdraw all their forces (then numbering fifty thousand, and now closer to seventy-five thousand) from Laos before the American bombing would stop, Souvanna Phouma allowed General Vang Pao, the leader of the Meo tribal army that is the country's only reliable fighting force—and that is supported by the C.I.A.—to move onto the Plaine des Jarres, in north-central Laos, which has been held since 1964 by the Communists. With the help of American bombers, Vang Pao began what turned out to be a considerable counter-escalation of the war in Laos. The North Vietnamese were driven eastward off the Plaine, losing a vast amount of equipment and supplies. By the end of the year, they had been regrouped and reinforced, and in January they began their own counterattack, which has now imperilled Vang Pao's two major bases, Sam Thong and Long Cheng, adjacent to the Plaine. No fewer than fourteen North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao battalions are occupying that area today.

The Communists can probably capture both sites (they took Sam Thong in March and then lost it again), though at a considerable cost in casualties—which Vang Pao, despite the fact that he has suffered heavy losses himself, is still capable of inflicting. A second move the Communists can make is to try to interdict the whole area between Vientiane, the administrative capital, and Luang Prabang, the royal capital, just to the west of the Plaine des Jarres. Another possible Communist move is an attack against the town of Paksane, on the Mekong River, west of the Laotian Panhandle and the main area of the Ho Chi Minh Trail complex. Such an attack would threaten both the heart of Laos and neighboring Thailand. The seizure by Communist forces on April 30th of the town of Attopeu, west of the Ho Chi Minh Trail, is clear proof of the determination of the North Vietnamese to widen their Trail complex by safeguarding the route south from Laos into Cambodia via the Sekong River. Attopeu lies between the plateau and the Sekong, and as long as the Laotian government held it, traffic along the river could be interdicted. Despite several attacks on Attopeu over the past years, the Communists had never been so bold as to grab it, and the fact that they have now done so emphasizes as nothing else could their need to find new supply routes into Cambodia, now that they no longer have Sihanoukville.

In the last two or three weeks, the Communist offensive has been held back by rains in the North, which came earlier than

usual this year. The North Vietnamese battalions are also suffering, as they did last year, from illness and from a shortage of supplies—a problem that has been aggravated by the Vientiane government's removal of most of the population in and around the Plaine. In the past, these people were impressed as porters by the North Vietnamese troops. Moreover, the rains helped lift the smog, abetted by brush fires at the end of the dry season, that had restricted allied air attacks; in the last few weeks, the planes have been hitting hard again at the now overextended North Vietnamese lines.

Early in March, the central committee of the Laotian Patriotic Front, which is the political arm of the Pathet Lao, offering Souvanna, at Hanoi's instigation, a peace plan that included, as before, a demand for complete American military withdrawal, plus a demand for disavowal by Laos of any foreign military alliances, and for an election to set up a National Assembly and create "a democratic government"—pending which there would be "a consultative conference and a provisional coalition government" embracing all parties. This is essentially the same program that the Communists have offered South Vietnam. Souvanna, in his reply, repeated what he had said before—that the North Vietnamese consistently have violated the Geneva accords of 1962 in Laos and have invaded the country in force.

He then declared that he was ready to a cease-fire and to the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops, under the supervision of the International Control Commission, and to "a meeting of the interested parties, in a place to be determined, to discuss thoroughly all points of difference and to seek an equitable and definite solution, taking into account national interests only, without interference in the internal affairs of neighboring countries, which is the very condition of neutrality." This seemed more an amendment than a rejection of the Communists' offer. In a number of interviews recently, Souvanna has said that the area of Laos through which the Ho Chi Minh Trail runs is virtually uninhabited and as far as he is concerned is of no real national value, that the North Vietnamese can have it, and that it is up to Washington and Hanoi to decide what to do about stopping the bombing. In the last month and a half, the Russians and the Americans have exchanged messages in which Moscow countered an American request for new consultations on Laos with a demand that the Americans stop the bombing first. All this has left things pretty much as they were.

Meanwhile, American opinion has been further aroused by the gradual disclosure—through leaks, and finally the release of a partial transcript of the secret Senate hearings on Laos—of the details of the American involvement in Laos since 1964. Despite the fact that relatively little has now been disclosed that had not been known before, if only unofficially, the reaction in the United States was to increase sentiment against any further involvement in Laos or Cambodia. Unfortunately, whatever chances existed for halting the bombing of the Ho Chi Minh Trail—even for a trial period—have been diminished as a result of our intervention in Cambodia. To stop the bombing now, the American military argue, would give the North Vietnamese total freedom to pour supplies and troops not only into Laos and South Vietnam but also into Cambodia. Because of the longer route involved, the military maintain that they can interdict thirty or more per cent of the traffic rather than the current twenty per cent.

In view of North Vietnam's determination to dominate Laos as well as South Vietnam and Cambodia, and of China's approbation and supervision of this course, it seems that there is little the United States can do except persuade Souvanna Phouma to restore the coalition with the Communists that fell apart

in 1964. The low-level American counter-insurgency support in Laos has bought time but not space, and as far as the United States is concerned the situation is not likely to improve, no matter how many more alternating dry-season and wet-season offensives and counter-offensives take place.

The recent Cambodian events simply aggravate the Laotian situation, since the widening of the war serves the Communists better than it does either the new Cambodian government or the Americans. However, there are signs that the Communists are aware of the dangers of overextending themselves in Cambodia, too, and that they need time to create their own rebel political structure there. They may threaten Phnom Penh, but they are not expected to actually attack it; they seem more interested in consolidating their new military strength within the country and then creating an equivalent of the Provisional Revolutionary Government in South Vietnam. If Lon Nol collapses, they will naturally move swiftly to take over, but they would almost certainly prefer a coalition deal in Cambodia, as in Laos, since it offers them the best and safest road to power.

Whatever the previous opportunity for or the advisability of big new ground and air attacks on Laos and Cambodia in order to "win" the war in Vietnam, as once urged by the military, there is no likelihood that such an effort can now succeed. The announced primary objective of our first Cambodian attack, the headquarters of COSVN—the Communists' Central Office for South Vietnam—has so far proved elusive, and will probably continue to do so, since reliable reports indicate that it was moved at the time of the coup against Sihanouk. Negotiation is still the best way out, but it still takes two to negotiate. Since neither Hanoi nor Peking wants negotiations at present—they certainly want to wait and see which way Cambodia turns—that leaves only the Russians as a source of leverage, and Moscow has continued to vacillate. The Russians are scarcely in a position to persuade their Chinese antagonists to begin talks, and since the coup in Cambodia the Soviet influence over the North Vietnamese is probably less than it was.

The prospects for peace are thus gloomier than ever. And what is happening in Saigon today, on the government side, scarcely improves the outlook. The rebellious attitude of South Vietnamese students and war veterans, and the friction between President Nguyen Van Thieu and the National Assembly, which has worsened the already bad economic crisis, threaten to cancel the gains that have been made in the countryside over the past year. It has become fashionable in Vietnam to maintain—and it is basically correct—that the psychological and political benefits gained by the Communists in the 1968 Tet offensive were dissipated by the huge losses they suffered and by the fact that the Saigon government, though belatedly, became aware of its opportunity to pull itself together. Some improvements were indeed made, but today the situation, aggravated by rampant inflation, has become more serious than ever, both economically and politically.

Ironically, the coup in Cambodia and its aftermath have given the Communists an unexpected psychological boost similar to the one they received from the Tet offensive, and at far less physical cost. What was regarded as a pro-Western move could prove to be the final blow to the American effort to withdraw from Vietnam in orderly fashion. The ugly racial aspect of the situation, with Vietnamese not only killing each other in Vietnam and in Cambodia but killing and being killed by Cambodians, could set off a new bloodbath, which in the long run would mostly benefit the Communists (although the attempt to create interracial unity at the Indo-China People's Conference suggests that the Communists are also aware of the dangers of racial upheaval).

If everything now comes unhinged, those who have urged the United States to admit failure in Southeast Asia and to gain stature by withdrawing completely will win new support at home. If things somehow stick together in Cambodia and Laos and the war simply drags on, but in a broader area, it will surely get messier, and public opinion in the United States will be more sharply divided and more painfully disillusioned than ever. At the moment, nothing is clear or certain. Correspondents cover the war in Cambodia by riding down dangerous roads on Hondas or in air-conditioned Mercedes-Benz sedans hired in Phnom Penh for inflated sums. (A dozen reporters have been captured by the Communists so far.) In Laos, the correspondents chase the elusive Vang Pao around in hired planes. In Vietnam, they ride helicopters by day and are briefed in Saigon at dusk with computerized statistics about population control and body counts. Less and less makes sense. The war—or wars—has become as unreal and macabre as a bad trip in the East Village.

IMPORT THREATS

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the following editorial which appeared in the April 14, 1970, issue of the Weirton, W. Va., Daily Times.

It points out all too well why this country must adopt immediate and adequate safeguards against imported steel products, especially those from Japan.

As the editorial so aptly explains it, "The chief threat to American markets comes from Japan. While broadening their export trade throughout the world they have maintained a rigid closed-door policy toward imports and foreign investments."

The article said the Japanese can produce and ship steel products to this country more cheaply than we can produce them ourselves because "their wage rates are low."

Mr. Speaker, action must be taken now to protect this country's steel industry and insure that it will not continue to be hurt by these cheap imported goods.

The editorial follows:

[From the Weirton Daily Times, Apr. 18, 1970]

IMPORT THREATS

National Steel Corporation, of which Weirton Steel is a division, produced 8,853,000 tons of steel in 1969, but in just two months this year foreign steelmakers shipped into the United States 1,478,000 tons of steel products.

The imports for January and February of this year represent an increase of 37.2 percent over the same months of last year.

The dollar value of the imports of the first two months this year was \$224,710,000 or 64.5 percent higher than the \$136,584,000 worth of steel imported in the same two months last year.

The trend of shipping higher grade and more expensive steels into the United States also gained momentum since the first of the year.

The chief threat to American markets comes from Japan. While broadening their export trade throughout the world they have maintained a rigid closed-door policy toward

imports and foreign investments. Their wage rates are low and they can compete very easily with steel industries of other nations.

Just this month, Japan's two leading steel producers, Yawata and Fuji, merged to become the Nippon Steel Corp., second largest in the world next to U.S. Steel. Together last year the two companies produced 31.5 million tons of steel, or 36 percent of Japan's entire output.

Officials of Nippon hope to overtake U.S. Steel by 1972. The Japanese in 1968 agreed voluntarily to limit their shipments to the U.S. to 5,200,000 tons a year, but they have found new markets in Europe and China to bolster home markets that are rising fast.

American steel industries, meantime, have a problem of diminishing returns on their production.

While the U.S. steel industry set records in 1969 for steel production, mill shipments and dollar volume of sales, it earned less money than it did in 1968. Of each sales dollar, net profit was only 4.5 cents, lowest since 1962's 4.04 cents. The 1968 figure was 5.3.

The steel industry's new income was \$966 million last year, down 10.5 percent from 1968's 1.08 billion.

RON MOSCATI SNAPS SERIES OF REMARKABLE PHOTOGRAPHS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that a picture is worth a thousand words.

Like other sayings, this is only a generalization—but it often is true.

Readers of the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express in my home city were treated recently to a remarkable series of photographs by one of the newspaper's staff photographers, Ron Moscati.

Many of you may have seen one or two of the pictures since they were given national distribution on the Associated Press wirephoto network.

The pictures were deserving of impressive handling—and they were given such display—in the Courier-Express as well as in other newspapers and periodicals.

Ron Moscati demonstrated the capabilities and sensitivities of an outstanding pictorial journalist in his assignment. He arrived on the scene of a house fire along with the city firemen. For metropolitan newsmen house fires usually are routine assignments.

This fire was fatal to 1-year-old Charlotte Ellis who was found in a second-floor bedroom by Lt. Fred Larson of Engine Co. 9. Lieutenant Larson carried the child to the street and administered continuous artificial respiration until an ambulance arrived. The child was reported still alive when taken from the scene, but died later in a hospital.

FATHER WATCHES HELPLESSLY

Ron Moscati captured on film the anguish of the infant's father as he watched helplessly as Lieutenant Larson administered mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. The picture was a vivid front-page feature.

The same fire provided another dramatic scene when Ron saw a fireman

leaning from a second-story window, yelling to his colleagues on the ground. Ron kept snapping as the firemen ran into position beneath the window to help break the fall as the firemen plunged earthward while flames licked at his body.

Ron Moscati caught a series of four spectacular pictures of: First, the fireman leaning from the window; second, beginning his plunge from the window as his colleagues raced to position with extended arms; third, the pileup of firemen on the ground after the impact; and fourth, two colleagues helping the injured fireman from the scene.

The dramatic factors of these tremendous photographs is perhaps expressed as well as any by Buffalo Fire Commissioner Robert B. Howard Jr., who said:

Dr. (Joseph) Manch (Buffalo schools superintendent) and (City Court) Judge H. Buswell Roberts told me on Sunday morning that the human relations promotional value of the pictures could not be purchased for a million dollars.

To Ron Moscati, I offer my hearty congratulations for a double-barrelled outstanding photographic accomplishment. And my congratulations, too, to the Courier-Express for giving these great pictures the prominent display which they deserved.

ISRAEL AND THE WORLD

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday May 10, 1970, at Independence Mall, Sixth and Market Streets, Philadelphia, in the very shadow of Independence Hall, a birthday party was held. The occasion was the 22d birthday of the state of Israel. It was sponsored by the Philadelphia Branch of the Rabbinical Assembly, the United Synagogue of America, the National Women's League, and the National Federation of Jewish Men's Clubs, Middle Atlantic Region.

Excitement at the rally was increased because many youngsters representing various organizations around the city of Philadelphia had marched to Independence Mall with pledges of monetary support for Israel from the entire community based upon their completion of the march. The program of the day was impressive, including important religious and lay leaders in the community, as well as all of the U.S. Congressmen from the southeastern Pennsylvania area and important representatives of the news media.

The program was particularly moving on this important Israeli holiday because the tempo of the struggle for her survival in the Middle East has increased with the Russian invasion of the Arab states in the area.

One of the most moving statements made on this memorable day was delivered by Rabbi Jacob Chinitz of Beth Ami Synagogue. This forceful orator, I

am glad to say, is the leader of a significant congregation in my congressional district.

I submit for the RECORD his statement which in many parts is truly inspirational. His remarks follow:

ISRAEL AND THE WORLD

This 22nd birthday of the State of Israel can be celebrated in private—and it can be celebrated in public.

According to a verse in the book of Numbers it should be private: "Behold, here is a people that dwells apart, and is not reckoned among the nations." In one sense, privacy and solitude, isolation, are forced on Israel. Beginning 22 years ago as the child of nations united, with its birth certified before its birth took place—the only state in history thus blessed in advance of its own creation—today Israel finds itself outvoted, outvoted, in the UN by Arab, by Soviet bloc, by so-called Third World nations.

If we have to celebrate alone, our thoughts and memories, our emotions and dreams are rich and ancient and souring. If no one else knows or understands, we know what it means to pick up the harps of psalmody laid down by the rivers of Babylon 25 centuries ago.

We know what it means to pray in a Jewish Jerusalem at the locus of Judaism's faith, the remnant point of Solomon's Temple mount.

We know what it means to see the bones of Auschwitz flourishing in the Valley of Jezreel and upon the hills of Judaea.

We know what it means, if no one else knows, to concretize, to embody, in earth and flesh and blood, and brains and brawn too, in university and town council, in the Keneset and in the Beth Hakeneset, the political dreams of Herzl, the ethical will of Ahad Haam, the messianic yearnings of Luria, the liturgical hymns of David, the dying visions of the Six Million martyrs and the ten thousand heroes of Israel's casualties, memorialized today.

It is not staidhood that we idolize—and let not neighboring theologies thus misconstrue our Israel. It is not military skill that we glorify—and let not our children be misled by the prattling of proletarian mobs. It is not flags that we worship.

We celebrate today the 22nd birthday of a faith restored to its heart and a people restored to its womb and a history reset on its track.

But according to another verse, in the Deuteronomy, this celebration should be public. "For this is your wisdom and understanding in the eyes of the peoples, who will hear of all these laws, and they shall say: this is truly a wise and understanding and great nation."

Israel in its insularity, Israel in its unique isolation, is yet part of this world and intimately involved with its crises and in its destiny. And so on this birthday we invite many parties to our party.

We invite the Arab people and the Moslem religion. What threat have a hundred years of Zionism and 22 years of Israel held out to you? Have we destroyed your holy places? Have we imperiled any of your 14 Arab states? Have we driven or threatened to drive your people into the sea? The 15th Palestinian state that you are now talking about—how was this nationalism created if not by Zionism and partition and the state of Israel?

It is your own state of Jordan that swallowed up East Jerusalem and the West Bank in 1948, the territory that was envisioned in the UN plan as the Arab state of Palestine and an internationalized Jerusalem. Have we brought other than health, and hospitals, and science, and a higher standard of living to the Middle East? Would there have been a Haganah and would there have been a Tzahal, Israel's Defense Forces, if not for

the attacks and the threats of annihilation that you have directed against us from the Hebron of 1930 to the Israel of 1970?

We invite the socialists and the progressives of the world to our party. Where have voluntary, humanistic collectives been established more successful and more moral than the Kibbutzim of Israel? It is a labor government that rules in Israel. Is Mapai deserving of your radical epithets and topsy-turvy criticism?

We invite the Russians to our party. You voted for partition on November 29, 1947. You provided the arms for defense in 1948 and 1949. Why do you threaten to destroy us today? Are Arab dictatorships and monarchies really more in tune with the memory of your hero Lenin, whose centennial you have just observed, than the social democracy of Israel?

We invite the British to our party. In 1917 you issued your Balfour Declaration, the modern counterpart to the declaration of Cyrus with which the Jewish Bible, the Tanach, ends: Who from among all his people, may the Lord his God be with him, and let him go up. Though later you kept us out with your white papers, though you hoped for our defeat and death before we were born, we forgive you. Come and celebrate with us in a land where your parliamentary procedure is practiced, where your common law is part of the legal system, where your language is second to our Hebrew reborn.

We invite the French who helped us in 1956, and for the decade 56-66. You turned against us in 1967. But we invite you back. The ideals of your revolution live among us in our egalitarian and free society.

We invite all Conservatives who wish to conserve human values. Come and celebrate the conservation of one of the oldest human traditions. Where have ideals and values, and human life, and natural resources been conserved as they have been in Israel and its restored soil?

We invite the revolutionaries, including our own radical Jewish youth, who are interested in change in favor of human values. Consider the revolutionary change in the condition of the Jewish people: exterminated between 1939 and 1945, threatened with further genocide in 1948, 1956, 1967, losing by attrition and assimilation its authentic identity and way of life. From this stage to the stage of self-determination, self-defense, and self-expression in a land which is now capable of self-expression through the restoration of its ancient children.

We invite the Black community. If you can understand what it means to grasp for emancipation after 400 years of slavery, can you not understand what it means to reach for freedom after 2,000 years of slavery in the Diaspora?

We invite the Christian religion. We gave you your New Testament. Your savior was born one of us. He preached to the children of Israel, now regathered in the land of Israel, which gave birth to your faith as well as ours. Why do you not glory in prophecy fulfilled?

Above all, we invite America, the America of Independence Hall, the America of 1776, which took inspiration in its founding from the fount of our Bible, and which, in turn, served as the inspiration for declaration of Atzmaut, independence, proclaimed by Ben Gurion and his colleagues on May 14, 1948, the fifth of Iyar, 5708.

As an ancient people, we know the evils of war, of materialism, of conformity, of anti-intellectualism, of race and religious hatred. To the extent that these are present in America we grieve and we criticize. But as an ancient people, having seen and suffered under all the empires of history, having lived under and survived all political systems, we know that America, with all its faults, is the best

that ever was and is. If we plead for peace, in Southeast Asia, or in the Middle East, we shall never raise the flag of the enemies of America.

We feel that the freedom for the spirit of man born in this Independence Hall almost 200 years ago, and the freedom reborn in Israel 22 years ago, travel along parallel lines. A big wheel run by faith, for the vast free world of mankind, and a little wheel run by the grace of God, for the Jewish people.

God bless America. God bless Israel. God bless mankind.

TALKIN' LIBERAL HEGEMONY
BLUES (WITH A NOTE OF OPTI-
MISM)

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just read an interesting article in the *New Guard* magazine which discusses conservatism and liberalism in our colleges and universities. I would like to place this in the RECORD at this point:

CONSERVATISM AND COLLEGE TEACHING—
TALKIN' LIBERAL HEGEMONY BLUES (WITH
A NOTE OF OPTIMISM)

(By John P. East)

Today in American colleges and universities political "liberalism" is the established *Weltanschauung*. This is hardly a new or startling finding, and in fact it is so commonly known that, in the words of the lawyer, we need not "prove" it, we may simply take "judicial notice" that it is so. The noted sociologist Seymour Lipset has written recently, "Intellectuals, academics . . . in the United States tend as a group to be disproportionately on the left. They are either liberal Democrats or supporters of left-wing minor parties."¹

In those academic disciplines where the discussion of politics is central, political science and history, the liberal-left dominance is greater than it is in the whole of academe. In my discipline of political science, and to a lesser extent it is true of history departments, conservatism, either of traditional or libertarian strains, is represented by an exceedingly small group of professors. Qualitatively they may be significant, but quantitatively they are not.

An unorthodox, yet revealing, method of underscoring this liberal-left dominance is to note some of the typical material I have received as a professor of political science. Obviously the senders had obtained lists of college and university faculties from various sources (perhaps the American Political Science Association or the American Historical Association), and mailed out their material on the valid assumption that the recipients would likely be of a liberal-left persuasion.

For example, periodically I receive a letter from Robert M. Hutchins, President of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, inviting me to join "the Center," and to receive *The Center Magazine*. In his letter Hutchins advises, "At the Center, distinguished guests like . . . Arnold Toynbee . . . Senator J. William Fulbright . . . Arthur J. Goldberg . . . and U Thant meet with staff members like Harry Ashmore . . . Linus Pauling . . . and Rexford G. Tugwell. The result is a continuing dialogue [sic]. . . . As you can imagine, these discussions are lively,

the observations and conclusions arresting and thought-provoking."

An attached brochure informs the reader, "Many [sic] viewpoints are represented in the output of the Center, but Center adopts none as its own [!]," and that tapes of Center convocations are available for "regular use in classrooms." The key word is "classrooms," and the receiver of the letter is expected to take it from there. Hutchins concludes his letter with this postscript: "Please forgive us if you are already a member of the Center. . . . This invitation has been mailed to selected lists which cannot always be checked to eliminate duplication. We hope that you will understand. . . ." The "selected lists" are, of course, lists of college and university faculty members in the crucial disciplines of political science and history, and when Hutchins pleads for "understanding" he will probably get it, for he knows his academic clientele well.

Commentary Magazine periodically sends out an announcement to political science professors in which the teacher is encouraged to require his students to buy reprints of articles for classroom use that have appeared in *Commentary*. The reprints are by "many of the world's best writers," including Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Richard N. Goodwin, Paul Goodman, and Michael Harrington. The announcement lists nearly one hundred colleges and universities that are using the reprints. If the professor requires his students to participate, he will receive a free subscription to *Commentary*. The editors of this liberal publication clearly know "where the ducks are."

C.O.P.E. sent out a letter to all members of the American Political Science Association. Signed by C.O.P.E.'s national director, the letter to me stated, "It occurs to me that you might be interested in informing your students of organized labor's role in politics, particularly those students majoring in political science. If you would be interested in having a C.O.P.E. representative address one or several of your classes, may I suggest that you write to me. . . ." C.O.P.E., knowing the academic mind, overtly seeks access to the classroom.

One of my favorites is the form letter sent out during the 1968 campaign to the academic community by Barbara Tuchman and Henry Steele Commager on behalf of the National Committee for an Effective Congress. In the letter to me I was urged to send my contribution "today" because "such Senators as Fulbright, Church, Morse, McGovern and Nelson could go down before racists, isolationists [!], cops and bombs zealots or, at best, standpat non-entities." I was warned that unless contributions were made I could expect to see "arch-conservatives," "drum-beating war candidates," and "extremist right-wing organizations" gain a "stranglehold on all important legislation." The letter was tailor-made for the liberal mind that dominates academe.

As a member of the American Political Science Association, I received a letter in 1968 from the Deputy Chairman for Research and Publications of the Democratic National Committee. This letter informed me that "as practicing political scientists, many of you will undoubtedly be working actively in the Democratic Party in your communities during the coming Presidential Campaign year. I hope that you will feel free to contact me for research materials, flyers, pamphlets, and other types of campaign documents that you can put to good use in your political work or in your classes." The italics are mine, and again we have a case of a liberal organization asking liberal academe to give it access to the classroom.

Never to be found flagging in the struggle for things liberal, the *New York Times* through its Book and Educational Division has mailed out to professors a brochure of

their new filmstrip series which will "challenge and inform young minds." The teacher is urged to use the filmstrips in the "classroom." Again, we are back to the classroom, and the potential subscriber is told that the first film is entitled "Behind the Bamboo Curtain" in which such questions as "Why Chinese Communism is compatible with China's national heritage" will be answered. One doesn't have to get the film to see the picture.

I have only brushed the surface in illustrating the types of material I receive as a professor of political science. Similar types of material are not received from conservative sources. Is it a matter of neglect on the part of conservatives? Probably not. It is a matter of knowing the political complexion of the academic community. Conservatives would be wasting advertising dollars in mass mailings to academe, which is dominated by the liberal-left. It is a liberal market and the advertisers know it.

THE EFFECT OF LIBERAL DOMINANCE

The most crucial effect of faculty liberalism is upon the students. There are studies indicating that colleges and universities have a liberalizing effect on young people.² As Seymour Lipset puts it, "Universities clearly do have a liberalizing effect, so that there is a gradual shift to the left."³ It is hardly surprising that liberal faculties would produce liberal students.

The problem goes beyond that to the radicalism of the student New Left. Here we confront that chronic malady of the liberal in which there are "no enemies on the left." This problem has been recently stated by University of Chicago Professor Theodore Lowi, himself a liberal:

"Liberals are famously capable of handling demands that originate from their right. Their defenses are well organized, their responses are facile yet firm, their knowledge of what is negotiable and what is nonnegotiable is unmistakably clear. In contrast, liberals are almost completely incapable of handling demands that issue from their left. Complaints from the left confuse the liberal. Complaints from the left automatically weaken him by implication that he is not liberal enough. Demands from the left make him feel illegit. And the liberal feels this way regardless of the actual, substantive character of the demands. Facing left, the liberal frankly cannot distinguish a good demand from a bad one, for voices from the left remove his bearings."⁴

When student New Left radicalism erupts on a campus, for the reasons Lowi outlines, the liberal scholars are often put to rout in disarray. For example, if SDS members were identifiable young fascists, the liberal professoriate would resolutely meet the threat and subdue it (and rightly so). However, because SDS fanaticism is of leftist origins the liberal professors are frequently put to flight. Liberal dominance of our faculties then not only has the effect of sanctioning New Left radicalism, but accelerates its growth by being innately incapable of moving against it. As M. Stanton Evans, among others, has pointed out, it is not surprising that we have a minority of student radicals today on our campuses.⁵ In view of the politics of academe, it is amazing we do not have more of them, and that they have not surfaced sooner. Conservatives need to be thankful for little things.

Liberal dominance of the faculties means a shutting out of conservative thought and ideas. Students are likely to know who Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and John Kenneth Galbraith are, and they are almost certain to know of Che, Fidel, Ho, Malcolm X, Goodman, Sartre, Cleaver, and Marcuse. Their teachers have prepared them well. On the other hand ask them about Kirk, Burnham, Voegelin, Strauss, Hazlitt, Tonsor, Molnar, Herberg, Possony, Kinter, or any figure af-

Footnotes at end of speech.

filled with contemporary conservative thought, and the likelihood is great they will have never heard of them. At best they may know of Buckley (who doesn't?), but the image they will have of him is usually unfavorable. Why this ignorance and distortion? The liberal faculties have ignored these figures, and when they do refer to them it will be disparagingly.

One of the most appalling manhandlings of conservative thought I have encountered of late is the statement by Professor Thomas Greer in his widely used paperback text, *A Brief History of Western Man*. Greer informs his student readers, "Drawing upon the political tradition of Edmund Burke, the Fascists asserted that the state is a living entity, transcending the individuals who compose it." One could weep silently at philosophical illiterates who cannot distinguish between Burke and Mussolini, but we must cry out with anguish that they should write our textbooks.

As suggested by Greer's book, liberal dominance of the academy means the text books reflect that fact, for the textbook publishers know their market. Neil McCaffrey, head of the Conservative Book Club and Arlington House, was asked, "Does Arlington House ever intend to invade the textbook field?" He answered, "Not in the foreseeable future. First, the educationist hierarchy tends to buy its books only from established textbook publishers. It's a tight field, very hard and costly to break into. Even more important, the educationist hierarchy would not be sympathetic to a conservative publisher."

A further effect of liberal dominance and the absence of conservative voices on the campus, is to frame the discussion of political issues for the students in terms of liberal versus radical. No conservative alternative is offered. For example, at one campus a committee made up of faculty and students had the responsibility of selecting guest speakers who would be paid out of student fees. One heated committee debate was over whether to invite Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr., or Lerol Jones, with liberals preferring the former and radicals the latter. Conservative representation on the committee could have suggested George S. Schuyler, but as already suggested such voices are rare in the academic world.

A profound effect of faculty liberalism has been, in the words of Russell Kirk, the growth of "Behemoth University" in America with all of its ugly side effects. With liberal faith in mass education the emphasis in higher education has too often been on size rather than quality with the resulting impersonality and IBM syndrome of the modern campus. This has been a contributing factor to student radicalism, for it fosters rootlessness and alienation. Conservative guidance would have stressed quality over quantity, the personal over the impersonal, it would have kept research and teaching in proper balance, and because of this emphasis it is doubtful that anomie and alienation would have blossomed so extensively on the modern campus.

Under liberal guidance "Behemoth University" has tended, in its lust for quantity over quality, to emphasize "things," whereas under conservative influence the emphasis would more likely have been on ideas and "the life of the mind." Where the campus liberal has encouraged direct political "action" and "involvement," the conservative, if present, would have encouraged thought, contemplation, and reflection, and he would have resisted the politicizing of the campus for any point of view. To illustrate this latter point, it is difficult to conceive of a conservative calling for a politicized campus for the support of his Vietnam policy. He would prefer to keep the campus forum open, neutral, and competitive to facilitate orderly

discussion of issues within a framework of academic freedom.

Finally, where liberal education theory has been preoccupied with the "now" and the "relevant," the conservative would more likely have stressed the long view philosophically and historically, and he would have encouraged appreciation of "the permanent things." But alas conservative influence on the campus has not been sufficiently pronounced in recent decades, and the liberal-left has presided over the rise of "Behemoth University."

WHY LIBERAL DOMINANCE?

A question I am asked frequently by non-teaching conservatives is why the liberal-left so heavily dominates our college and university faculties. The question is simple and obvious, but the answers are complex and elusive.

Going back to the Enlightenment, the Renaissance, and even beyond, we find the roots of contemporary liberalism which have brought it into ascendancy and dominance in Western intellectual thought. In addition to the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, we find its origins in gnosticism, scientism, utilitarianism, Marxism, positivism, pragmatism, secularism, hedonism, materialism, and other "isms" that have gone into the making of what today we call contemporary American liberalism.

It is beyond the scope of this article to analyze these ingredients and to delineate their respective contributions to contemporary liberal thought. It will have to suffice to note that they have been dominant themes in Western thought in recent centuries, and they are foundation stones of modern Western liberalism. In brief, *intellectual thought* (not necessarily the work-a-day world of the proverbial "man in the street") in our times has been heavily liberal, and so it is not surprising that colleges and universities, which by mission and function are expected to be "intellectual," would reflect in stark form a liberal hue. As to why the world of the intellectual liberalism has taken root and evolved over recent centuries is a complex matter of intellectual history clearly outside the principal concern of this brief essay. For present purposes, I am saying it is a matter of historical record that liberal dominance in intellectual thought has come about, and it is not surprising this fact is reflected strongly in our colleges and universities, the centers of our intellectual life.

One is still plagued, however, with the nagging question of why liberal dominance is so utterly disproportionate in academe compared with American thought and life in general. We have conservatives in journalism, the professions, business, practical politics, and throughout American culture generally. Indeed, a broadly defined conservatism may well be the dominant theme of American life. Certainly it is clear that the liberal-left professoriate is hardly representative of "mainstream" America. Why is the imbalance so great and so pronounced?

The problem is more fruitfully approached not by concentrating on why liberals move into academic work (why shouldn't they; it is an honorable and challenging profession), but rather by focusing on why conservatives shy away from college and university teaching.

To begin with, the graduate schools, which train our future faculties, are overwhelmingly liberal and they attract and reproduce their own kind. This vicious circle is difficult to break. At best the graduate school environment for the conservative is usually a neutral one, and sometimes it can be hostile. Too often liberal academe equates liberalism with intelligence, and conservatism with lack of same. The end result is to discourage conservative students from entering graduate work in such crucial disciplines as political science

and history where this formula is more likely to be honored.

Furthermore, the academic world is heavily bureaucratized and socialized, and unappealing to the conservative. It may be questionable whether college and university organizations are any more bureaucratized than the modern business corporations, but it is true that they can be highly socialized in terms of economic rewards. The difference between "top" and "bottom" salaries at a given institution are often not great, and salaries over-all are held at levels lower than comparable jobs in private industry. If college and university salaries were based upon a "free market," they would increase dramatically, for clearly today a college education is a "service" or "commodity" in great demand. But the libertarian spirit of the free market is anathema to the liberal professoriate, and it would prefer lower salaries to a breach of faith regarding its sacred economic theories. This is not an economic setting sufficiently challenging to many conservatives.

Part of the blame for conservative absence on the campus must be placed upon American conservatism itself, which is heavily rooted in the narrow confines of economic conservatism or *laissez-faire* capitalism, and its growth beyond those roots has been qualitatively but not quantitatively impressive. Many of our most talented conservatives in America have been caught up in either creating or servicing the great industrial-technological revolution that has preoccupied America over the past century. This point was personally brought home to me by a close and brilliant conservative friend who is now a partner in one of America's leading law firms. He was a *Phi Beta Kappa* undergraduate in history, and graduated first in his law school class. He told me, "I would rather be a third-rate lawyer than a first-rate history professor." The priority is clear, and I feel it reflects in a personalized way the narrow economic base of much of American conservatism, and its rejection of a more broadly-based cultural conservatism.

I find my non-teaching conservative friends in their frenzied lives of maintaining and serving the great American industrial-technological apparatus (I agree that someone must do it, but why not make the liberals do some of this dirty work?) live almost wholly in a world of "action" in which "the life of the mind" is at best a remote dream. In this regard their life style is not much different from the liberal world where action takes priority over thought, contemplation, and reflection. There can even be a subtle anti-intellectualism in which books and "ideas" are considered hallmarks of the effete to the "dynamic" young executive "on the go."

In discoursing with nonacademic conservatives, I have found they are likely to be readers of the *Wall Street Journal* and *U.S. News and World Report*, and these and similar publications are their principal sources of "conservative" ideas. They will usually know of William F. Buckley Jr., but will probably have read little of his work. There is some chance they may know of James Jackson Kilpatrick, John Chamberlain, and M. Stanton Evans, and be vaguely familiar with their editorial stance. The nonteaching conservative may know of such free-market exponents as Milton Friedman, Ludwig von Mises, or Henry Hazlitt, but the odds are not great. Finally, and most revealing, there is little chance that the nonacademic conservative is familiar with such figures as Russell Kirk, Eric Voegelin, Richard Weaver, James Burnham, Leo Strauss, or other conservative figures of comparable stature.

In short, too much of American conservatism is an intuitive, narrowly based economic conservatism with at best an additional exposure to popular conservative editorial writers. But when it comes to the cultural conservatives of the stature of Kirk, *et al.*, Amer-

ican conservatives know little. "Getting and spending" exacts a heavy toll. Because it lacks cultural breadth and depth, American conservatism itself is partially to blame for the dearth of conservative teachers on our campuses. Unfortunately, to a considerable extent it lacks the intellectual content to nurture potential young teachers.

NEEDED: CONSERVATIVE TEACHERS

The need for conservative faculty members is compelling. I am not calling for an infusion of ideologists of the right into academe, but I am agreeing with Professor Stephen J. Tonsor's observation that "The ideological and cultural uniformity of higher education in America is a disgrace. Why is it that our colleges and universities have conformed themselves over the past two decades to the orthodoxy of secular liberalism?"⁸ Like Tonsor I am calling for political pluralism and diversity within our faculties. I am contending that we need conservatives, whether they are of traditional or libertarian bent or a mixture of both, to enter the teaching profession at the college and university level. We need scholars in the classroom who will defend, in the words of M. Stanton Evans, "... traditional values ... the free enterprise economy ... [and who will offer] reasoned opposition to the menace of communism. . . ."⁹

Before conservative America can nurture young teachers it will have to broaden its cultural base beyond merely economic conservatism. A good start has been made in this direction through such publications as *The National Review*, *Modern Age*, *The Intercollegiate Review*, *University Bookman*, *Triumph*, *THE NEW GUARD*, *Human Events*, and *The Freeman*. An impressive recent addition to broadening the cultural base of American conservatism is the Conservative Book Club of Arlington House.

We need to encourage our talented undergraduate conservatives to enter college teaching. Why not? It is an honorable profession, the financial rewards in it have improved significantly in recent years, and above all, opportunity for service to the country and conservative principles in general is unexcelled, for as Lincoln put it, "The philosophy of the classroom today, is the philosophy of Government tomorrow."

Unfortunately there is evidence that some leading conservatives no longer feel the struggle on the campus is worth the effort. Russell Kirk has recently written, "... wild horses couldn't drag me back to permanent residence on the typical campus."¹⁰ Similarly, prior to his recent entry into the partisan political arena, former Professor Philip M. Crane wrote, "If there were a genuine hope of reforming the university from within, conservative professors could take the lack of promotions, minimal pay raises, cramped offices, paper work, committee overloads, suppression in the journals, prejudice in the reviews as a small price to pay to achieve the restoration of the academy. But the prospect of internal reform appears remote."¹¹ It appears that Kirk and Crane are conceding conservative defeat on the campus.

Is American conservatism willing to concede the loss of higher education to the liberals and radicals? If so, a great and tragic watershed in the history of the Republic has been passed. The struggle today on our campuses for the minds of the young is spirited and vital. If you will, this is where the action is. If conservatives are willing to concede this crucial battle, I fear they will ultimately lose the war. This battle is too significant to be forfeited.

I do not agree with Crane that the matter is as desperate as he describes it. It is bad, but not that bad. Indeed, if my own personal experience is any guide, I have found a considerable amount of liberal openness to a conservative teacher. It is true that one becomes something of "the house" conservative, but there is still enough of

the libertarian spirit in much of academic American liberalism that it will listen to a statement of the conservative viewpoint.

I have been called upon frequently to debate and defend conservative positions on campuses in my area, and often the forum has been provided by the liberals. For example, I was asked to debate publicly a liberal professor on the evening of the October 15 Moratorium on the proposition: "Resolved: The United States should immediately and unilaterally withdraw from Vietnam." I took the negative position, and we had an exceptionally large student turnout. Here was a forum provided by liberals and radicals who often look in vain for conservative opposition on the campus. One neighboring college called upon me to substitute for Secretary of State Dean Rusk (!), who had to cancel his appearance at the last moment. I am not exactly in a league with Dean Rusk, but the campus in question was desperate to find anyone with academic credentials who would defend American policy in Southeast Asia. Here again, the forum was provided by liberals. American conservatives must avoid paranoia about the American campus, for after all they have left the playing field, and frequently the liberal looks in vain for his natural American opposition.

In brief: "the harvest is plentiful, but the laborers are few. . . ."

FOOTNOTES

¹ Daniel Bell and Irving Kristol (eds.), *Confrontation: The Student Rebellion and the Universities* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1969), p. 47.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 47, 55; Jeffrey Hart, *The American Dissent: A decade of Modern Conservatism* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1966) pp. 171-175; Allan Brownfeld (ed.), *The New Left* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), pp. 214-215.

³ Bell and Kristol (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 55.
⁴ Quoted in "To the Left of the Professors," *Human Events*, March 1, 1969.

⁵ For Evan's excellent statement on this, see Brownfeld (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 214-215.

⁶ Thomas H. Greer, *A Brief History of Western Man* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1968), p. 523.

⁷ From an interview in *Human Events*, (May 20, 1967), 9. (Italics added.)

⁸ Stephen J. Tonsor, "Alienation and Relevance," *National Review*, (July 1, 1969), p. 661.

⁹ M. Stanton Evans, "A Generation of Growth," *Human Events*, April 12, 1969, p. 52.

¹⁰ Frederick Wilhelmsen (ed.), *Seeds of Anarchy: A Study of Campus Revolution* (Dallas: Argus Academic Press, 1969), p. 28.

¹¹ Philip M. Crane, "Conservatives in the Academy," *Human Events*, (April 12, 1969), p. 56.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. BETTY McCALL ZOROTOVICH

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, 1970, the community of San Pedro, Calif., will be honoring Mrs. Betty McCall Zorotovich upon her coming retirement after 32 years of teaching in the Los Angeles Harbor area. I wish to take this opportunity to commend her and share with my colleagues the following information about this noteworthy woman:

Betty Zorotovich was born in Imperial, Calif., October 28, 1908. Her parents were

Thaddeus Dale McCall and Cora Faure McCall. Her father was born and raised in Texas. He was employed by International Harvester and became their representative in Mexico for a number of years. The family moved to the Imperial Valley and became one of the pioneering families in that area when it was first settled. There were five other children in her family: Thad, Bob, deceased, Carlos, Johnny, and Dulcie.

Betty graduated from Imperial High School in 1925, and graduated from UCLA in 1929 with an A.B. degree, majoring in economics. She obtained her teaching credentials from UCLA in 1938.

On June 29, 1929, Betty married Nicholas Zorotovich in San Gabriel, Calif. They later had two children, Virginia Mae and Nicholas Dale. Virginia is now married to Comdr. Jack Hyde and has given the Zorotovichs four grandchildren: Jack Elgin, Nicholas Craig, Leslie, and David. Nicholas Dale presently teaches at the San Pedro High School and has also given his parents four grandchildren: Pamela, Nicholas Scott, Kathi Ann, and John Patrick.

In 1938 Betty began teaching at Gompers Junior High School in Los Angeles. After a short period there, she transferred to Dana Junior High School in San Pedro where she has taught ever since. In the beginning of her teaching career, she taught English and history. In the mid-1940's she taught art and became chairman of the art department. In the late 1940's, she became interested in why many children of seemingly normal or above-average intelligence could not read. Mrs. Zorotovich began using the kinesthetic method developed by Dr. Fernald, and has used this method and expanded it in her work with remedial reading. She has since become one of the outstanding teachers of remedial reading and has conducted workshops for other teachers in this area. Today hundreds of young people in San Pedro can read more proficiently because of her devotion to them. In recent years she has continued to teach English, history, and remedial reading.

In the late 1940's she helped to establish the Art Patrons of San Pedro to coordinate the efforts of the local artists, writers, thespians, and photographers. She served as the first president of the group, and at one time it was the second largest such group on the Pacific coast. She helped to organize the Writers' Guild of San Pedro and has served as president of the group. She was named an honorary member of the Ephebian Society because of the extensive work she did in the organization along with Mr. Zorotovich. She also served as president of the Ephebian at one time.

Betty is a member of Delta Kappa Gamma, an honor organization for outstanding women educators. She is now president-elect of Alpha Beta chapter.

Betty plans for retirement include some travel, especially in Mexico, with her husband, Nicholas.

I wish to join the entire community of San Pedro in commending Betty Zorotovich for her outstanding contribution to her community and wish her many years of fruitful and happy retirement.

ISRAELI CRISIS

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, on April 30 I met with Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Sisco to be briefed on the worsening crisis in the Middle East, from which he had just returned. For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting an article on this briefing into the RECORD:

[From the Day Jewish Journal, May 4, 1970]

AMERICA MUST SELL 125 PLANES TO ISRAEL
BECAUSE OF THE DANGER OF SOVIET
INTERFERENCE

(Interview with Mr. Jacobson, Congressman Scheuer's report of the interview we had with Mr. Sisco, the Assistant Secretary of State.)

The meeting was held with Mr. Sisco, in Mr. Sisco's office. Even though the meeting was an informal meeting it lasted for one hour and was the first meeting that Mr. Sisco had with a representative since he has been home from the middle east.

Congressman Scheuer, Bronx Congressman gave his wonderful opinion and also the opinion of many high American officials that the United States has no alternative but to declare openly that Russia is helping Egypt and the Arabian countries. That Russia is testing the United States by sending pilots to Egypt. Nixon must make a very quick and decisive decision. High officials in the Nixon administration are of the opinion that the United States has no other alternative but to send one hundred and twenty-five planes that Golda Meir has requested from Mr. Nixon.

These opinions have been made after the official of the United States government found out that Russia has sent from two thousand to three thousand military technicians to Egypt. They are the advisers and workers to the entire missile system.

The Russians also sent around one hundred pilots, members of the Russian Air Force to be ready to counter attack the Israeli attacks to the mideastern military machine. The situation in Israel is very serious. The interference from the Soviet Union is a challenge to the United States and to see how far the Nixon administration will go.

Many officials of the State Department feel that the only way that the United States can show Russia that we will not let Israel down is to send the much needed planes to Israel.

Congressman Scheuer also stated that the (Big Four) who have been trying to find a solution to the problem are not succeeding. U Thant is not sympathetic to Israel and the situation is hopeless as long as Russia and Syria and the similar nations are members of the United Nations.

Congressman Scheuer also stated that there is only one way to clarify our stand with Russia and that is the United States will not sit idly while the security of Israel is in danger and to help is to send, as soon as possible, without hesitation, the planes to the State of Israel.

Congressman Scheuer sent a telegram to President Richard Nixon on this matter and Congressman Scheuer hopes that very soon the Nixon administration will make this wise and only decision and send Israel the help she so desperately needs, so that she can hold off the attacks of Egypt which only really started with the Russian interference in the middle east.

MEDICAL STUDENTS AND FACULTY
OPOSE WAR IN CAMBODIA AND
VIETNAM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker many students and faculty members from the Nation's medical schools have been stopping by offices on the House and Senate sides during the last few days to express their opposition to the war in Cambodia and Vietnam.

I am placing in the RECORD the excellent statement prepared by this group on the history of their effort and the plans they have for forming a "medical Alliance for Political Action":

MEDICAL ALLIANCE FOR POLITICAL ACTION
(MAPA)

Medical students, faculty, and administration represent a national constituency heretofore unrepresented politically in Washington. This group has accepted this muteness without question during the past years. Always viewed as members of the great silent majority due more to the group's apathy than ideas, we have galvanized around certain issues which we cannot, in good conscience, continue to ignore.

Last week a group of first-year medical students from Yale decided that we must temporarily suspend classes to address ourselves to these issues. Business as usual had to stop for a time. But what to do with this allotted time was a question whose answer was not immediately apparent. After much discussion, we formed two groups, one to focus on local issues and one committed to a national effort. The idea of yet another mass march on Washington seemed a worn-out and ineffective way of making our views known. So we agreed to come to Washington to confront those in power and to tell them how we of the medical community feel about the Indo-China War, the oppression of minority groups at home, and the stifling of dissent.

We also agreed that if we could get representation from several medical schools, our position would be that much stronger. Carloads of students and faculty were sent out to various medical schools around the East Coast to gain their support, and information about our proposed endeavor was mailed to every medical school in the United States.

We have been in Washington for the past three days, and we estimate that upwards of 600 Medical, dental, and nursing students, faculty, and administrators have come to join our effort, with delegates from as far away as the Midwest and; seven the West Coast. The magnitude of this effort, especially in view of the short time in which it was put together, is testimony to our broad base of support. We have been heard here in Washington, and we will continue to be heard.

We understand now the need for our voice to be heard beyond this three day period. Representatives from the major medical delegations have met and decided to form an organization to carry out such a purpose. This organization will be named the Medical Alliance for Political Action, and will include not only medical students, faculty, and administration, but also all other health related professionals who feel their political opinions have not been expressed by any previous voice in the medical community.

SOVIET-U.S. CARGO SERVICE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a Soviet subsidized steamship company now seeks to bid for a scheduled cargo service contract to the United States.

Obviously but another prestige display to propagandize Soviet Sea Power.

But who can underbid government owned and subsidized vessels operated with "scab" labor?

Several newscippings follow:

[From the Evening Star, May 12, 1970]

REDS SEEK PACIFIC RUN

(By Stephen M. Aug)

A Soviet shipping company has served notice it intends to compete with United States and Japanese shipping lines in the lucrative Pacific trade at cut-rate prices, the chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission says.

If the plan goes through, the Far Eastern Steamship Co. would be the first Russian-owned firm to operate regularly scheduled cargo service to the United States in 20 years—or since the outbreak of the Korean War.

Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, FMC chairman, told newsmen yesterday the firm had applied to the commission on April 28 and plans to begin the service June 1.

She said the rates to be charged average 13 percent below those charged by shipping companies that belong to the Trans-Pacific Freight Conference, an international rate-making association. Some of the rates are 47 percent below conference charges.

Under federal law the commission has the power to block such a plan if it believes there is danger of a rate war that would be detrimental to U.S. trade and commerce. The commission is expected to act next week—but Mrs. Bentley would give no indication of what action it would take.

COMPLICATION CITED

Complicating matters, she noted, is the fact "we are entering a period of negotiations with the Russians and trade, of course, is one of the areas" under discussion.

The state-owned firm, Mrs. Bentley said, plans to provide a general cargo service—ranging from trucks and cars to electronic instruments and sake—between 11 Japanese ports and four U.S. West Coast ports: Los Angeles, Portland, San Francisco and Seattle.

The company, which has head offices in Vladivostok, plans to begin with three ships. Although the number is small, Mrs. Bentley said "it's a sign that the Russians are going into the third flag trade on a pretty large basis," and "it very well could take cargo away from American flag ships." Third flag shipping means entry of an outside nation into trade between two other nations.

MAY NEED ICC OKAY

The Russian company plans to attract tonnage which might otherwise move through Atlantic or Gulf Coast ports, and it has filed for approval of overland common point rates. Such rates presumably would require Interstate Commerce Commission authorization. An ICC spokesman said no application has been filed there.

Although no Russian vessel has provided regularly scheduled service to the United States since the outbreak of Korean hostilities, there is no federal law that would prevent it. The FMC may act only if rates would have detrimental effects on trade. But in

order to enter any U.S. port—13 are authorized to receive Communist bloc vessels—a Russian ship must notify the State Department several days ahead of arrival. If shore leave for the sailors is sought, a list must be sent ahead 21 days before arrival. Fueling also requires government permission.

Mrs. Bentley said the application from FESCO follows about six months of discussions between the Soviet Union and the State Department. She added that the White House has since been told. There has been no reaction from the Japanese government, she said.

EIGHT U.S. LINES

Currently, eight U.S. lines provide regular service to Japan. They are American Mail Line, American President Line, Matson Line, Pacific Far East Line, Sea Land Service Inc., States Steamship Co., Waterman Steamship Corp. and United States Lines. Japanese lines also are involved in the trade.

Mrs. Bentley said none of the Soviet ships anticipating entering the trade is known to be specially equipped to carry containerized shipments.

She said also it was not known what commodities the Russians plan to take out of the United States. No export tariffs have been filed. She speculated the vessels might pick up outbound cargo at Vancouver, B.C., which currently is regularly served by Soviet vessels.

Mrs. Bentley, who has long felt the United States must match or be ahead of Russian merchant vessel activities, said she believes the Russians are "trying to expand their merchant marine all over. As the Russians become stronger in their merchant fleet their seapower strength grows." She called the move "another reason why we must build merchant ships."

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 1970]

RUSSIA SETS JAPAN-U.S. SEA SERVICE

A Russian steamship company plans to begin regularly scheduled service between Japanese and U.S. ports, the chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission announced yesterday. This is the first time since the Korean War Russian ships have attempted to enter U.S. oceanborne commerce, FMC chairman Helen Delich Bentley said.

Mrs. Bentley said she interpreted the Russian move as another indication that country is expanding its merchant marine activities all over the world.

Far Eastern Steamship Co. (FESCO Lines), a Russian flag service company, has filed a proposed freight rate with FMC, Mrs. Bentley said. The proposed rates would average about 13 per cent below the group of ships now serving that route, she said.

FMC's staff has been asked to prepare a report for the Commission indicating whether the proposed rates could set off a rate war which could be "detrimental to U.S. trade and commerce." If the Commission decides a rate war is possible, it can hold hearings and possibly issue a cease and desist order.

The Russian line must have a freight rate approved by FMC before it can enter U.S. trade. FESCO Lines plans to begin the service June 1. FMC's initial decision on the rates will probably come next week, Mrs. Bentley said.

Presently, there are no U.S. cargo ships regularly serving Soviet ports, she said.

WILL DISBELIEF GET AMERICANS?

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues

a very interesting article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones which appeared in the Evening Star on Saturday, May 9, 1970, entitled "Will Disbelief Get Americans?"

This column discusses the repeated emphasis of the mass media on those who refuse to bear arms in defense of this country rather than praise for our American forces who are defending this country with their lives every day in Southeast Asia.

I insert this into the RECORD at this point:

WILL DISBELIEF GET AMERICANS?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

I've been reading the May 5 Look magazine—the one with the big cover picture showing Joan Baez and her husband, David Harris, over the caption, "A family kept apart by conscience."

And there's quite a story about it all, with poignant pictures of the loving couple and the baby, and with brave letters from prison where Dave is doing three years for refusing the draft.

Those pictures took up so much space, in fact, that some pertinent items must have been squeezed out of Joan's biography. Like, for example, the fact that she was up to her eyebrows in radical causes long before we were involved in Vietnam. Look simply describes her as "a gentle anti-militarist."

Well, I know some other young couples who have been "kept apart by conscience." I know one young mother who lost her husband in a Vietnam battle and whose life was a double hell for weeks afterward as Yippie and Weatherman types called her up in the middle of the night, laughing, cursing and taunting her.

There are many thousands of young couples kept farther apart than Joan and Dave because the husbands had too much conscience to bug out and run to Canada. And if jail is onerous, so is an advance command post in the jungle, and jail's safer.

What is really going to be interesting is whether this great and powerful nation is going to be able to survive the steady and incessant drumfire of sympathy in much of the mass media for those who would refuse to bear its arms. However inadvertent this editorial selection may be, what can be the end effect except to raise a generation conditioned for surrender?

"The Ideological War Against Western Society" was a series of lectures delivered last winter at Rockford College in Illinois by an Englishman, Arthur A. Shenfield, visiting professor of economics.

Schenfield's thesis is that it is time sophisticated people detected the difference between social criticism designed to correct evils and social criticism designed to undermine national morale. He says:

"If one finds that men attack minor evils but either ignore or bless major evils; or that men attack minor forms of a particular evil but ignore or bless major forms; or that men attack an evil when they find it in one place but ignore or bless it when they see it in another place, then one may conclude that their purpose is not to destroy evil but to destroy the society that harbors the evil they choose to attack. The behavior of many of the ideological critics of Western Society fits this description.

"If the assault on the alleged evil in a society is conducted in such a manner as to deprive it of its self-respect, of its pride in its past and of recognition of its achievements, one may conclude that the purpose of the assault is not to remove the evils but to destroy the society.

"If the assault on these alleged evils takes a form calculated to persuade the society to abandon its will to defend itself against aggression, one may conclude that the critics are waging a war primarily against the society itself.

"Finally, if the assault on the alleged evils is calculated not to remove or diminish them but to aggravate them, one may conclude that either the intelligence or the motive of the critics is suspect."

It is curious how selective the fingerprinting is among many of our home-grown caterwaulers. The alleged massacre of 100 Vietnamese at My Lai is cited as proof of America's degradation while nothing is said of the 5,000 corpses found in the mass graves at Hue after the Communist Tet offensive.

Demands that we dismantle our "military-industrial complex" seem to ignore the fact that all arms are produced in military-industrial complexes, including those of the Soviet Union and Red China.

Cries that we must "take risks" for peace come from those who appear unaware that we started taking risks with our fast repatriation of troops in 1945 and that into every weakness Communist power flowed.

The claim that work on our antiballistic missile system would be "provocative" seems to overlook the Soviet Union's feverish work on its own antiballistic missile system, nor are the critics apparently worried about what would happen to mankind if a totalitarian power ever achieved overwhelming nuclear blackmail.

Finally, what is there in the militant left's policies on America's race problems that is designed to do anything else than exacerbate tensions and rip apart the fabric of American society?

Bob Dylan sings, "You Don't Know What's Going On—Do You, Mr. Jones?" It's time Mr. Jones found out.

LOYALTY DAY—MAY 1, 1970

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, of this year, I enjoyed the privilege of participating in the Loyalty Day observance of the Hasbrouck Heights, N.J., Post 4591 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The main speech at the ceremony was given by Comdr. Harry J. Beck of Montvale Memorial Post 10161, V.F.W. I thought it was especially well done and the content of his eloquent talk was worthy of the attention of all of our people in the United States.

Commander Beck has for some time been dedicated toward carrying the meaning of loyalty throughout the Nation and he has made a real contribution by his devotion and dedication.

I am including at this time a copy of his address that evening:

LOYALTY DAY—MAY 1, 1970

You're sitting in an airplane—you're in the take-off pattern—waiting! Planes are landing—planes are leaving—Your pilot awaits the signal from the traffic controller. The traffic controller watches intently the big radar scan with its total area picture of all traffic patterns—this one holding over Sandy Hook—that one holding over Lakehurst—this one coming in on Runway No. 3, another, your flight sitting on No. 4—30 seconds—the incoming on No. 3 touches down—the controller sees an opening—signals your pilot, and 1 minute and 20 seconds later you're safely airborne!—Did you ever doubt it for a minute?—Of course not! Or you wouldn't be there!

You had faith in the pilot's skill—more than that—you had faith in the skill of the traffic controller to correctly interpret the changing patterns on the big picture before

him and you had faith in his ability to make the right decision that would see you safely on your way.

President Richard M. Nixon is our National Traffic Controller—He has his eye on the big World Wide picture before him—watching the changing patterns—a commitment here (Laos)—a withdrawal there (Vietnam)—now a commitment to Cambodia!

We cannot see the total picture as he sees it—But we must have faith that what he is doing is right for the good of all of us—We wouldn't think of telling the air traffic controller how to do his job.—For God's sake let's not tell the President how to do his. What he needs now more than ever is our faith—What he needs now as never before—is our loyalty.

Let's take a look at that word loyalty. The dictionary defines loyalty as being steadfast in allegiance to one's country, government, or sovereign; faithful to a person, ideal, or custom. However accurate, this is a rather naked explanation of the meaning of the word.

To me it means much more. To me loyalty is that quality which prompts a person to be true to the thing he understands. It means definite direction, fixity of purpose. Loyalty supplies power and poise. It is a quality woven through the very fabric of one's being and it makes that thing to which you are loyal, yours. Loyalty gives success to those who are true to the cause which they undertake. Loyalty is positive, it is active—it's alive!

Now we know the meaning of that word with which we name this day. We know also its opposite, disloyalty, so ably demonstrated by the dissidents and the misguided who march in May Day parades, among other things. There is another word, however, that presently concerns us more, and that word is unloyalty. Unloyalty is very much more common than disloyalty. Unloyalty means simply—indifference.

This word concerns us greatly because it describes a very large segment of the population of our country; a segment which our President calls the Silent Majority. These people would probably resent it if you told them they were unloyal . . . yet that is what they are. They're inactive, passive, indifferent. They are also the balance of power that can make the difference between winning or losing the fight against the divisiveness that now splits our great nation. They must be awakened, they must be activated, and they must be given to know that if they don't stand up now and be counted while they are still free men, before too long someone else will count them as slaves.

We in the V.F.W. do our best to sound the call to these people through our Operation Speak Out . . . and we do a good job. But lately the impetus seems to have lessened. I hear comments like, "Every time I mention something like 'respect for the Flag' I'm called a Flagwaver" or "When I say a teacher who doesn't say the Pledge of Allegiance in school might be leftist oriented I'm called a witch hunter." Well there's nothing wrong with Flagwaving! It's a darn sight better than flag burning or flag spitting or flag trampling! And as for a teacher who doesn't say the Oath of Allegiance in school—I sure as hell wouldn't call him 100% American!!!

It's fashionable, and calculated—and to some degree effective, for liberals, intellectuals and pseudo-intellectuals to deride your loyalty by describing it in obtuse or exaggerated terms to make you feel like an extremist. They use words like Flagwaver or Fascist. Another tack is to generalize a specific to make your logic look faulty.

For example, when a teacher in our school system wore a black armband on Moratorium Day last October, I told the principal the man was suspect as he was displaying un-American behavior. The principal's reply

was "You guys think every teacher is a Communist." In the first place, it wasn't 'you guys'—I alone made the accusation. And in the second place it wasn't all teachers, it was one lousy punk who is obviously aiding the enemy's effort. Needless to say I now have my eye on the principal.

I realize we face obstacles never faced by those brave and determined men who fought so hard to give us freedom. We fight a much more difficult fight. At least they knew who their enemy was and anyone found assisting the enemy was hanged. Today the enemy's unknown agents are all about us, he could be a neighbor, or a coworker. And as for assisting the enemy—how do you hang a Television Network?

There is an old saying—hard work is not easy. If we are to be successful we must work at it. We must be active, we must speak out, we must be aware, and above all we must spread our influence. Teddy Roosevelt said, "No man is worth his salt who is not ready at all times to risk his body, to risk his well-being, to risk his life, in a great cause." We had a great cause once—we who fought in World War II—we risked our bodies, and we risked our well being—and we put our lives on the line. We have a great cause still, ours is the cause of freedom—ours is the cause of restoration of Love and Respect for our Flag, ours is the cause of Honor and Unity.

When you go home tonight, take a good hard look in the mirror and ask yourself, "Are you worth your salt?"

Written by: Harry J. Beck, Commander, Montvale Memorial Post No. 10161, V.F.W. Delivered on: Loyalty Day May 1, 1970, at Hasbrouck Heights Post No. 4591, V.F.W.

WHITE COLLAR CRIME

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in further amplification of the speech by Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Rossides which was inserted in the RECORD yesterday, I would like to enter herein an article entitled "White-Collar Crime" from the March 30, 1970, issue of Barron's which also indicates concern over the same banking measure, H.R. 15073:

WHITE-COLLAR CRIME; MUST ALL U.S. CITIZENS PAY FOR THE SINS OF A FEW?

"On Capitol Hill, where sheer survival virtually guarantees distinction of sorts, Rep. Wright Patman, who has stood for the First Congressional District of Texas since 1928, long ago gained fame as a tireless champion of cheap money and lost causes. Like some latter-day William Jennings Bryan, the Texarkana Democrat, who also happens to be chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, eloquently has denounced the American Bankers Association as a 'greedy lobby' . . . In his epic struggle with the vested interests, Rep. Patman over the years has launched a series of protracted, and generally fruitless, investigations into the nefarious activities of tax-exempt foundations and commercial banks. Much of his pet legislation has either died in committee or fallen short of passage. . . . Since the 'Thirties, when he helped pass the veterans' bonus and terrorized the rapacious chain stores, the aging Populist has been long on threats and promises but short on performance. However, even Wright Patman can't lose them all."

Since these lines first appeared in print

(Barron's, June 6, 1966), the Texan has launched upon what in his league at any rate look perilously like a winning streak. With the help of homebuilders and mortgage lenders, Rep. Patman (whose name graces more than one notorious piece of legislative price-fixing) that same year succeeded in slapping ceilings on the return paid depositors by thrift institutions and commercial banks, a move which heavily penalized the saver of small means and led to massive disruption of the flow of mortgage funds. Now the Congressman is up to more mischief, which, thanks to the skillful demagoguery of all those in favor and the weakness of the opposition, stands an ominous chance of becoming law.

Known as H.R. 15073, and innocently titled "A bill to . . . require insured banks to maintain certain records, to require that certain transactions in U.S. currency be reported to the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes," the measure aims at helping the authorities track down illegal transactions made by U.S. citizens abroad. "The foreign bank with its secret accounts," so Robert M. Morgenthau, former U.S. District Attorney, current Deputy Mayor of New York City and gubernatorial hopeful, recently told the Patman Committee, "is the place where the organized underworld and the purportedly respectable businessman meet."

What irresistible targets, especially in an election year, for politicians-on-the-make. Mr. Morgenthau, who apparently commands a worshipful press as well as a powerful Congressional ally, is apt to make the most of it. Yet the legislation—not to mention the sensationalism from which it has sprung—smacks as much of fraud as anything the D.A.'s office has uncovered. There has been a handful of prosecutions for illegal acts involving the use—or abuse—of foreign banking facilities. Of these Mr. Morgenthau has made a federal case; from them, in testimony distinguished (as we shall see) for inaccuracy and bias, he also has conjured up a frightening, and largely illusory, wave of "white collar crime." To combat the evil, he and others are pushing an ill-conceived, wretchedly drawn bill (it has gone through over a dozen drafts) which would give hardened criminals no pause. It would vastly increase the cost of doing legitimate business, destroy the last vestiges of financial privacy (by compelling banks to photocopy and keep for official inspection records of all checks drawn by every depositor), and, by raising doubts abroad about the ultimate aim of such authoritarianism, jeopardize the global standing of the dollar. Political ambition may not be a crime, but it could be a national disaster.

If so, one need not seek far for the villains of the piece. Messrs. Morgenthau and Patman for years have been working hand-in-glove. In 1968, with the former's approval, the latter introduced a bill to prohibit Americans from doing business with foreign banks operating under laws which permitted (or mandated) secrecy. Cooler heads, noting that the ban would apply not only to Switzerland but also to the Bahamas, Lebanon, Panama and West Germany, finally prevailed. The pending measure takes a different tack. It gives the Secretary of the Treasury broad discretion to require banks to keep records of each check, draft or similar instrument offered for collection or deposit, as well as ascertain the identity of payer and payee. In addition, the Treasury could require the filing of reports by anyone taking out of the country U.S. currency or coin in sums exceeding \$5,000 at a clip or \$10,000 in a calendar year. U.S. citizens also would have to report all transactions with foreign financial agencies which refuse to open their books to Washington. Thus, the long arm of the law finally would reach out for "persons holding positions of responsibility and power in the business and financial world," who, accord-

ing to Mr. Morgenthau, use foreign bank accounts to "cheat on taxes, trade in securities in violation of our securities laws, trade illegally in gold, perpetrate corporate and other frauds and hide the fruits of their white collar crimes."

Quite a bill of particulars. On close scrutiny, however, it grows rather less impressive. The ex-D.A. claims credit for the indictment of "more than 75 persons" on such charges, and the "referral of dozens of cases" to the Internal Revenue Service. Then he goes on to estimate: "For each case we prosecuted there were roughly six cases where we had specific information that a crime had been committed, but we were unable to prosecute either because we lacked the resources . . . or because the evidence we had was inadmissible in court." Without a shred of evidence, he sweeps on to the grand conclusion: "For each potential case we uncovered, there were thousands of other cases of criminal conduct cloaked by secret foreign accounts which were not touched by our investigations."

Numbers games aside, Mr. Morgenthau makes a better prosecutor than witness. In any case, his latest testimony drew scathing rebuttal from the New York Clearing House Association. Thus, Mr. Morgenthau discussed an incident allegedly involving the Hamburg branch of Chase Manhattan which didn't exist at the time. He charged that U.S. banks are opening branches in Nassau "obviously because of the convenience which its secret bank accounts offer to Americans to unload cash. . . ." In fact, as the association tartly observed, U.S. banks establish branches in the Bahamas in order to acquire Eurodollar deposits. Time after time, in his allegedly expert testimony, Mr. Morgenthau displayed a lamentable ignorance of business and banking. "The direct connection between the provisions of the bill," the association said, "and much of Mr. Morgenthau's testimony is far from clear."

Just so. As matters stand, Swiss bank accounts, numbered or otherwise, are open to scrutiny when the alleged offense is punishable under Swiss law. Violations of securities acts and regulations, purchases of gold and tax evasion simply aren't regarded as crimes, a point of view which, in the light of the high esteem the Swiss financial community enjoys throughout the civilized world, might give legal zealots over here something to think about. Be that as it may, H.R. 15073 will scarcely deter the criminal element. Persuasive testimony on this score was offered by Carl W. Desch, senior vice president of First National City Bank and spokesman for the 10 member banks of the New York Clearing House Association.

He stated: "It should also be kept in mind that criminals are masters at avoiding regulatory procedures and that the provisions of the bill can easily be circumvented. For example, Chapters 2 and 3 of Title II of the bill relate to transactions in coin or currency but say nothing about travelers checks or bearer bonds which are, of course, as easy to negotiate abroad as currency. Other methods which readily come to mind include the transfer of funds by mailing or transporting cash abroad, the so-called courier system; the transfer of funds by the purchase of foreign exchange or commodities or silver for future delivery and sale of the contract abroad; the transfer of funds by the purchase of a check or draft from a commercial bank, a savings bank or a savings and loan association; the transfer of funds abroad by underinvoicing commodities exported or by the issuance of letters of credit in favor of an agent abroad, kickbacks and so forth. Some of these methods involve the banking system; some of them involve the banking system in a manner that would leave no trail; and others

would not involve the banking system at all."

Mr. Desch, whose statement got scant coverage in the press, made several other telling points. While testimony before the Committee focused "almost exclusively on foreign transactions," he pointed out, H.R. 15073 covers a staggering number of domestic dealings. He estimated that in 1970 the U.S. banking system will handle over 20 billion checks, each of which on average will pass through two-three institutions. Hence the measure would require banks to make at least 20 billion—perhaps as many as 50 billion—photocopies per year, equivalent to over 160 million pounds of "little pieces of paper." Such a requirement, needless to add, would be exceedingly costly and time-consuming for banks and their customers.

Dollars-and-cents aside, the pending legislation constitutes a shocking invasion of privacy. Prior to the latest version available as we went to press (the 13th or 14th), it authorized the Treasury, without subpoena, to scrutinize all financial records. True, that provision applied only to uninsured banks (like Brown Brothers Harriman, for example) and, for the moment, has been dropped. However, it could reappear in some future draft and it would set an alarming precedent. As Mr. Desch observed: "Legislation authorizing government officials to browse at will among records of financial institutions would raise substantially the same sort of constitutional and ethical questions as legislation authorizing law enforcement authorities to listen in at random on telephone conversations or to open letters to sample their contents." As to the broad record-keeping requirements, the association spokesman was equally incisive: "I wonder whether this measure is not analogous to requiring the Post Office to open and record the contents of every piece of mail passing through it or requiring the phone company to tape every conversation going over its lines."

Finally, Mr. Desch warned, H.R. 15073 could go far toward lessening the appeal of the U.S. dollar as a reserve and trading currency. "Foreigners other than official institutions keep many billions of dollars, perhaps as many as six billions, on deposit in the United States. We believe that legislation which would make less private the records affecting the accounts in which such large sums are held would be viewed with alarm by a substantial number of foreigners, the vast majority of whom we would assume are entirely honest. Similarly, extensive reporting requirements as to currency and banking transactions would seem to many foreigners to be the beginning of exchange controls. . . . Any legislation which would shake foreign confidence that the dollar is a freely spendable store of value would have the gravest repercussions indeed."

So much for H.R. 15073, the case against which we find compelling. One last comment on those who espouse such draconian measures may be in order. In the Language of Dissent, Lowell B. Mason, maverick bureaucrat, observed that whenever so-called crimes against the state (or the people) begin to loom as more heinous than crimes against the individual or person, society is moving down the road to serfdom. Thus, in the Soviet Union, rapists and thieves "were treated with tolerance and circumspection. On the other hand, those accused of violating the state's political or economic commands were sentenced to death or exiled to Siberia without any semblance of trial." Again, to quote Ralph Nader, "If you want to talk about violence, don't talk of the Black Panthers. Talk of General Motors." We don't expect Mr. Morgenthau to change his mind about "white collar crime"; he plainly has too big a stake in it. We can only hope that Congress will have sober second thoughts.

BATTLE OF NEW MARKET MEMORIALIZED

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, today—May 14—there was dedicated on the New Market Battlefield at New Market, Va., in my congressional district, one of the most unusual memorial facilities in the United States. This facility is a hall of valor, honoring the memory of the corps of cadets of the Virginia Military Institute who fought as a corps in the Battle of New Market on May 15, 1864.

The purpose and nature of this memorial and the Battle of New Market are more fully described in two newspaper articles that appeared in the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch on May 10, 1970, and I would like to call them to the attention of the Members.

At a time when great violence and unrest is marking so many American campuses, I would pay a special tribute to the corps of cadets at the Virginia Military Institute, which has not been the scene of campus disorder.

Since its founding, VMI has furnished to America trained leaders. In each of the wars in which this country has engaged in which VMI men have served, they have performed in keeping with the courage and spirit exemplified by the corps at the Battle of New Market.

The newspaper articles follow:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch,
May 10, 1970]

BATTLE OF THE BOY HEROES—CENTER TO HONOR SKIRMISH

(By Gene Carrow)

NEW MARKET.—Although the battle here on May 15, 1864, was a sidelight to a vastly larger campaign, a sidelight has kept its memory alive outside the detailed footnotes of studies intended primarily for historians.

Robert E. Lee, grappling with the 100,000-man Federal army of Ulysses S. Grant and the crucial Wilderness Campaign to the east, could spare no reinforcements for Major Gen. John C. Breckinridge, faced with a smaller Union threat in this Shenandoah Valley area.

Ordered north from Dublin, in Pulaski County, to meet the 6,500-man Federal force under Major Gen. Franz Sigel that threatened Confederate supply lines at Staunton at Lee's left flank, Breckinridge was forced to alert all available troops as he rushed north.

Along with the battle-hardened regulars available, Breckinridge called out the Corps of Cadets at the Virginia Military Institute in Lexington.

Breckinridge intended to use the cadets as a last reserve, as supply guards, but, as the battle wore on, the cadets moved from a third Confederate line into the hot front line of the battle.

After holding down a position against the main Federal counterattack to the left-center of the Confederate line, the cadets played a full role in the final Confederate charge that broke the Union line and sent Sigel's troops retreating back toward Mt. Jackson.

The 247 cadets formed approximately one-sixteenth of the Confederate fighting force at New Market, but the stories of their part in the fighting grew as the years passed.

Writing in 1912, historian Edward R. Turner disagreed with the myths that had

grown around the teen-aged troops, but he minced no words about his opinion of the role they had played in the fighting.

"They did not rally the Confederate army, nor stem a route, nor capture unaided a powerful battery under impossible circumstances," Turner wrote. "But at a critical moment, they did conduct themselves in a manner beyond all praise."

Turner called the cadets' participation in the Confederate charge that broke the federal line "one of the most remarkable episodes of the Civil War, or, indeed, of any war . . . that in the first battle in which they had ever served they should do what they did is almost beyond belief."

The young cadets, as they joined Breckinridge's main force in Staunton on May 12, had been taunted by the war weary regulars, according to most accounts of their muddy march up from Lexington. After the battle, came praise from Breckinridge, from Confederate legislators in Richmond and even from Union commanders whose troops had opposed them in the field.

In the battle, 57 of the cadets fell. Of this number, five died on the field and five more were later to die of the wounds they had received during the day's fighting.

In an annual ceremony, the 10 who died are still honored by VMI cadets. On each anniversary of the battle, with the Corps in formation, the names of the 10 are called. As each name is sounded, a representative of the company in which that cadet served answers, "Died on the field of honor."

Since 1964, another memorial to the cadets who fought at New Market has been taking shape, a fully-developed park on a part of the field where they joined hardened Confederate veterans in pushing back the Federal attempt to take the Valley.

The 160-acre tract that forms the memorial includes the Bushong House, around which the cadets advanced in moving up to the Confederate front line.

The ground over which the left flank and center of the Confederate line launched its final, successful charge of the afternoon also forms part of the memorial site left to VMI by George R. Collins, a 1911 VMI alumnus who died in 1964, barely a month after the battle's centennial.

In addition to the land, Collins's handwritten will also contained a \$3 million bequest to cover the development and maintenance of the land as a memorial park.

The full development is costing approximately \$1.25 million, according to James J. Geary, director of the battlefield memorial. Interest from the rest of the fund will be used to maintain the site, he explained.

The primary emphasis in developing the park site was to restore it, as nearly as possible, to the view it would have presented in 1864.

Certain concessions—parking lots, signs, lots, instructional signs, scenic overlooks and graveled walkways—were made for the benefit of visitors.

Others were forced by 20th Century innovations. Interstate route 81 left a pedestrian underpass as the only direct route from the main portion of the tract to about 20 acres on the east side of the highway, and, contrary to the first hopes of park officials, overhead telephone wires could not be buried, though they were moved close to the interstate highway and away from the main portion of the park.

In the absence of a permanent visitors' center, one of the two front rooms in the Bushong House was turned temporarily into a small theater for the showing of a 12-minute prize-winning film that takes the cadets from Lexington through the New Market battle. The other front room became a temporary display room, and the rest of the 19th Century farmhouse was turned into quarters for a caretaker.

With the completion of the new visitors' center, to be officially dedicated at ceremonies at 11 a.m. Thursday, the exhibits and rows of chairs will make way for Civil War period furniture. The exhibits now in the Bushong House will join a host of others in the large display rooms of the new center and the modest drawing room theater will be replaced by a full 120-seat auditorium.

Original plans called for the park, complete with the new visitors' center and museum, to be ready by May, 1967. As it turned out, the opening came about two months late, without the specially built visitors' center.

The decision to open before the center-museum was complete was made, only after much thought, in January, 1967, commented a park official.

On July 1, 1967, when the memorial park first opened to the public, it was complete, even down to four full-size model Civil War cannon. Two of the imitation 19th Century Napoleon 12-pounders were cast of iron, but two others were made of fiberglass from moulds taken from the authentic Civil War field-piece that sits in front of the Harrisonburg municipal building.

The original plans for the park's development will be realized with the finishing of the sprawling visitors' center and museum, which will be named The Hall of Valor.

In addition to the large theater where the 12-minute color film, "New Market—a Field of Honor," will be shown, a second, smaller theater will offer "Stonewall's Valley," a new color film that delves into the personality of the troop commander and traces his 1862 campaign through the Valley.

A room adjacent to the large theater will feature exhibits relating to the Battle of New Market and a large, circular display room is to contain pictures and three-dimensional displays that trace the key movements of the war.

While it aims at nothing less than providing a capsule view of the entire Civil War, the Hall of Valor commemorates the cadets' participation in the 1864 battle here. "Through honoring them," Geary explained, "the museum will pay tribute to the role of youthful valor on both sides of the Civil War and in all the nation's other conflicts."

As it has taken shape over the past year, the museum-center represents the fourth design developed by architects for the memorial. The first three submitted, though approved by the VMI Board of Visitors, were turned down by the State Art Commission. At least two were formally rejected.

Two of the rejected designs called for a large, basically square building. A third was roughly circular in shape. All three designs were for clean-line, architecturally modern buildings.

Now a bright orange, the steel sheeting and structural members that form the walls and braces of the core will turn dark in a rusting process that will provide a maintenance-free surface as natural oxidation progresses.

Like the crater of a volcano, the ribbed core stands slightly above the surrounding hills.

Similarly, like the eruption of a new volcano, slow but sure and deadly, Union and Confederate troops converged on the town in 1864, almost casually at first, but fiercely and decisively as the muddy Sunday in May wore on.

For most historians, the struggle waged here between almost 4,500 Confederates and 6,500 Union soldiers is only a footnote to the Wilderness Campaign.

That the battle was fought in New Market was basically an accident. Neither Maj. Gen. Sigel, commander of the Union forces, nor Maj. Gen. Breckinridge, the Confederate

commander, chose this town more than hours before the battle as a place to fight.

The forces that met here had to clash. Sigel had been sent south by Gen. Grant to cut the supply line formed by the Central Railway connection in Staunton. Eventually, he would link forces with the 10,000 troops under Brig. Gen. George Crook, who was advancing into Southwest Virginia.

If the forces that met here were destined to meet, they could have as logically fought the battle for the Valley at a number of different locations between Staunton and Mt. Jackson.

Pausing in Staunton on May 10 for two days, Breckinridge considered waiting near there for Sigel to bring his troops south, down the Pike. Again, after moving through Augusta and Rockingham counties, the Confederate commander again waited for Sigel, trying to lure him beyond New Market.

For Breckinridge, commander of the smaller of the two forces, luring Sigel's force into battle against prepared positions on prechosen ground would have been sound; it would have helped offset the numerical advantage that belonged to Sigel.

For a different reason, Sigel was also playing a waiting game.

When his army left Winchester on May 1, no sizable Confederate force stood in his way. The only relatively large mass of troops were 1,600 cavalry and mounted infantry, commanded by Brig. Gen. John D. Imboden.

Moving rapidly, Imboden's men chopped up flanking forces numbering 500 and 300 that Sigel had sent to the east and west to cover his advance. Imboden struck at the front of Sigel's force as it moved into Woodstock, and through the rest of Sigel's march, Imboden's troops continued the harassment of the larger federal force.

At Woodstock, Sigel got a break. He captured the Confederate telegraph station there and, with it, the news that Breckinridge was moving north to oppose him. His reaction to the news set a pattern that ultimately cost him the campaign. He sent out a heavy advance force, splitting the troops he had. The advance force would remain ahead of his main body throughout the campaign, and fresh Union troops would be marching from Mt. Jackson into New Market even as the battle on May 15 was drawing to a close.

On the 14th, as Breckinridge hoped to draw Sigel south beyond New Market, Sigel hoped Breckinridge would come further north and fight near Mt. Jackson.

The compromise was a bold one for the Confederate commander. All of the heavy fighting occurred north of New Market. Breckinridge threw nearly all of his available troops into what became a single front line as the afternoon wore on. After one uncoordinated attempt at assaulting Sigel's line and a Union counterattack that failed to break the Confederate line, a final, concerted Confederate attack cracked the Federal position in the late afternoon, and Sigel began a retreat that ended when he recrossed the Shenandoah River and destroyed the bridge behind him.

If it could have been fought as well elsewhere, the battle could also have been forgotten as easily as larger, more impressive battles have been.

Local people have remembered. It was their fight. Some of their ancestors took part in it, others watched. When it was over, they dealt with the wounded.

Of the town's residents, one contemporary newspaper account commented: "A better people . . . does not live. The ladies stood in the doors of their dwellings with refreshments for the wounded and hungry soldiers as they came from the battlefield, and some of them assisted in dressing and binding up the wounds of the poor fellows . . . Private

parlors were cheerfully given up to the wounded."

To honor those who fought for the Confederacy, New Market ladies in 1867 organized the "Women's Memorial Society of the Lost Cause." They chose the date of the battle as their Memorial Day.

WOODSON'S RALLY: IT MARKS THE SPOT WHERE HEROES FELL

NEW MARKET.—At a quick glance, the monument to "Woodson's Heroes" at the northeast corner of the Bushong House yard seems like little more than a boundary marker.

A small piece of granite atop a low cairn of cemented gray fieldstone, it manages in four lines of simple poetry to tell the story of the unit that probably had the highest percentage of casualties of any fought in the battle of New Market.

The inscription on the stone reads:

This rustic pile
The simple tale will tell:
It marks the spot
Where Woodson's Heroes fell.

The stone, placed on the battlefield in 1905 by two men who had been members of the company when the battle was fought, James H. Dwyer and W. R. Falls, comes close to telling the historical truth.

"Six dead, 54 wounded, and five fit for duty," reported the company's acting adjutant on the morning after the battle. The small unit attached to the 62nd Virginia regiment during the battle had come a long way to fight an old enemy.

A number of the men in the unit had faced troops commanded by Franz Sigel, the Union commander at New Market, in battles fought earlier, in the west.

On May 15, 1864, after having been captured and then exchanged for captured Union troops, the Missourians again found themselves fighting Sigel and from one of the hottest parts of the Confederate front line.

If the company of Missourians stayed with the 62nd through the entire battle, they moved up in the first abortive attack on the Federal line early in the afternoon.

It was during that attack, according to George H. Smith, that the 62nd lost probably more than four-fifths of the 241 men killed and wounded during the day's fighting—nearly half the unit's strength when the battle began.

It was after the 62nd withdrew to reform and wait for other Confederate units to come up on its flanks that most of the Missouri unit's casualties were sustained, according to James H. Dwyer, in a letter published in a 1910 issue of the "Shenandoah Valley."

"The federals ran a four-gun battery forward and over, enfilading the 62," Dwyer noted, and Woodson's company moved forward to the point where the marker is located.

"From that point," his letter states, the Missourians "shot the gunners from their pieces so as to almost silence the battery. This was, however, at the loss of almost all of their men."

Dwyer, wounded in the battle, married Ada Sprinkle "who had cared for him when wounded," stated an article in the May 25, 1905 issue of the "Shenandoah Valley."

EFFORT TO ELIMINATE WATER, AIR, AND ODOR POLLUTION

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of this Nation's foremost manufac-

turers of paper and paper products yesterday made an announcement that I feel should be brought to the attention of every Member of the Congress who is concerned with the quality of the environment.

President Edward B. Hinman of the International Paper Co., announced at the annual stockholders' meeting that his company will spend \$101 million over the next 4 years in an effort to completely eliminate water, air, and odor pollution.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Hinman and his company for their very graphic and positive demonstration of genuine concern for the environment.

I urge my colleagues to take the time to read of this tremendous effort by a segment of private enterprise to deal with one of the most pressing problems facing our Nation.

The announcement referred to follows:

INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY ANNOUNCEMENT

(By Edward B. Hinman)

NEW YORK.—International Paper Company will spend \$101 million over the next four years to complete its program to control air and water pollution at all of the company's U.S. mills and plants. Edward B. Hinman, President and Chief Executive Officer, announced today at the annual meeting of shareholders here.

The company-wide program will provide every operating mill with primary and secondary waste water treatment systems, utilize the latest technology to remove from the air over 99% of all particulate matter coming from its pulp and paper mills, and adapt new technical developments to control mill odors.

Mr. Hinman pointed out that in the last five years alone the company has spent more than \$23 million at existing mills and plants on facilities designed solely to improve water and air conditions. Many other capital investments for projects other than those specifically for pollution control have had related beneficial impact on environmental conditions, he added.

One such program, for example, involves the construction of a \$76 million pulp and paper mill in Ticonderoga, New York, to replace an old mill there.

The new Ticonderoga mill will include the most modern water and air treatment facilities ever installed in North America. Purified water from the treatment system will be diffused in Lake Champlain in such a way that the biological and esthetic values will not be altered. The mill is also expected to be virtually odor-free. The old Ticonderoga pulp mill will be shut down by the end of 1970 as the new mill starts up. Remaining operations at the old mill will be phased out late in 1971.

The company said that by 1974, highly efficient water treatment systems will be installed at all of the company's operating pulp and paper mills in the United States. These treatment systems will remove all settleable solids from waste water and enable the company to meet standards for biological oxygen demand. Water so treated does not adversely affect the complicated life chain in natural waters from bacteria to plankton to plants and fish life.

The company reported that projects totaling \$33 million of the \$101 million program have actually started. As a result of programs conducted in past years, I-P now has primary water treatment at 12 of its 18 mills and some form of secondary treatment at 6 mills. Projects now under way include sec-

ondary treatment systems to be installed at I-P mills in Georgetown, South Carolina; Panama City, Florida; Mobile, Alabama; Moss Point, Mississippi; Corinth, New York; and Jay, Maine. A secondary water treatment system has just been completed at the company's mill in Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

Programs related to air improvement to be started this year will involve mills at Natchez, Mississippi; Tonawanda, New York; Panama City, Mobile, Georgetown, and Jay.

Between 1971 and 1974 similar water and air treatment will be installed or modernized at the other operating mills of the company in the United States. Of the \$101 million program announced today the company expects that a total of \$45 million will have been invested in water treatment systems and that an additional \$56 million will have been invested in applying the latest technological developments to the control of all emissions to the air, including the pungent odor characteristic of kraft paper mills.

Mr. Hinman told shareholders today, "All of these activities are part of your company's commitment to a cleaner, better America. Our program is not designed merely to meet the requirements of existing legislation—this is a program to do what is right as industrial citizens in our communities and our nation—in keeping with our stated policy. We believe that we can complete this program for a better environment without interrupting our planned growth or adversely affecting achievement of our profit objectives."

In discussing I-P's programs in support of the national search for a quality environment, Mr. Hinman also noted that the company was deeply involved in environment and ecology in its role as owner and manager of millions of acres of timberland.

He said that the company has a staff of professional foresters who are trained ecologists and conservationists.

"Good forest management, which is their job, is good environmental practice", Mr. Hinman said. "Well managed tree farms, in addition to producing the continuous crops of trees essential to our business, provide many environmental benefits as well. Under our programs of multiple use many of the benefits of the managed forest are available to be shared by the public."

Among these benefits he listed are: the role of the forest in preventing erosion, collecting rainfall for later release as pure water into streams and lakes; the food and shelter provided by young, growing forests for wildlife; the road systems built and maintained by the company, which provide forest access for recreationists as well as protection against forest fires; the natural beauty of the company's widespread forest areas, and the lesser known function of a forest in its normal growth process of absorbing carbon dioxide from the air and releasing oxygen.

CHICAGO'S NOISE ORDINANCE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, our modern environment is being drowned deaf in a sea of noise. The constant din of noise pollution that surrounds us is frazzling our nerves and endangering our health and the situation is getting worse.

My own city of Chicago has responded to the urgent need to control noise pollution, by enacting a noise and vibration control ordinance. Chicago is one of the leaders in applying modern scientific

technology to this problem as well as providing rigid enforcement procedures. I recently inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks made by the distinguished participants at the Chicago Hearing Society's Symposium on Environmental Noise. I am including in the RECORD today, remarks delivered at the same conference by H. W. Poston, the Commissioner of Chicago's Department of Environmental Control:

CHICAGO'S NOISE ORDINANCE: THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY

(By H. W. Poston)

There are 2.5 billion tons of raw materials used each year to produce the goods consumed by the people of this country. This amounts to 13 tons per capita per year. As these materials are put into use and enter a state of obsolescence, they in turn are disposed of either into the air, the land, or the water.

Also, in the cycling process, the transportation, manufacturing, use and disposal of these products create noise. And it is the problems of noise and waste disposal that concerns the Chicago Department of Environmental Control.

In this presentation, the Chicago Noise and Vibration Control Ordinance is examined and discussed as it applies to the abatement and control of noise pollution. Pointed up are some of the obstacles preventing rigid enforcement not only of the Chicago Noise Ordinance, but similar ordinances in other cities throughout the nation. Recommendations are made for studies needed in specific areas to determine the noise profile of Chicago. Such a study would be designed to be applicable to the noise problem in any similar metropolitan area.

This presentation will conclude with a summary of the activities comprising the noise abatement program of the Chicago Department of Environmental Control.

Historically, control of noise has been the direct province of the public nuisance statute or ordinance. Action was taken to restrain or seek damages from the offending source. There was zoning to restrict land by area to some form of residential, commercial or industrial use.

Chicago was one of the first cities to apply scientific advances in noise measurement to land use zoning ordinances. Maximum noise limits in decibels at each octave band have been established for residential and business districts that border each of the three types of manufacturing zones.

Chicago's Noise and Vibration Control Ordinance covers eight types of noise and defines their limitations by time and distance:

- (1) Vocal and musical instruments, both private and commercial.
- (2) Steam whistles.
- (3) Factories using pneumatic hammers.
- (4) Mechanical apparatus in building or construction operations.
- (5) Boisterous behavior that disturbs the peace.
- (6) Transportation and loading of metal.
- (7) Motors on vehicles in excess of five tons.
- (8) Vibration-producing equipment.

According to the ordinance, persons violating any of the provisions shall be fined not less than five dollars and not more than 200 dollars for each offense.

Chicago's Noise Ordinance, which is rather typical of the other large metropolitan ordinances, does not cover the following:

- (1) Transportation sources such as aircraft, elevated and subway trains, trucks in non-residential areas, and private automobiles;
- (2) Stationary sources such as demolition and construction activities; garbage and refuse collection; home appliances and power tools; background noise in office, plant and recreational settings.

The phenomenal rise in the number of these sources, their extension in our daily lives, and the fact that most ordinances of large cities do not deal with these sources, account for much of the frustration that exists over the noise problem. In the past, Chicago noise complaints have been investigated by the Department of Buildings, and recorded by the Zoning Bureau along with other zoning violations. Surprisingly, the number of complaints over the past several years has been minimal—usually during the the summer months when doors and windows are open.

Nearly all have been from residential areas that border on industrial zones. The offenders have been cooperative in remedying the situations, and most of the problems were minimized by simple techniques, such as the use of shields, partitions, baffles, mufflers, or simple rearrangement of the sound source.

There is some indication that the rate of complaints is picking up. Since the first of the year, the Environmental Control Department has already received a dozen or more complaints. These were about exhaust fans, garbage and refuse collection, outdoor scrap metal loading, punch press operations, and the elevated trains. These complaints are currently under investigation and remedial action.

Obviously, these few complaints do not reflect the extent of the noise problem in Chicago. A Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission Study of aircraft noise showed that between 1963 and 1969 the Federal Aviation Administration Community Relations Division and O'Hare Control Tower received a total of 656 complaints from surrounding communities.

Within Chicago, I am sure that additional complaints are registered with other agencies, such as the Police Department. The Department of Environmental Control expect an increase in the number of complaints as word of its newly assumed responsibility reaches the public.

In planning a noise control and abatement program, we are faced with a number of problems. First of all, we lack recent information on the true nature of Chicago's noise, its characteristics, its sources, how it is perceived and what effects it may have—both physically and psychologically. Most of the information on noise effects is from industrial studies, and is inadequate for designing community noise abatement programs.

The noises in mechanized industries—as a group—have higher, more intense levels than those found in the residential community. Furthermore, these higher levels of industrial noise typically provide daily continuous or recurrent types of exposure which can last for a worker's lifetime on the job. In contrast, the more significant community and home noises are usually intermittent and infrequent in their occurrence. Nonetheless, noises found in the community and home can reach levels comparable in some instances to those found in industrial workplaces. Indeed, rock-n-roll music enthusiasts and residents living under the flight path of a nearby airport can experience the same sound levels as those noted for the noisiest pieces of industrial equipment.

The initial step in a comprehensive community noise control program is to determine the extent and nature of the problem. For immediate purposes, a more detailed study of noise must be done. Such a survey would include a description by zones, block areas, census tracts or other geographical boundaries, of the acoustical character of noise, namely, spectral distribution, duration, complexity of tones, onset duration, intensities, occurrence rates during day and night, and background levels. The contribution of all these factors, both singularly and in combinations, must be ascertained.

The last attempt to define Chicago's noise problem was a study made in 1947 by the Armour Research Foundation. This survey only covered three areas: *traffic noise, noise*

in the vicinity of industrial plants and residential area noise. The results of this study were used to establish a basis for "tolerable levels" and for ordinances dealing with noise abatement. Since 1947, however, changes have occurred in the City of Chicago which have drastically changed noise exposures. Some of these changes include:

- (1) The elimination of street cars and replacement with buses on city streets.
- (2) The establishment of a subway system in the city.
- (3) The building of expressways coupled with the handling of large numbers of vehicles on the city streets.
- (4) The changeover from propeller driven to jet aircraft, a greatly increased number of flights and the establishment of O'Hare Airport.
- (5) The increase in use of power tools and equipment by the "householder."

Because of these changes, a new survey is needed to determine the noise profile of Chicago. Hopefully, such a survey will measure the following:

- (1) The noise exposure of passengers using all forms of mass transportation, including buses, "L", subway trains and railroads.
- (2) The overall contribution of transportation system noise to surrounding residential, commercial and industrial properties.
- (3) The contribution of noise from construction work.
- (4) The noise contribution of industrial and commercial properties to surrounding residential areas.
- (5) Noise levels in areas where people spend leisure time, including shopping centers, sporting events, entertainment, and recreational areas.
- (6) Noise produced by citizens themselves; including various types of power equipment, such as mowers.
- (7) Noise exposures resulting from appliances and other sources within the home.

Extensive data on the characteristics of noise, however, will not be sufficient to determine the acceptance or tolerance of these sounds. Psycho-social factors play just as important a role in the evaluation of a noise problem. The fact that a sound can, simultaneously be noisy yet acceptable tells us that at least two different dimensions must be used to analyze noise. Responses to noise may be governed by the following factors: (1) the average noise level, (2) the degree of fluctuation in sound level, (3) expectation or anticipation of the sound, (4) necessity of the source of sound, (5) the amount of pure tones present, (6) background levels, (7) randomness in time, impulsiveness and acceptance by peer groups, (8) the degree of speech interference, apprehension, and unpleasant associative imagery, such as visual cues or odors.

None of these factors, except the impulsive sounds and the pure tone, have been included in any of the ordinances governing community noise for there is no way as yet to account for them in quantitative terms. However, these factors are important in real-life community situations. And in many cases, they govern the acceptability of the noise source in the community.

The results of the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission's analysis of the noise complaints around O'Hare airport and other studies conducted in 1968, give support to the idea that these non-quantifiable factors are important. The proximity of aircraft take-offs and landings causes large, noticeable changes in level, raises the speech interference level to unacceptable levels, introduces pure tones, is often random, is a single readily identifiable source, carries with it unpleasant associations, and often creates apprehension.

From these studies, however, there appear to be some guidelines for the community. In general, a new noise or an intermittent noise that is about twice as loud as the existing

background noise, will generate widespread complaints in most neighborhoods. When the intruding noise becomes three to four times as loud as the background noise, there is little doubt that threats of legal action or actual legal measures will follow. There can be exceptions. Where the new noise is similar to the existing community noise and creeps up slowly, the change will go unnoticed. How do we know? Well, this is just what happens between 2:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. There is usually a doubling of the continuous noise, and transient noises rise often to four to six times that of the early morning quiet.

This leads to the question of how much leadway we can give to community noise. If we prepare regulations for community noise and allow industry and air-conditioning noise to be about equal to the present neighborhood background, then the sum of all of the new noises will be three to five decibels greater than it was. As soon as we are all acclimated to this noise level, a new noise survey will show that we can increase the level a bit because no one will notice a small increase. This has been called the "creeping ambient." There is one immediate roadblock to an ever-increasing spiral. The community will react as soon as the continuous noise in the community begins to interfere with speech communications in the residential neighborhoods.

Another part of the overall noise control and abatement program for Chicago should be to revise and update the city noise ordinance in light of the knowledge gained from the studies on community noise profiles, effects and public response. Some types of noise not covered by the ordinance have already been discussed. Undoubtedly, these gaps will be filled.

Enforcement of the ordinances will be another problem. Sound cannot be separated from environment in that sound intensity is a function of distance, and a decibel is a limited standard measurement, that is, it measures the intensity but not acceptability of sound. A new system of complaint investigation and enforcement will have to be developed before adequate controls can be realized. Other cities which have tried to initiate noise control, based on traditional concepts of ordinances and measurements, have begun to realize that a new system is necessary.

For example, New York State in July, 1965, became the first in the United States to enact a highway anti-noise statute. The New York State law defines a measurable noise limit which can be enforced against motor vehicles creating excessive or unusual noise. On the books, this law looks fine. But field enforcement is difficult in noisy areas and the New York statute can be enforced only in areas near toll stations where traffic is moving slowly and trucks are at a proper distance from each other. During the first year, only about 15 truck drivers were arrested. Some reduction in extremely noisy trucks has been achieved, but the improvement is barely noticeable since the volume of traffic has increased.

Most states have motor vehicle statutes or codes requiring mufflers on automobiles and trucks to prevent excessive or unusual noise. These statutes, many times fail to spell out quantitative measures in decibels at which violations would occur. Thus, the statutes are for the most part extremely difficult to enforce and are, therefore, not rigidly carried out.

California recently adopted comprehensive highway anti-noise legislation that would prohibit noise levels in excess of 82 decibels for passenger cars and 92 decibels for trucks and buses. This state is taking somewhat of a different approach to enforcement. In Beverly Hills, for example, police base arrests on their own sense of hearing, but a test in an open field is available if questions are raised.

Another goal for the Department of Environmental Control, not only in terms of a noise program, but for all environmental problems, is the strengthening of communication and cooperation between other municipal agencies, as well as private and governmental agencies at the local, state and federal levels. Practically every City Department has some interest and responsibility in the control of noise. Indeed, the cooperation of all parties concerned is a necessary step in achieving control over a problem as diffuse in origin as noise.

To set an example for others to follow, the City of Chicago can do a great deal to alleviate noise generated by municipal operations. Uniform city codes should be enacted concerning the requirements, construction and maintenance of housing, and the problem of elimination of airborne construction noises.

Planning and new concepts in elimination of noise by design is another area where the Department of Environmental Control can become involved. We look forward to continuous cooperation with the Department of Urban Renewal, Model Cities, and the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission in providing adequate noise control in areas designated for development and improvement.

We must not forget that we are treading on new ground as we develop noise control programs. There is a paucity of information about how to plan and about the effects of contemporary episodic and ambient noise levels on people. Essentially all of the current literature in the practice of urban planning is silent on the subject of noise. A few texts make polite passing reference to the growing presence of noise in cities, but fall back on citations of typical zoning and nuisance controls which have long since been outrun by the noise of newer technology. Accordingly, city planners and cities themselves have at best a limited perspective on the problem of environmental noise and means to respond to public pleas for greater peace and quiet.

Machinery now exists in many metropolitan areas for applying more enlightened planning. Pursuant to Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, all applications for Federal assistance for many projects of a metropolitan scale, including highways, airports, mass transportation facilities, open-space acquisition, and land conservation, must be submitted to a metropolitan or regional agency for review. Such agencies are now in existence in more than 200 metropolitan areas, and several are experienced in applying noise projection technology in the development or urban planning policy. We hope to learn a great deal from these agencies.

Federal law authorizes the Department of Housing and Urban Development to make grants "in order to assist State and local governments in solving planning problems resulting from the increasing concentration of population in metropolitan and other urban areas . . ." Noise is one of the problems that would be covered under this law, and we shall try to take advantage of the grant program, while developing an effective noise control program.

Another area in which the Department of Environmental Control is concerned is research on the effects of noise. A number of research efforts are now underway in Chicago and we are presently trying to collect the information generated by these projects. Based on the data (or lack of data) provided by current research, the next step would be to develop additional projects in cooperation with other agencies, such as the Board of Health, and organizations, such as the Chicago Hearing Society.

And finally, a public education and information program must be devised to inform

the community of the hazards of noise, and the ways of preventing, avoiding, controlling the source of the problem.

In summary, then, the seven following activities will comprise the Environmental Control Department's Noise Control and Abatement Program:

- (1) Definition of the noise problem by survey of its sources and effects.
- (2) Establishment of an efficient complaint and investigation system.
- (3) Promotion of new legislation and revision of the noise ordinance.
- (4) Development of new enforcement procedures.
- (5) Cooperation and communication with all relevant governmental agencies and private organizations in planning a noise program.
- (6) Design of research projects, and
- (7) Implementation of a public education and information campaign.

In conclusion, I assure you that the members of the Department of Environmental Control are aware of the urgency to improve environmental conditions and will intensify their efforts to enforce and control pollution in the city for the welfare of four million Chicagoans. Your help is needed to accomplish this goal.

SONS OF NORWAY

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, upon reading the April 23, 1970, issue of the *Nordisk Tidende*, I was very much impressed with a front page story by Arnold Folkvard entitled "From a Humble Start Sons of Norway Became Nationwide."

Under the permission, heretofore granted me by unanimous consent, I am pleased to share this interesting article with my colleagues:

FROM A HUMBLE START SONS OF NORWAY
BECAME NATIONWIDE
(By Arnold Folkvard)

"75 years ago on January 16, 1895, eighteen young Norwegians met in a vacant store on the North side of Minneapolis and organized Sons of Norway.

If these 18 men could but see what their organization has grown to become! I know they could be proud indeed but I am equally as certain that they would be full of disbelief that their small group could have grown to such proportions.

The original purpose of these 18 young men was basically simple—

To create and preserve interest in the Norwegian language and to labor for the development, enlightenment and progress that conduces to honest citizenship in order that the Norwegian people in this country may be properly recognized and respected, and since it was a time of depression, to render each other assistance when the need arose.

They had no intention of forming an international or even nationwide organization. Their aim was to fill an immediate want and to confine their activities to their own locality.

So thoroughly did the young society Sons of Norway do its job that it soon attracted attention among compatriots in other parts of Minneapolis and eventually the country.

After three years, in 1898, the second link was formed in the fraternal chain and then

a third link formed in 1900. That same year, delegates from the three lodges instituted a Supreme Lodge and Sons of Norway was truly underway.

By 1903 twenty lodges were established, all in Minnesota. This same year the Supreme convention decided to make the entire United States its field of operation, and permission was granted to sell insurance and organize lodges in North Dakota and Wisconsin.

At this time an organization with similar aims and purposes was formed on the West Coast and it was inevitable that consolidation would eventually take place. After years of correspondence and mutual visitations and consolidation of the Midwest and Pacific Coast orders was consummated in 1910.

In the meantime 1909 saw the first lodge organized in Chicago, followed closely by the first East Coast lodge, organized in Brooklyn on January 6, 1911. This was Faerder Lodge No. 109, still very active with its over 600 members.

In August 1912, District Lodge No. 3 came into being, and that same year women were admitted into Sons of Norway as social members, and a wise move it was for what would Sons of Norway be without the ladies?

The growth of Sons of Norway is a story in itself.

From a membership of 18 in 1895 we are now approximately 55,000 strong. The amazing part of the story is that while many organizations of similar nature have in the last 10 to 15 years diminished in strength or have completely collapsed, ours, the Sons of Norway is having its finest period of growth.

I normally avoid statistics for they can be most dull, but just to demonstrate the tremendous growth of our order, I cite the following comparisons:

In 1895 we had 18 members and I'm in doubt as to the amount of insurance in force but it must have been insignificant.

43 years later, in 1938, we had 22,000 members and 10½ million dollars insurance in force.

At year 1969 we have approximately 55,000 members and 75 millions insurance in force.

In 5 years time (1965 through 1969) an increase in membership of some 57% and an increase of insurance in force of over 100%. This is a tremendous achievement.

WHAT IS THE FUTURE OF SONS OF NORWAY?

This of course is an unknown, but we can only assume that the fantastic strides we have made over the past 5 or 10 years are only a beginning. We have, I am convinced, only scratched the surface. Certainly changes will have to be made, changes in organization, changes in thinking. . . .

Some we can foresee and I'm sure many that we are unable to visualize at this time.

With immigration at a virtual standstill, we must depend more and more upon 2d, 3d and even 4th generation Norwegians to help fill our ranks. We may be forced in the future to liberalize our requirements for membership by Non-Norwegians.

We must make a concerted effort to entice our children and indeed our grandchildren into the Sons of Norway. However, to do this and not change some of our thinking would be foolish, for their interest would soon be lost. Many of our lodges will have to streamline the business portion of our meetings so these will be enjoyable rather than tiring. I know that few, if any of today's youth will put up with business meetings of three hours duration, and this still occurs in all too many lodges.

We must adjust our social activities to be of interest to the younger members. I don't imply that we should cater to their every whim but, we must recognize that their tastes are not necessarily the same as ours and without the youth our future would not be too bright.

We must convince our members, particularly the younger ones, to take active part in our lodge activities, serving as officers, serving on the various committees.

We must develop programs of interest in our social activities and our cultural endeavors. We must encourage building programs for one of the best ways to create enthusiasm within a group is to give them something worthwhile to work for.

Let us promote charitable projects within our communities for this will benefit our image in the community at large and attract the attention of other Norwegians and bring them into our fold.

Let us support our Benevolent programs for regardless of the society in which we live with social security, hospitalization plans, medical and surgical insurance, Medicare, etc., we are a fraternal group and to a great degree, "our brothers keeper".

The future of Sons of Norway is bright indeed. With progressive thinking on the Supreme, District and Local lodge levels we are bound to progress. The future of Sons of Norway is up to US.

ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, when I was first elected to the Congress, I pledged to my constituents in the Seventh District of Michigan that I would send back to them annual reports on the activities of the Congress. Such a report would give these citizens the opportunity to review the efforts of their Congressman over a 12-month period.

I have just completed the annual progress report, part I for 1969-70, and will soon be mailing it to every person in the Seventh District of Michigan. The text of this annual report follows:

YOUR ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN DON RIEGLE, 1969-70—PART I

DEAR FRIEND: This last year—early 1969 through early 1970—has seen a new testing period for our country, our institutions, our political system, and ourselves. The old comfortable view that problems are separate from each other and belong to someone else—just doesn't work any longer. This old compartmentalized view has given way to a new sense that all problems and all people are inter-related and interdependent.

In the past, we looked at poverty, schools, jobs, pollution, transportation, crime, etc., as problems which just affected some of the people some of the time. Now we see and we feel issues that cut all across society—the war, the uncontrolled cost of living, our educational system in turmoil, public disorder, loss of confidence in our institutions, enlarging gaps between young and old, destruction of our environment, and so on. We now see that these are all connected and affect all the people all the time.

So I want to give you an in-depth summary of our work in Congress this past year—what we have done and what we're doing now. This report will cover many subjects and so will come in two separate newsletters—this one and a second one to follow in a few weeks. As always, this job in Congress belongs to all of us and I need your ideas and thoughts.

DON RIEGLE.

REFORMING CONGRESS—A PRIME TARGET FOR OVERHAUL

The problem.—The Congress today, for many reasons, is not up to the job required of it. It is out-dated, inefficient and not responsive to the urgent realities we face as a nation. Congress has moved too slowly, avoided many issues, rammed other measures through without study or meaningful debate, and continues to have ethics scandals. The great issues of our time go begging for attention while Congress often bogs down in nit-picking.

At the root of this crisis are outdated rules, procedures and organizational methods designed 200 years ago. Congress is badly handicapped by the seniority system which automatically makes the oldest surviving member of a committee the chairman. Thus, today in the House we have seven committee chairmen in their seventies and two in their eighties. Some are unable to work a full day—and use work methods that are hopelessly inefficient and out of date. Common sense tells us that the best man on the committee should be the chairman—whether he's 75, or 55 or 35. If a man at age 52 is the best equipped to become the committee chairman he shouldn't have to wait 25 years until he's 77 and his older colleagues have died to become committee chairman.

Also, Congress—the people's branch of government—has surrendered too much power to the executive branch and the Supreme Court. Worst of all, Congress is continuing to lose the confidence of a concerned and well-informed public. Because of this more and more people—particularly the young—are looking "outside the system" for answers. Congress must overhaul itself and come into the 20th century.

Our action this year

Working in the forefront of the drive for Congressional Reform;

Testified before the House Rules Committee urging strong reform;

Continuous discussion to get grassroots citizens to join the fight;

Travel throughout the country to urge new people to run for public office—in both political parties; and

Speaking out strongly on the issues to reassert the independent voice of the Congress.

Part of the answer

Change the seniority system—while experience is important, so is leadership based on ability, energy, performance, determination to do the job. We should elect committee chairmen.

Open all hearings and congressional work to public review—except where national security and personal privacy must be maintained.

Establish an on-going mechanism for reform—a bipartisan committee that recommends new methods and improvements.

Provide more resources for Congress to do its job—staff, information, computer analysis, etc.

Reach new and better decisions on National priorities and goals.

You can help.—Congressional reform can move ahead but only if enough citizens want it and speak out. You can help—by writing a letter to Speaker John McCormack, Minority Leader Gerald Ford, or Chairman of the House Rules Committee, William Colmer—Capitol, Washington, D.C. These gentlemen are in the position to help change the rules and make Congress more effective.

TASK FORCE ON CAMPUS DISORDERS

Last year, Congressman Riegle and five others organized 22 House members to visit college campuses and investigate the problems and causes of campus disorder. They felt that unrest and violence were disrupting our educational system and that we did not

clearly enough understand the nature of this turmoil and alienation among young people.

Congressman Riegle headed one of six teams that visited colleges in California. Congressman Riegle was an eye-witness when bayonets and helicopters spraying tear gas were used against student demonstrators. The California team talked privately with students, faculty, administrators, and local public and law enforcement officials.

Major conclusions and recommendations included:

There are some campus revolutionaries that advocate and use violence. They must be apprehended and held accountable under the law. The greater problem however is the non-violent vast majority of students who are seriously concerned over the difference between the promise and the performance of today's American system—educational, business, political, etc. to reach these legitimate student concerns we must deal more directly with the war, equality of opportunity, and other issues which are hurting the country.

There is great need for real educational reform to make learning more relevant to the issues and needs of a rapidly changing world.

Violence and violation of rights of others cannot be a legitimate form of protest. At the same time, university officials and law enforcement officials must be far more sensitive to the conditions which breed lack of trust and, ultimately, violence. Ignoring explosive problems or repressive measures which treat innocent and guilty alike can force the majority of students into greater alienation.

The media and politicians have often made the campus unrest problem worse by distorting and polarizing public understanding of our universities and students.

Reform the draft (this has now begun)—in part due to the action of this Task Force.

Lower the voting age—we are now fighting for this and other methods of providing young people greater opportunities to work within the system.

We would be happy to mail you a copy of the full report if you write to our Flint or Washington office.

UPGRADING SOCIAL SECURITY

In recent months, I met with many hundreds of our senior citizens and received thousands of letters and calls from others. The message was loud and clear—our senior citizens just cannot live a secure, safe, and full life on the present social security payment—especially when the cost of living continues to eat up their limited income.

After much delay in Congress, I am pleased to report that we were able to fight for—and win a 15% across the board increase—effective January 1, 1970. But this is not enough, other changes are still needed. I will continue to fight for these changes and have introduced legislation which would:

Provide automatic future increases based on increases in the cost of living;

Increase the income limitation ceiling to \$3,000;

Make the first \$5,000 in income exempt from all Federal taxes;

Make eligible for Medicare those disabled senior citizens now receiving social security;

Increase benefits for widows and dependents; and

Protect VA pensions from social security increases.

NEW STUDENT INTERN PROGRAM

During the year over 40 college and high school students from Michigan and other parts of the country have worked on public projects and studies through our Washington and Flint offices—such things as:

Flint Model Cities Program and investigation of local urban renewal;

Problems facing senior citizens;
Drug abuse among young people;
Stopping the pollution of Lake Michigan and Potomac River; and
Cost of living in Michigan and auto industry employment

These students work full time at their own expense for three weeks to three months each.

"These young people make an excellent contribution to public problem solving and we will continue our intern program at full capacity this year. Most young people today are willing to work hard to try to improve things constructively by investing their own time and energy. Our Congressional office will continue to be open to any volunteer, of all ages."

SPECIAL CASE—A VETERANS HOSPITAL

At the request of members of the Buick UAW Local 599 last year, Congressman Riegle was asked to investigate alleged unsatisfactory conditions at the Ann Arbor Vets Hospital. Mr. Riegle's office made an unannounced tour which found many unsatisfactory conditions and determined that the situation at the hospital needed urgent attention and improvement. Congressman Riegle made a report to the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration in Washington requesting that an official inspection team be sent—unannounced—to evaluate the hospital and its services. As a result, the VA sent Congressman Riegle a list of significant changes and improvements which would be made. Because a group of local citizens cared enough to petition their Congressman, that hospital is now updating and improving its facilities. And of course we are continuing to watch the condition there—so the old problems don't return.

RIEGLE BILLS INTRODUCED

Tax reform and plugging tax loopholes.
Increasing social security benefits.
Resolution calling for humane treatment of U.S. prisoners of war.
Reform of the Congress.
Study of effects of TV violence on children.
Safeguards and restrictions against obscene mail.
Resolution supporting the President's Vietnamization program and U.S. troop withdrawal.

Termination of Gulf of Tonkin war-making authority as of December 1970.

Tax credits to train and employ the handicapped.

National emergency telephone number for citizens reporting crimes.

RIEGLE VOTES IN CONGRESS

Issue, Riegle vote, House vote
Full funding for water pollution control: Yes—Defeated.
President Nixon's draft reform bill: Yes—Passed.
Increased funding for education: Yes—Passed.
Reduce farm subsidies to max \$20,000 per farmer: Yes—Defeated.
Tax reform: Yes—Passed.
Special education programs on drugs and drug abuse: Yes—Passed.
Extend the 10% income surtax: No—Passed.
Mine safety regulations: Yes—Passed.
Extra \$1 billion for unbudgeted battleships: No—Passed.
\$96 million for supersonic transport plane: No—Passed.
Direct election of the President: Yes—Passed.
Establish Council on the Environment: Yes—Passed.
Funds for ABM deployment: No—Passed.
Increase G.I. education and Vet benefits: Yes—Passed.
Reduce voting rights enforcement in South: No—Passed.

Increase social security benefits: Yes—Passed.

Sustain President's veto of the HEW bill: Yes—Passed.

Commission on Population Growth Problems: Yes—Passed.

Provide authority for settling railroad strike: Yes—Passed.

VIETNAM WAR—ENDING U.S. INVOLVEMENT

The President has taken some encouraging steps to turn the war and the nation-building effort back to the Vietnamese where it belongs. But Congress—after 8 years—has still not faced up to its constitutional responsibility to decide when the U.S. should engage in war and what our national priorities should be.

The facts are:

1. The war goes on at the rate of nearly 100 American men killed per week, 5,000 deaths per year, 30,000 injuries, and some 23 billion (\$460.00 for every American family of 4 in 1970).

2. It is not certain that the present South Vietnamese government can win the support of its people and build a nation with or without U.S. blood and money. This is one reason why I think the South Vietnamese must steadily assume all military responsibility, with all American combat and support troops removed.

3. The deep political, social, and economic roots of the conflict are spreading in Cambodia and Laos. Eventually, there will have to be a political solution to these problems by the Asians themselves. Our own national security involvement cannot be based on these unstable internal conditions in S.E. Asia. We must not get drawn into Laos or Cambodia.

4. The \$23 billion cost of the Vietnam war is the number one factor blocking our ability to hold down the cost of living, attack crime, improve education, clean-up our environment, and deal squarely with the urgent problems that weaken our nation at home.

A recent witness before the Appropriations Committee said proudly "my wife is safer in Saigon than Washington, D.C." What a sad admission—more evidence that we better clear up our own back yard before we go 13,000 miles away to tell other people how to live.

In light of these facts, we are leading two Vietnam initiatives in Congress at this time.

One—Asking Congress to amend the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution of August 10, 1964 to terminate any implied war-making authority as of December 31, 1970. The Administration which originally opposed this idea has now declared itself neutral, properly leaving the matter for Congress and the people to decide.

Two—Asking Congress to accept its legal constitutional obligations by making a decision on how long the U.S. should continue to pour American blood and money into Vietnam. Our resolution would require Congress to fund U.S. Vietnam forces only at the level required to have all U.S. combat and support troops out by July 1, 1971. These steps are actually required if we are to follow the Constitution.

(a) U.S. Constitution: *Article I, Section 8.* Congress shall have power . . . to declare war . . . to provide for the common Defence 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 . . .

(b) 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.

These actions are not intended as a challenge to the President; on the contrary, we believe they coincide with his expressed desire, and that of most Americans, to de-Americanize the Vietnam war within a reasonable period of time. Both McCloskey and Riegle supported President Nixon's resolution last fall which endorsed the Administration policy of orderly withdrawal and search for a just peace.

THE SEVENTH DISTRICT CONGRESSIONAL SEAT
AND THE U.S. SENATE

Earlier this year there were many people around the state who expressed interest in—and speculated about—my running for the U.S. Senate this November. After deep and searching reflection, and with mixed feelings, I concluded that it was best that I not run for the Senate in 1970.

It is an honor to have been among those considered for the U.S. Senate. In this respect my intent was, and will remain, to work vigorously with all who wish to make our political system more effective. Citizen government is a tough and vital job which we all must carry on—and your part in it is just as important as mine or anyone else's. The issues, and needs of our country are larger than any individual's, so we've got to pitch in and work together to get the job done.

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

Especially in these times, it is important that every person have his or her own chance to speak out—or find out—about national issues or individual problems that relate to the government. He should be able to do this without having to use a middleman, or having to belong to a special interest group. Because it is not always convenient for people to come to the Congressional office, Congressman Don Riegle and his staff have established a new service of local area get-togethers with citizens that will systematically cover every neighborhood and community in our district. So far, the neighborhoods covered have been the City of Flint, and major parts of Burton, Mt. Morris, Genesee and Flint Townships—other areas will be covered soon.

The way it works is this: Congressman Riegle will send a postcard to your home saying when and where he will be in your area—and inviting you to get together—usually in the local area shopping center; although during the summer, we will again use the Congressional mobile office trailer.

Watch for the one in your area so that you can talk directly with Don Riegle about the things that matter most to you.

WORK IN GENESSEE AND LAPEER

This year, being in close touch with our district meant coming home many times during the year, meeting with thousands of constituents and many groups, as well as maintaining a vigorous district office at 425 Detroit St. in Flint. Even with telephones, press and mail, there just is no substitute for getting with people personally and exchanging ideas and concerns about our community and country. Here are some of the Congressman's local meetings this last year.

UAW Chevrolet Local 659.

G.I. Wives Club of Flint.

Fisher I Plant.

Dedicated Davison City Hall.

Dedicated Fenton High School.

Genesee County Tax Reform Association.

Central Christian Church.

New citizens group.

Bendle High School, Lewis School.

Clio homecoming.

Lapeer Day.

Professional Engineer Association.

THIRD ANNUAL G.I. KIDS' CHRISTMAS PARTY

This was a heart-warming success for the kids and their families because so many people and local groups pitched in. Each

family tape recorded a personal message to their dad or brother, which was then sent air mail in time for Christmas. Games, refreshments, and gifts were there for every child along with Santa Claus and Bozo the clown. Special thanks for help go to Mr. Thomas McCall, volunteer chairman, local UAW unions, VFW posts, radio and TV stations, etc.

This is only one of the many ways we can express our deep gratitude to those families and young men who serve our country—and are away at Christmas.

MODEL CITIES—A CHANCE FOR PROGRESS

Congressman Riegle, along with county and city officials, announced a HUD grant of \$3,577,000.00 to Flint-Genesee Model Cities program. After a year of local planning, now follows the first year of action.

Performance, and the ability of diverse public and private groups to work together will determine the future of Model Cities. Unlike other government sponsored programs, which depend on Federal involvement, the success or failure of Model Cities will be entirely a product of local initiatives and a desire on the part of all groups to make the program work.

YOUR HOT-LINE TELEPHONE—USE IT IF YOU
NEED TO

Remember, anytime you need to reach Congressman Riegle or his staff in Washington about an important government-related problem or issue—you can do so by telephone—at no charge to you by coming in to your District Congressional office and using the Hot-Line phone to Congressman Riegle's Washington office.

NOT PRINTED AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE

These newsletters are not printed at government expense—any and all contributions will help greatly in continuing this newsletter service. If you wish to help, make check payable to "7th District Newsletter"—425 Detroit St., Flint, 48502—our thanks to those that have helped in the past.

WHEN TREASON PROSPERS—
ENEMIES ARE UNKNOWN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, military courtesy has assumed new dimensions. The Department of the Army now offers guided tours of U.S. military installations to military officers from Soviet and Communist bloc countries.

The 1970 foreign military attaché tour group included Russian Maj. Gen. Mikhail I. Stolnik and other officers from the Communist Warsaw Pact satellite countries.

The "friendship" tour, according to the official Army brochure published in conjunction with the tour, included a flight by Special Air Mission—SAM—C-135 aircraft from Andrews Air Base to Pope Air Base, N.C.

At Fort Bragg, the "guests" observed a dress rehearsal of Exercise Brass Strike.

At Fort Benning, Ga., an airborne/pathfinder demonstration, leadership reaction course, weapons firing, observed rangers in action, observed Highley village search, and ambush demonstration—a mock Vietnamese village search.

The guests departed Fort Benning en route to Fort Rucker, Ala., by U.S. Army

helicopters. At Fort Rucker, they had a visit of maintenance training for an orientation and tour of training facilities. Also, static display and briefing on all rotary aircraft. Observed airmobile operation. Observed and inspected armed aircraft including the Mohawk and Bulldog.

The tour of U.S. training and defense installations proceeded:

To Cape Kennedy: A Kennedy Space Center briefing—tour of flight training building—tour of vehicle assembly building—and launch control center—tour of crawler transporter—tour of pad A launch site.

To Fort Bliss, Tex.: A briefing on U.S. Air Defense Center and Fort Bliss. Briefing on role and mission of U.S. Army Air Defense School. Briefing on 1st Advanced Individual Training—AT—Brigade activities, demonstration of forward area weapons, observed Chaparral/Vulcan training, automatic weapons training, Hawk missile briefing and demonstration, and briefing and firing of all air defense artillery forward area weapons.

To Fort Hood, Tex.: A briefing on Project Master, display of major items of armor equipment, and observed accuracy firing demonstration.

To U.S. Military Academy at West Point: Tour of academy. Retreat parade.

One wonders what thoughts passed through the minds of our men who were ordered to demonstrate in front of military representatives of Communist nations, including Russia—whose cadre, arms, and equipment are being used to kill and maim their buddies in Vietnam—and perhaps in the future against them.

Morale must be at an all time high when U.S. taxpayers play host to the enemies' military representatives while over 40,000 of their sons are dead and a war is yet to be won.

What reciprocal benefits can our fighting men expect in return? Release of our POW's? Cessation of Russian supplied arms and equipment? A promise not to "bury us?"

One can but guess what the mothers, fathers, widows, sweethearts, and children of over 40,000 unsung heroes must feel at this infamous mockery of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I include several newsclippings and the official military tour program in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 25, 1970]

SOVIET GENERAL, OTHERS TO TOUR FT.

BENNING

FT. BENNING, GA.—A Soviet major general and officers from half a dozen Warsaw Pact countries will be among foreign military attaches who will tour the huge infantry training center here next week.

The attaches will spend three days at Ft. Benning and will be shown American infantry weapons and tactics, including a search of a simulated Vietnamese village, an Army information officer said.

He said the group of 49 Washington-based military attaches will arrive here Tuesday as part of a nationwide tour.

They will go later in the week to the Army aviation center at Ft. Rucker, Ala., for a look at Army helicopter training and tactics used in Vietnam.

Maj. Gen. Mikhail Ivanovich Stolnik will head the Soviet delegation, he said.

[From the Alexandria-Pineville (La.) Town Talk, Apr. 30, 1970]

RED GENERALS VISIT

Soviet Maj. Gen. Mikhail Stolnik is welcomed at Fort Benning, Ga., by Maj. Gen. Orwin Talbott, commanding general. Some 49 Washington-based officers, including six Warsaw Pact military attaches, arrived for a two-day tour of the U.S. infantry installation.

FOREIGN MILITARY ATTACHE TOUR 1970

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C.

GREETINGS FROM THE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR INTELLIGENCE, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

On behalf of the United States Army, I take great pleasure in extending a most cordial welcome to those members of the Corps of Military Attaches participating in the 1970 Military Attache Tour. It is our hope that your visits to our military installations and civilian communities will be both enjoyable and of professional value.

I personally look forward to accompanying you during the first week of the tour. Major General Freund, my Deputy for Intelligence Support, will join the tour on 2 May and accompany you during the second week.

J. A. McCHRISTIAN,

Major General, GS, ACOFS for Intelligence.

ITINERARY—MILITARY ATTACHE TOUR, 1970

Sponsor: Department of the Army.

Visitors: Foreign Military Attaches Accredited to Department of the Army.

Escort officers: Major General J. A. McChristian, Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (26 April-3 May 1970).

Major General J. F. Freund, Deputy for Intelligence Support Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (2 May-8 May 1970).

Colonel H. B. Lane, Chief, Foreign Liaison Office.

Lieutenant Colonel D. E. Gaston, Foreign Liaison Office.

Lieutenant Colonel J. M. Hamilton, foreign liaison office.

Major Charles R. Ray, Foreign Liaison Office.

Major E. Sanchez, ACS-I, OACSI, (Spanish Linguist).

Medical Officer: Captain Daniel Teres, Andrew Rader Army Clinic, Fort Myer, Virginia.

Washington, D.C., Contact Officer: Lieutenant Colonel Charles R. Rawlings; Foreign Liaison Office, OACSI.

NOTES

1. All attaches and escort officers are requested to wear name tags, provided by the Foreign Liaison Office, during all visits and official social functions.

2. If a foreign officer does not have the uniforms listed in the itinerary, he is requested to wear the equivalent uniform of his service.

3. All times listed in the itinerary are local.

4. Those attaches wishing to visit the United States of Mexico while in the El Paso area should have their passports available at that time.

DATE AND LOCAL TIME, ACTIVITY

Sunday, April 26

1400—Assemble in the Distinguished Visitors Lounge, Military Airlift Command (MAC) Terminal, Andrews Air Force Base. Dress: Duty Uniform (Army Green). A group photograph will be taken prior to departure.

1500—Depart Andrews Air Force Base via Special Air Mission (SAM) C-135 Aircraft for Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina. Flying Time: One hour.

1600—Arrive Pope Air Force Base. Met by a representative of Commanding General, XVIII Airborne Corps.

Quarters: Holiday Inn, Fayetteville, North Carolina 28301.

*—Enroute via bus to quarters.

1750—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Duty Uniform (Army Green).

1800—Enroute via bus to Officers' Open Mess, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

1830—Official Reception/Buffer hosted by General John L. Throckmorton, Commander in Chief, United States Strike Command.

*—Enroute via bus to quarters.

*—Balance of evening at leisure.

Monday, April 27

*—Breakfast at leisure.

0820—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Duty Uniform (Short sleeve khaki shirt and trousers).

0830—Enroute via bus to Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

0900—Arrive York Theatre, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

*—Observe Dress Rehearsal of Exercise "Brass Strike".

1230—Lunch at VIP Mess Tent, Drop Zone "Sicily".

1530—Enroute via bus to quarters.

1630—Leisure time.

1820—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Duty Uniform (Army Green).

1830—Enroute via bus to Fort Bragg Officers' Open Mess, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

1900—Reception and Dinner hosted by Lieutenant General and Mrs. John J. Tolson, III, Commanding General, XVIII Airborne Corps.

*—Enroute via bus for quarters.

*—Leisure time. Request attaches pay motel bill prior to retiring.

Tuesday, April 28

*—Breakfast at leisure.

*—All baggage to be packed and placed on beds in motel room.

0920—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Duty Uniform. (Short sleeve khaki shirt and trousers).

0930—Enroute via bus to Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina.

1015—Depart Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina via SAM C-135 Aircraft for Lawson Army Airfield, Fort Benning, Georgia. Bade farewell by a representative of Commanding General, XVIII Airborne Corps. Flight time: One hour and fifteen minutes.

1130—Arrive Lawson Army Airfield. Met by Major General and Mrs. Orwin C. Talbott, Commanding General, United States Army Infantry Center.

1130—Quarters: Holiday Inn of Columbus—Airport, Columbus, Georgia 31904.

*—Enroute via bus for Fort Benning Officers' Open Mess.

1200—Official luncheon hosted by Major General Orwin C. Talbott.

1330—Enroute via bus to Infantry Hall.

1340—United States Army Infantry Center and United States Army School Activities Briefing.

1405—TV Briefing and Tour.

1425—Tour of the Infantry Hall.

1445—Enroute via bus to Eubanks Field.

1455—Airborne/Pathfinder Demonstration.

1600—Enroute via bus to quarters.

1620—Leisure time.

1830—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Uniform/Informal (Summer White).

1840—Enroute via bus to Supper Club, Officers' Open Mess, Fort Benning, Georgia.

1900—Official Reception and Dinner hosted by Major General and Mrs. Orwin C. Talbott.

*—Enroute via bus for quarters.

*—Balance of evening at leisure.

Wednesday, April 29

*—Breakfast at leisure.

0820—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Duty Uniform (short sleeve khaki shirt and trousers).

0830—Enroute via bus for Dixie Village.

0900—Observe the Leadership Reaction Course.

0955—Weapons Firing.

1130—Luncheon hosted by a designated representative of the Commanding General, United States Army Infantry Center, at the Supper Club, Officers' Open Mess.

1230—Enroute via bus for Ranger Training Area.

1300—Observe Rangers in Action.

1350—Enroute via bus for Higley Village.

1410—Observe Higley Village Search and Ambush Demonstration.

1520—Enroute via U.S. Army helicopters to quarters.

1550—Leisure time.

0750—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Civilian/Informal.

1930—Official Social Event hosted by the Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Georgia. (Place and details to be announced).

*—Enroute via bus for quarters.

*—Leisure time. Request attaches pay motel bills prior to retiring.

Thursday, April 30

*—Breakfast at leisure.

*—All baggage to be packed and placed on beds in motel room.

0750—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Duty Uniform (Short sleeve khaki shirt and trousers).

0800—Enroute via bus to Lawson Army Airfield.

0845—Depart Lawson Army Airfield via United States Army helicopters for Cairns Army Airfield, Fort Rucker, Alabama. Bade farewell by Major General Orwin C. Talbott. Flight time: One hour and 15 minutes. Retard watches one hour.

0900—Arrive Center Parade Field, Fort Rucker, Alabama. Met by Major General Delk M. Oden, Commanding General, United States Army Aviation Center and Commandant, United States Army Aviation School.

Quarters: Holiday Inn, Dothan, Alabama 36302.

*—Enroute via bus to United States Army Aviation School.

*—Initial Orientation presented by Assistant Commandant, United States Army Aviation School.

1000—Visit Department of Maintenance Training for an orientation and tour of training facilities.

1130—Enroute via bus to the Officers' Open Mess.

*—Attaches from Australia, Ethiopia, Greece, Iran, Italy, Korea, and Norway meet with their student officers in the lounge of the Officers' Open Mess.

1145—Official luncheon hosted by Major General Delk M. Oden.

1300—Enroute to Hooper Range, United States Army Aviation Center.

1320—Static Display and briefing on all rotary aircraft.

1415—Enroute to Longstreet Range, United States Army Aviation Center.

1430—Observe airmobile operations.

1515—Observe and inspect armed aircraft including the Mohawk and Birdog.

1600—Enroute via United States Army helicopters to quarters.

1630—Leisure time.

1820—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Uniform/Informal (Summer White).

1830—Enroute via bus to Fort Rucker Officers' Open Mess, Fort Rucker, Alabama.

1900—Official Reception and Dinner hosted by Major General and Mrs. Delk M. Oden.

*—Enroute via bus to quarters.

*—Leisure time. Attaches are requested to pay motel bills prior to retiring.

Friday, May 1

*—Breakfast at leisure.

*—All bags are to be packed and brought to the motel lobby.

0630—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress:

Duty Uniform (Short sleeve khaki shirt and trousers).

0640—Enroute via bus for Old City Airport, Dothan, Alabama.

0645—Depart Dothan Old City Airport via United States Army helicopters for Eglin Air Force Base, Florida. Bade farewell by Mayor General Delk M. Oden. Flight time: 1 hour and 15 minutes.

0800—Arrive Eglin Air Force Base, Florida. Transfer to United States Air Force SAM C-135 Aircraft. Depart Eglin Air Force Base for Cape Kennedy Air Force Station, Florida. Flight time: 1 hour and 10 minutes. Advance watches one hour.

1030—Arrive Cape Kennedy Air Force Station Skid Strip, Kennedy Space Center, Florida. Met by a representative of the Director of Center Operations, Kennedy Space Center.

1045—Visit Cape Kennedy Air Force Station to include United States Air Force Museum, Astronaut Memorial and Titan III Missile.

1200—Official luncheon at Headquarters, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Kennedy Space Center hosted by a representative of Center Operations.

1300—Kennedy Space Center Briefing.

1340—Tour of Flight Crew Training Building.

1410—Tour of the Vehicle Assembly Building and the Launch Control Center.

1500—Tour of the Crawler/Transporter.

1525—Tour of Pad A (Launch Site of Apollo XIII).

1545—Enroute to Cape Kennedy Air Station Skid Strip.

1605—Depart Cape Kennedy Air Station Skid Strip via United States Air Force SAM C-135 Flight for Miami International Airport, Miami, Florida. Bade farewell by a representative of Center Operations, Kennedy Space Center. Flight time: 45 minutes.

1650—Arrive Miami International Airport, Miami, Florida. Met by Colonel Roseman, Commanding Officer, 31st Artillery Brigade (Air Defense).

Quarters: The Carillon Hotel, Miami Beach, Florida.

*—Enroute via bus to quarters.

1930—Reception hosted by a Miami Beach Civic organization. Dress: Uniform/Informal (Summer White).

Saturday, May 2

*—At leisure in Miami Beach, Florida.

Sunday, May 3

*—Breakfast at leisure.

0950 (*)—Assemble in hotel lobby. Dress: Casual Civilian Clothes and Bathing Suit.

1000 (*)—Enroute via bus for Hobe Sound, Florida.

1200 (*)—Picnic and Swimming Party hosted by Major General and Mrs. Joseph A. McChristian, Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence. Dress: Casual Civilian Clothes and Bathing Suit for those desiring to swim.

1700 (*)—Enroute via bus to quarters.

1900—Leisure time in Miami Beach, Florida for the balance of evening.

*—Attaches are requested to pay hotel bills prior to retiring.

Monday, May 4

*—Breakfast at leisure.

*—All bags should be packed and placed on beds in hotel rooms.

0935—Assemble in hotel lobby. Dress: Duty Uniform (Short sleeve khaki shirt and trousers).

0945—Enroute via bus to Miami International Airport.

1045—Depart Miami International Airport via United States Air Force SAM C-135 Aircraft for El Paso International Airport, El Paso, Texas. Flight time: 3 hours and 40 minutes. Luncheon served enroute. Retard watches two hours.

(*) Optional for those attaches wishing to attend.

1230—Arrive El Paso International Airport, Transient Terminal, El Paso, Texas. Met by Major General Richard T. Cassidy, Commanding General, United States Army Air Defense Center and Fort Bliss.

Quarters: Holiday Inn, El Paso—Downtown, El Paso, Texas 79901.

*—Enroute via bus to Building No. 2, Fort Bliss.

1300—Welcome by Commanding General, United States Army Air Defense Center and Fort Bliss.

1305—Briefing on United States Air Defense Center and Fort Bliss.

1325—Briefing on the Role and Mission of the United States Army Air Defense School.

1340—Enroute via bus to Training Area No. 17.

1400—Briefing on the 1st Advanced Individual Training (AIT) Brigade Activities.

1410—Demonstration of Forward Area Weapons.

1430—Coffee Break and Visit of Static Display of Equipment.

1450—Enroute via bus to the Chaparral/Vulcan Park.

1455—Observe Chapparral/Vulcan Training.

1510—Enroute via bus to the Automatic Weapons Park.

1515—Observe Automatic Weapons Training.

1530—Enroute via bus to quarters.

1600—Leisure time.

1850—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Uniform/Informal (Summer White).

1900—Enroute via bus to the Officers' Open Mess, Fort Bliss, Texas.

1930—Official Reception and Dinner hosted by Major General and Mrs. Richard T. Cassidy.

*—Enroute via bus to quarters.

*—Leisure time.

Tuesday, May 5

*—Breakfast at leisure.

0750—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Duty Uniform (Short sleeve khaki shirt and trousers).

0800—Enroute via bus for Fort Bliss, Texas.

0830—Hawk Missile Briefing and Demonstration.

*—Hercules Missile Briefing and Demonstration.

1200—Official luncheon hosted by Major General Richard T. Cassidy.

1330—Enroute via bus to the McGregor Redeye Range, New Mexico.

1445—Briefing and Firing of all Air Defense Artillery Forward Area Weapons.

1545—Enroute via bus to quarters.

1700—Arrive quarters.

1820—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Civilian Casual Clothes and Bathing Suits.

1830—Enroute via bus to Officers' Open Mess.

1900—Informal Swimming Party and Buffet Dinner hosted by Major General Richard T. Cassidy.

*—Enroute via bus to quarters.

*—Leisure time. Attaches are requested to pay motel bills prior to retiring.

Wednesday, May 6

*—Breakfast at leisure.

*—All bags are to be packed and placed on beds in motel rooms.

0750—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Duty Uniform (Short sleeve khaki shirt and trousers).

0800—Enroute via bus to El Paso International Airport, El Paso, Texas.

0830—Depart El Paso International Airport Transient Terminal, via United States Air Force SAM C-135 Aircraft for Gray Army Airfield, Fort Hood, Texas. Bade farewell by Major General Richard T. Cassidy. Flight time: 1 hour and 25 minutes. Advance watches one hour.

1100—Arrive Gray Army Airfield. Met by a

representative of Commanding General of III Corps and Fort Hood.

Quarters: Cowhouse Motor Hotel, Killeen, Texas.

*—Enroute via bus to Officers' Open Mess. 1200—Official luncheon hosted by Major General John Norton, Deputy Project Director, Project Masster.

1315—Enroute via bus to Building 38 North, Fort Bliss.

1345—III Corps Command Briefing.

1415—Briefing on Project Masster.

1445—Enroute via bus to 1st Armored Division Parade Ground.

1450—Display of major items of Armor Equipment.

1545—Observe Accuracy Firing Demonstration.

1615—Enroute via bus to quarters.

1630—Leisure time.

1820—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Civilian Informal.

1830—Enroute via bus for the Officers' Open Mess, Fort Hood, Texas.

1900—Official Reception and Barbecue hosted by Major General and Mrs. John Norton.

*—Enroute via bus for quarters.

*—Leisure time. Attaches are requested to pay their motel bills prior to retiring.

Thursday, May 7

*—Breakfast at leisure.

*—All bags should be packed and brought to motel lobby.

1005—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Duty Uniform (Army Green).

1015—Enroute via bus for Gray Army Airfield, Texas.

1045—Depart Gray Army Airfield via United States Air Force SAM C135 Aircraft. Bade farewell by a representative of Commanding General III Corps and Fort Hood. Luncheon served enroute. Flight time: 2 hours and 45 minutes. Advance watches one hour.

1430—Arrive Stewart Airport, Newburgh, N.Y. Met by a representative of Superintendent, United States Military Academy (USMA).

Quarters: Holiday Inn of Newburgh, Newburgh, New York.

*—Enroute via bus to United States Military Academy.

1500—Greeted by Major General William A. Knowlton, Superintendent, United States Military Academy.

1530—Visit the United States Military Academy.

1710—Retreat Parade.

*—Enroute via bus to quarters.

*—Arrive quarters and leisure time.

1920—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Uniform/Informal (Summer White).

1930—Enroute via bus to the West Point Army Mess, United States Military Academy.

2000—Official Reception and Dinner hosted by Major General and Mrs. William A. Knowlton, Superintendent, United States Military Academy.

*—Enroute via bus to quarters.

*—Leisure time. Attaches are requested to pay motel bills prior to retiring.

Friday, May 8

*—Breakfast at leisure.

*—All bags packed and placed on beds in motel rooms.

0820—Assemble in motel lobby. Dress: Duty Uniform (Army Green).

0830—Enroute via bus for the United States Military Academy.

0900—Continue visit of the United States Military Academy.

1200—Luncheon in Corps of Cadets Mess Hall.

*—Farewell by Superintendent, United States Military Academy.

1300—Enroute via bus for Stewart Airport, Newburgh, New York.

1345—Depart Stewart Air Force Base via United States Air Force SAM C-135 Aircraft for Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland. Bade farewell by a representative of the Superintendent, United States Military Academy. Flight time: 55 minutes.

1450—Arrive Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland.

JACK RICE OF CANTON, OHIO

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Jack Rice of Canton, Ohio, is a businessman deeply concerned by the problems that face small business including inflation, the emphasis on consumer legislation, and the relationships between big and small business. Mr. Rice recently made the keynote address at the annual meeting of the National Appliance and Radio-TV Dealers Association of which he is the treasurer. His remarks afford insight into the attitudes and problems of American businessmen. I include the address as follows:

ADDRESS BY JACK RICE

In 1965 at the NARDA convention in Hollywood Beach, Florida probably the most exciting banquet speaker ever to address us held forth on the platform talking on the subject of the demise of the independent retailer. The speaker, Mr. E. B. Weiss, contended that we as independents were doomed because of the buying power, merchandising ability and in short just the financial resources of the big chains and mass merchandisers.

Now 1965 has come and gone, 1966, 1967, and 1968 have brought with it booming sales, primarily I feel as a result of inflation and a super psych'd up economy, not from actual economic strength. We have all witnessed staggering leaps in our gross sales because of the customers demand for color television which merely substitutes \$500-\$600 dollar units for what we used to sell for \$200-\$250 dollars.

But now we have entered the 70's, the government and the economists have decided to cool off the economy, our suppliers by and large have caught up with their plant expansions and now can ship more goods than our customers will eagerly buy. Our employees have demanded and received more than just compensation for their increased cost of living. Our landlords, utilities and anyone else who sells us anything that we use in our business are catching up by higher prices with their need for more money to pay their bills too. Our suppliers are drastically cutting costs wherever possible even at the expense of cheaper product, less protective shipping cartons, fewer and fewer services to help us sell the product and while those manufacturers that for years we have known and loved and trusted, still stand behind us and the products they sell us, they seem to be standing further and further behind us and it's getting so that anymore when you need them you can't see them because they're so far behind. Dealers large and small are left to fight their own battles with freight companies for example, who have found the cheapest way to handle freight damage is to pay as few claims as possible.

Certainly not least important is the fact that today to borrow money to run our business we must pay from 33%-45% more to the bank or finance company. In short, ladies and gentlemen, at the beginning of the 70's we face the upward pressure on the cost of

doing business and a strong downward pressure on our ability to increase the prices we charge. In short we face as never before the disappearance of a thing called gross margin which is just another way of saying what Mr. Weiss said, a disappearance of the independent retailer.

The appeal of a Jean Dixon or Edgar Casey is to be able to predict the future before anyone else can see it. I hesitate to give E. B. Weiss such clairvoyance but I'm afraid the above reasons are why his prediction has not come true sooner and that unless we remaining independent appliance dealers don't act dramatically and swiftly the early 1970's will mark the rapid decline of the independent appliance dealer.

Not to be a prophet of doom nor a purveyor of old cliches but at this point I must insert the old chestnut about the college professor who on the first day of class told each student to look at the man to his right and to his left because one of them would not be there by the time graduation rolled around. If we are to avert a further 1/3 to 1/2 decline in the number of independent appliance dealers we must begin now at this convention, today, to plan for the future so that we are not the one who disappears and does not graduate.

In any planning for the future, a prudent businessman must recognize there is no iron-clad foolproof method. It doesn't matter whether you use a computer, slide rule or just an "educated seat of pants" method, it all depends on those overworked ingredients, judgment and common sense. These cannot be intelligently exercised without the facts before you—past and present. There is an old Mennonite or Amish saying that "we grow too soon old and too late smart." We know the future is inevitable. It will be an outgrowth of the present, which in turn developed out of the past. So what is happening in the appliance business? Many aggressive hard-working dealers have flunked out. Many more are on the ragged edge. Many of the remaining successful dealers are waiting, hoping for some big chain to take them out of the rat race and buy them out.

In the meantime, the debate goes on between the professors and the politicians as to whether we're in a "downturn" or a "recession." Some people are even beginning to whisper depression. And while we're waiting to see if Mr. Nixon's battle with inflation will be any more successful than the historic noble experiment of prohibition 50 years ago, the retailer is sinking. What the retailer wants to know is not what we're in but how long it will last.

The retailer is caught between the rising cost of doing business and the drop in sales. He isn't going to get any help from Washington, the manufacturer, the Federal Reserve, or the Federal Trade Commission.

Washington will compromise almost every wage demand resulting in another round of increases all around. The manufacturer in turn will raise prices in an attempt to cover rising costs. The Federal Reserve will tiptoe thru the tulips with the interest rate making everyone think a big cut is coming, but actually it will be just enough for you not to give up hope. The Federal Trade Commission will look the other way while the same old abuses continue.

When things get tough, everybody wants to pass a law. Well, let's just take a look at what this Congress has done for us so far this session:

Two year extension of the office of economic opportunity. (Now that ought to give you a few big ticket sales.)

Voted 1.86 billion in foreign aid. (If you had a store in Japan you might get some help.)

Passed a relief and reform tax act. (Very little reform and absolutely no relief.)

Upped social security benefits 25%. (Just hang on a few more years and you'll be OK.)

Passed a 4.8 billion dollar extension of

major federal programs for public housing, urban renewal, etc.

A 610 Million Dollar appropriation for the food stamp program for fiscal 1970 was adopted.

Passed a bill limiting debt increase to 12 billion dollars.

There are many more good things congress is working on—and, oh yes, last but by no means least, congress doubled the President's salary, voted itself a 41% boost in salary with party leaders getting extra money hiked the pay of the Vice-President, House Speaker, Federal judges, cabinet members and others.

It is a little hard to see how inflation will be curbed with congress free-wheeling like it is. One thing it means higher taxes, which go right into everyone's cost of doing business.

Wages are going up industry by industry. This affects you not only in your own operation but hikes the cost of everything you buy.

Another matter of concern to every appliance dealer is the flood of imports. Should you fight them or join them? It's a cinch we can't ignore them. Some dealer in your town will handle them so your manufacturer has to put you in a competitive position.

Recently some radio reporters covering the Amalgamated Clothing Workers rally at Chicago to protest the flood of Japanese-made imports came up with red-faces. They were all using Sony tape recorders to report the event.

If I were to sum up our present situation, I would say:

Everything going up but profits. Profits are down.

Unemployment is going up.

Buying power is at a standstill.

Wages are going up.

Prices are going up.

Not a very bright picture for an appliance dealer to make a buck.

Competition and short profits will force you to cut costs—such as Labor, materials, advertising, you'll have to get value received for every cent you spend—you'll have to be selective about inventory—you've got to have something to sell—your manufacturer or distributor has got to come up with "deals."

Nader's Raiders and Mrs. Knauer are going to be much in the news fighting for the consumer. They may get the Federal Trade Commission off dead center, but don't wait for them.

We as individual independent appliance dealers, as the most powerful trade association in the United States and as just concerned citizens should turn the whole idea of consumer protection around. It is not a problem of consumer protection but a problem of consumer education. We are not telling the story often enough, loud enough or to the right people. For example do the retail sales people on your sales floor tell every customer how to use every product immediately after every sale. The most important benefit to any customer is ease of use and knowledge beforehand eliminates problems after the fact. The most expensive way to run a business is to be putting out fires all the time so the best way and maybe the only way to substantially cut the cost of doing business is to do these things better on the front end.

Don't be misled, consumerism is also the only important issue whether we condemn RCA for servicing non-RCA televisions. When RCA begins servicing non-RCA products in your market think twice before you condemn the whole thing as the end of the independent service department. If they can hire and train men, run trucks, inventory parts, keep records, et cetera, cheaper and more efficiently than we can, then we do not deserve to get the business. What are more likely the facts is they do all the things you and I do but charge more money for them. The threat to your or my service is the guy who doesn't know what his service is worth and there-

fore sells his soul for less than it is worth. RCA can actually provide an umbrella under which we can all get more for the service we know to be better, faster and more personalized than theirs.

What is important here is the interest of the customer and we must serve her needs the best way we know how but demand that we get paid every dime we are entitled to whether it is cash or warranty credit from the manufacturer.

In addition to consumer protection or consumer education if you will, there is also an up to now almost forgotten area of dealer protection and for that matter manufacturer protection. Here again it is more education rather than protection. I refer specifically to franchising or how shall a dealer or supplier be allowed to run his business and sell his products?

Consumerism and the franchise could be the two hottest corridor discussions of this convention. You know about them already and many of us have talked of little else since we arrived.

There are two extremely important comments I want to make about the franchise namely 1) what it is and 2) what it does or doesn't do. A franchise is only a plan, but a plan if it is used to its best potential is still quite something. A franchise is not a license to plot out an area of geography, sit down, and wait for the promised land. The coal miners and now the plumbers and electricians have used a form of labor franchise to so restrict the size of market and therefore drive up the cost of their services that today most coal is automated at the mine and we see modular construction and mobile home growing by leaps and bounds. You and I as intelligent independent appliance dealers should never be party to any franchise that does not realistically look at the market and set out clearly in writing what each party is to do and what standard of performance is expected from each and every party.

At this convention you have heard and will hear much discussion on the government attempt to change the way Magnavox does business. Now I fear that much more heat than light will be generated on this subject before an eventual compromise is worked out or before the federal chargers go galloping off to knock down some other straw windmill. Now I have never been a franchised Magnavox dealer and most likely never will be but I want to make this abundantly clear that if Magnavox loses this fight to sell their products in the planned orderly manner they choose every other manufacturer will also lose and every independent dealer will in the long run be the biggest loser of all because every brand name manufacturer follows at least some of the ideas and practices used by Magnavox.

There is nothing that has made me prouder of NARDA unless it be the strong stand taken against Sears than the very quick and very clear support your trade association made for one company against a great big government. Every independent appliance dealer is fortunate in having a strong trade association. The trade association is strong because it provides services to help its members succeed and survive.

But your NARDA membership is only as valuable as you make it. The cost of doing business survey, forms for which have just gone out to every member for 1969 is the only accurate composite guide or bench mark to judge the success or failure of our individual businesses. The more dealers who participate the more valuable the survey. NARDA is the only trade association that offers such a complete variety of computer programs covering all facets of our business. NARDA's activity in dealer education with the oldest most successful Institute of Management in Washington to the more numerous symposium programs offered in every part of the country to the enthusiastically received

School of Service Management which I hasten to point out at this moment has had two back to back years of door busting attendance with every dealer who attended paying every dime of his own way without a handout, dole, or scholarship from any manufacturer. I could not begin to list all the activities that your trade association does for you but I would sum up by saying that whatever you ask NARDA to do for you NARDA has the means, the man-power and the methods to help you do it.

While our industry has a lot of headaches now and in the balance of the 70's we will survive if we are alert and diligent, work hard, think smart and use those two things I spoke of earlier, judgment and common sense.

So . . . as an industry and a nation we have a lot of work to do in the next decade, a lot of energy to expend. No one can say exactly how we shall go about solving all the problems lying ahead, but it's a safe bet that we WILL. We've always turned our difficulties into opportunities and advantages.

You often hear people fret about the future. They have doubts that the country will survive, they think we're going soft, weak-kneed. We Americans often underestimate ourselves and our determination to take things that are wrong and put them right, no matter the cost. We are hypercritical. We gripe about each other, our system, our government, institutions we have built up. Yes, even about prosperity.

This isn't a weakness, it's a strength—this tendency we have to find faults in ourselves. It shows our aspirations . . . for perfection. By ticking off our faults, we draw attention to them and correct them.

Let's look at ourselves in perspective, tote up our strengths: Our wealth is the greatest in history, the envy of the world. We take it for granted. And individually, we try to increase it. Our productive capacity is enormous. It's based on ingenuity, the ability of free men to find better ways to produce and distribute. Our profit system is the incentive, the carrot, for improvement. Many scorn it, but soon discover that it works where other systems fail. We still have poverty, too much of it, but even our poorest are in better shape than the poor in most other nations of the world. And we're working at THIS . . . not out of shame but from a sense of fairness. Our people are compassionate, openhanded, willing to share . . . they beef about charities, but then they dig down and give generously.

Our school system, education, is worth special mention because it is perhaps our GREATEST asset, our best insurance for the future. Today nearly 60 million people are full-time students . . . about 30% of total population. Also over 40% of all college-age youngsters go on to college (20 years ago, one out of 14). This gives you the dimension of our educational set-up. The training of young minds makes education an ECONOMIC resource, ranking ahead of machines. That's a definite plus.

And add all the other assets. Your job, business. Your family. Your freedom to move about. Freedom to follow your interests anywhere. Freedom to speak your mind, vote, take a vacation, go to church, study. We have faults, too, plenty. You know them, everyone knows them. They are driven home to us every day, in the news and public discussions.

The tide of criticism by the young, the radicals, dissidents, as painful as it is will actually turn out to be a blessing in disguise. They are the first step toward finding new ways to solve the problems themselves. It's the mark of a free society, not shared by dictatorships, a sure sign that we don't consider the United States a finished society. Never will, in fact. And that's a good thing. It means we are willing to change, to grow, to work toward something better.

If you were there at that convention in 1965 you may remember that it was Mr. Weiss's contention that the independent would come back stronger than ever by banding together and even co-operating on such things as buying, advertising, and financial management. In short what he was saying 5 years ago was that in order to remain independent, every dealer in the room had to surrender some of his independence. I remember that convention in 1965 because I sat down the platform from Mr. Weiss. That was the first year I was elected to the board of NARDA. Since then I have been in contact with the best minds in our industry and because they have been willing to co-operate, share and especially surrender some of their knowledge and vast amounts of their time I have learned a little how to run a better business in Canton, Ohio.

You and I have the power to solve these problems, because the retailer controls the methods or manner of distribution of appliances, Televisions and Stereos.

Ladies and gentlemen you have the best minds in our industry together here in one room. If we use them we can solve our problems today and any and all of the even greater problems that will come tomorrow.

UNEASY PEACE UNDER PRINCE SIHANOUK HAS BEEN REPLACED BY WAR IN CAMBODIA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States and of our Government lack knowledge and understanding about Cambodia. This has been an important factor leading to President Nixon's decision to invade Cambodia.

The complex forces within Cambodia kept in balance by the enormous popularity of Prince Sihanouk before his overthrow are well described in an article in the Eastern Economic Review for April 9, 1970. It is written by T. D. Allman and is entitled "When Khmers Kill Khmers."

WHEN KHMERS KILL KHMERS

(By T. D. Allman)

PHNOM PENH.—The euphoria of political victory among Cambodia's new leaders and their followers has given way to a degree of soberness which may or may not conceal genuine apprehension at the crises—domestic and international—the government reaped for itself by suddenly deposing the man who created Cambodia's unique national life style. Certainly apprehension and even more melancholy emotions recently have overtaken many foreign observers here and some Cambodians as well.

"We probably shall look back on these days as the opening phases of the Cambodian civil war," one diplomat here said gloomily, as he reviewed the course of the demonstrations. He may not have been exaggerating. Although reports last week of Vietcong columns advancing on Phnom Penh were false, for the first time since independence in 1953, Cambodians were killing Cambodians, travel through the countryside was restricted and sometimes dangerous, and the Phnom Penh government's hold on the rural population was in doubt.

The average Cambodian wants most of all to live in peace, but already he is being urged to choose sides. On the government side are the army, most of the business class, the aristocracy, the intellectuals and government functionaries. Ranged against the new gov-

ernment are some 40,000 Vietnamese troops—who so far have taken only a small role in the anti-government movement—the tiny Khmer Rouge guerrilla movement, and most importantly, a sizable but unknown proportion of Cambodia's six million peasants who still see Sihanouk as a god-king and the nation's only leader.

There is much speculation here that the series of pro-Sihanouk demonstrations last week, mostly in provinces near the Vietnamese border, may have been organized by the Vietnamese communists. Government soldiers shot and killed between 80 and 100 Cambodians, none of them carrying firearms. Significantly, no Vietnamese was killed. And observers here say that the government would face opposition in the provinces even if the communists stayed aloof.

One Cambodian official conceded: "It is still not considered an unpatriotic thing to demonstrate on behalf of Sihanouk. The people in the villages do not understand the mistakes he made. They are still blinded by him and susceptible to pleas to cause trouble."

The most serious threat yet to the new government's authority came last week in the province of Kampong Cham, a rubber-rich area northeast of Phnom Penh with a large indigenous Vietnamese population.

In three days of demonstrations, which finally ended in what amounted to a government massacre of perhaps 50 people, Cambodians for the first time turned on the new government and its officials. The trouble began on March 25 and 26 when Cambodians poured into the provincial capital—a French colonial style river town—carrying pro-Sihanouk banners and shouting anti-government slogans. Provincial authorities asked the army for 24 hours to put down the demonstrations peacefully.

Although authorities arrested hundreds, all except the small number of Vietnamese among them were released after a few hours detention and a strong lecture on the virtues of the new regime. The soft measures were designed to convert the demonstrators, and it was perhaps an indication of the new government's naivete that they failed.

On the night of March 26, more than a score of vehicles, mostly buses and lorries began moving on Phnom Penh by two different routes, carrying several thousand demonstrators bearing Sihanouk photographs and singing patriotic songs. They reached the two bridges leading over the Tonle Sap and Tonle Bassac into Phnom Penh before dawn, and camped for the night.

The next morning the new regime's hopes of peacefully consolidating its hold on the country turned to blood. Although many of the demonstrators dispersed peacefully, Cambodian soldiers opened fire at both bridges when some of the demonstrators tried to cross into the capital. The government later claimed only two were killed, but responsible estimates run as high as 20.

The worst violence occurred later the same day back in Kampong Cham where thousands of enraged Cambodians sacked the provincial headquarters and burned down the court house. A magistrate and two members of the national assembly were killed. By the time the army had restored order that evening, at least 30 Cambodians had been fatally wounded, with some estimates of the dead running much higher. There were also disturbances reported on the road between Phnom Penh and Kampong Cham, and French plantation managers began evacuating their families by air to Phnom Penh.

The next day the disturbances continued in the province of Takeo, south of Phnom Penh, where thousands of peasants lined the roads, waving knives and machetes and stopping traffic. At least a dozen were killed by army gunfire in Takeo during the next 48 hours, and the full toll may never be known because many seriously wounded villagers

were taken back to their homes, where they may have died. Sporadic demonstrations were also reported in the area around Kampong Speu, on the road to Sihanoukville.

In official accounts of the incidents, the government claimed that most demonstrators dispersed peacefully, and accused the Vietcong of inciting the people to violence. Most observers here agree communist agents, mostly Vietnamese working in rubber plantations near Kampong Cham, helped to organize the move on the capital. Communist agents reportedly played radio speeches of Prince Sihanouk on tape recorders urging the people to rise up against the government. The government claimed that the communists killed several lorry drivers when they refused to hand over their vehicles. Most of the demonstrators, by the time they reached Phnom Penh, seemed thoroughly confused. Some claimed that they had come to rescue Prince Sihanouk and Queen Kossamak, whom they had been told were being held captive in the Royal Palace. Others believed that Prince Sihanouk was waiting for them at Camchar Mon, his official residence, to give them guns to defend the country. A government report claimed that 85% of the demonstrators had been forced to come to Phnom Penh against their will, that 15% had been coming here on normal business and that only 5% were determined to cause trouble.

Observers here are less certain that the Vietnamese were involved in the demonstrations at Takeo. "The question of communist instigation," one diplomat said, "is basically irrelevant. You can assume that the Vietcong will do what they can to harass a hostile government. The point is that before they never had much opportunity to cause trouble because the country was united around Sihanouk. Now there are divisions to exploit."

If the degree of bloodshed was an indication of how deep the divisions here now run, then the country is indeed in for bad times. "The people hate the Vietnamese, but they love Prince Sihanouk," said another diplomat. "Now the government is calling Sihanouk a traitor, and Sihanouk himself is threatening to regain power with the help of the Vietnamese. There must be total disorientation in the villages. For decades, they were secure. Now they don't know which end is up."

While the government had its hands full putting down the pro-Sihanouk demonstrations, Vietnamese communist troops also put increasing military pressure on government troops near the border. According to government reports, they also infiltrated into positions that would permit them to cut several main road and river links between Phnom Penh and Sihanoukville and the Vietnamese frontier.

Communist troop movements and attacks do not yet constitute open war but observers, although they think the government has exaggerated the menace, find the increased communist attacks nearly as ominous as the demonstrations. The threat, they say, lies not so much in the possibility of direct communist attacks against Phnom Penh and the other main towns but in the fact that the entire military accommodation with the communists, which for years left Cambodia in peace, may be breaking down.

"If you had a map of Cambodia with red pins in it representing communist troops and their positions, nothing much would have changed since Sihanouk was ousted," said one military source. "Those troops have always been there. It is the attitude that has changed. Before, the Cambodians and the Vietnamese coexisted. When there was fighting it was usually because the Cambodians decided to make a show of force. The communists had orders to lie low. Now it is the communists who are making the show of force, and, of course, they are much stronger."

No one here is willing to say that after the

demonstrations and the Vietnamese military attacks all hope is gone for negotiations between the new government and the Vietnamese. But most observers here say that with the North Vietnamese and the South Vietnam Provisional Revolutionary government embassies closed, the government trying to cut the rice trade with South Vietnam, and Sihanouk inciting the people to violence over Radio Peking, the accommodation Sihanouk and the communists worked out has been disrupted, probably irrevocably.

"I don't think we will see any big battles right now," said one longtime French resident of Phnom Penh. "But we will see fighting along the borders, we will see more demonstrations, we will have at the beginning a smallscale guerrilla war, and some of the major roads will be cut."

"In short," added another Western observer, "the truce has ended. We have gone from uneasy peace to partial war. This creates a great strain on the government, and on the people. The communists probably hope that this tension will permit Sihanouk to return to power. If he does not come back, they will be in the position of either negotiating or fighting—as they wish—with a weak government discredited by popular demonstration and unable to hold its own on the battlefield."

But if the new regime is aware of the implications of the mounting military and political problems it faces, it has not so far shown in the public composure of its chief officials. In public appearances and press interviews, Prime Minister Lon Nol and Deputy Prime Minister Prince Sisowath Sirik Matak have appeared calm, confident and unemotional.

Although invective against Prince Sihanouk has grown more strident, and appeals for the support of the people more frequent and flowery, most people here, including government officials, seem convinced things are going as well as can be expected.

Riding a wave of anti-Vietnamese nationalism, the government has passed a Riel 9,800 million budget, which includes increases for military expenditures. The government has continued its programme of economic liberalization by increasing bank interest rates and ending government monopolies in most manufacturing enterprises. Following a call for reservists and veterans to rejoin the army, small groups of young and middle-aged men have appeared for voluntary induction into the army. Although government buildings have been sandbagged, road blocks set up on the major highways, and more and more soldiers are seen in the streets, Phnom Penh and most of countryside remain calm. There have been no increases in prices, no hoarding, and the government claims, no flight of capital from the country.

Can the government hang on? Most observers here think so, though some of them fear at the price of a continually deteriorating situation.

"Every day that Sihanouk does not return," one Cambodian official argued, "he becomes more discredited. He has hurt himself by staying so long in Peking, and by throwing his lot in with the communists. We are going to have trouble now. But it is better to deal with these problems now than to have left things the way they were."

To have left things the way they were would have meant, in essence, to leave Prince Sihanouk in control. "This government has made a lot of mistakes," concluded another observer. "But it has made only one fundamental error—throwing out Sihanouk. The Cambodian people, politically, are among the least demonstrative in Asia, so despite the demonstrations, the killings and the bad military situation, everything seems more the same than changed. But this is not right. Cambodia in recent days has changed more than during the previous 10 years. And the change has not been for the better."

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION
ACT

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have just handed to the clerk a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H.R. 11475, a bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which was referred to that committee on May 20, 1969.

I take this action in the face of reports that the Rules Committee has announced that it will schedule for action by the House its own version of the Legislative Reorganization Act of the 1960's. Indeed, I take my action because of the rumored imminence of the scheduling of a bill that in my view may be unacceptable, particularly at the present time when young people all across this troubled land are seriously questioning whether our democratic system can really be made to work. If the contents of the bill to be reported by the committee are similar to those of the print published by the committee last fall, I want to put myself on record as opposing that kind of so-called reform legislation as worse than no bill at all for raising false expectations that meaningful reform had occurred.

I am informed that a copy of the committee's version of the bill will be available next week. While this puts me in the position of attempting to criticize a piece of legislation I have not seen, it also puts me in the position of serving notice on the committee that any bill weaker than H.R. 11475 is unacceptable to this Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that the action I take today is individually motivated. Each Member of the House will have to consult his own conscience on the question of discharging the Committee on Rules from further consideration of this bill. I would like to underscore my own preference for regular order and normal procedure in ordinary times. My action stems from a recognition that these are not ordinary times. We certainly are not witnessing regular order on most college campuses, and it seems to me that normal procedure in the House of Representatives has brought very little fruition on the subject of congressional reform.

I direct the attention of my colleagues to the brief history of H.R. 11475. This bill is the result of a compromise between the bill introduced on February 5, 1969, by our former colleague Donald Rumsfeld, H.R. 6278, and cosponsored by 122 Republican members, and H.R. 10426, introduced by the Honorable THOMAS REES and cosponsored by more than threescore members of his party. All three of these bills are derived from the bill passed by the Senate carrying out recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress in its final report dated July 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I am just fed up with procrastination on the question of taking some positive steps toward modernizing the legislative branch of the Federal

Government. H.R. 11475 is not the ideal answer to our problems. I consider it the minimal reform package we can enact and say with a straight face that we have really done something constructive about congressional reform. But H.R. 11475 is a step forward, at least, and I am not sure that the package rumored to be forthcoming from the Rules Committee is genuine progress. Unless the bill reported by the Rules Committee is roughly equivalent in strength to the recommendations made by the joint committee 4 years ago and passed by the Senate on March 7, 1967, I think there is a real danger in adding to the present and growing discontent in America. I do not believe we can sell people on the idea that we have changed very much by enacting a few minor reforms.

Mr. Speaker, I know the young people of this country understand the necessity for congressional reform. It would be the cruelest hoax, at a critical moment in the Nation's history when its young citizens are trying so hard to believe in the viability of the democratic process, to pass a watered-down reorganization package. I understand that one committee version even fails to provide for a permanent Joint Committee on Congressional Operations which would have continuing responsibility for upgrading procedures for handling the Nation's business. It would be indefensible, it seems to me, to go to the public in a congressional election year claiming that we had really made a difference in the way Congress operates by enacting changes in procedure that are reform in rhetoric only. And it seems to me a dereliction of responsibility on our part as Members of Congress to continue to fail to act because we say that congressional reform has no constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to affix their signatures to my petition, but if no name appears on this motion but my own I will still feel that I have taken a forthright stand and presented tangible evidence of my own concern that we put before the House a really meaningful congressional reform bill.

I include the full text of H.R. 11475:
H.R. 11475

A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act, divided into titles, parts, and sections according to the following table of contents, may be cited as the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE I—THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM

Sec. 101. Rulemaking power of Senate and House.

PART 1—PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO BOTH HOUSES

Sec. 102. Committee procedure.
Sec. 103. Committee hearing procedure.
Sec. 104. Committee powers.
Sec. 105. Legislative review by standing committees.

Sec. 106. Conference reports.

TITLE II—FISCAL CONTROLS

Sec. 201. Rulemaking power of Senate and House.

PART 1—BUDGETARY AND FISCAL INFORMATION AND DATA

Sec. 202. Data processing system.

Sec. 203. Standard classifications.
Sec. 204. Availability of data.
Sec. 205. Cost effectiveness studies.
Sec. 206. Current budget information.
Sec. 207. Powers and duties of Comptroller General.
Sec. 208. Construction.
Sec. 209. Definition.

PART 2—THE BUDGET

Sec. 221. Supplemental budget information.

PART 3—THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

Sec. 231. Committee hearings.
Sec. 232. Budget review.
Sec. 233. Committee action.
Sec. 234. Passage of bills.
Sec. 235. Rollover vote required on measures changing compensation of Members of Congress.

PART 4—UTILIZATION OF REPORTS OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Sec. 241. Assistance to committees.
Sec. 242. Reports to committees.
Sec. 243. Agency reports.

PART 5—LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

Sec. 251. Cost estimates.
Sec. 252. Appropriations on annual basis.
Sec. 253. Committee jurisdiction.

TITLE III—SOURCES OF INFORMATION

PART 1—STAFFS OF SENATE AND HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEES

Sec. 301. Committee staffing and related provisions.

PART 2—LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH SERVICE

Sec. 321. Improvement of legislative research facilities of Congress.
Sec. 322. Joint Committee on the Library.
Sec. 323. Repeal of obsolete law relating to the abolished Office of Coordinator of Information.

PART 3—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS PROVIDING INFORMATION FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sec. 331. Rulemaking power of House of Representatives.
Sec. 332. Changes in existing law to be shown in introduced House bills and joint resolutions; digests of introduced House bills and joint resolutions; availability of amendments of twenty-five or more words.
Sec. 333. Quarterly reports of salaries paid from clerk hire allowances of Members.
Sec. 334. Periodic preparation by House Parliamentarian of simplified versions of House precedents.

TITLE IV—CONGRESS AS AN INSTITUTION

PART 1—JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

Sec. 401. Establishment of Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.
Sec. 402. Duties of Joint Committee.
Sec. 403. Powers of Joint Committee.
Sec. 404. Staff of Joint Committee.
Sec. 405. Records of Joint Committee.
Sec. 406. Transfer of functions.
Sec. 407. Office of Placement and Office Management.
Sec. 408. Expenses.

PART 2—AUTHORITY OF OFFICERS OF THE CONGRESS

Sec. 421. Authority.
Sec. 422. Capitol police.
Sec. 423. Senate and House pages.
Sec. 424. Capitol Guide Service.

PART 3—CONGRESSIONAL ADJOURNMENT

Sec. 433. Congressional adjournment.

PART 4—APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS

Sec. 441. Appointment of postmasters by Postmaster General.
Sec. 442. Vacancies in positions of postmaster.
Sec. 443. Vacancies on rural routes.
Sec. 444. Saving provision.

PART 5—PAYROLL ADMINISTRATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sec. 471. Conversion of pay to aggregate rate basis in House of Representatives.

PART 6—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 481. Use of House contingent fund to pay salaries of employees paid from clerk hire allowances of Members and absent from duty because of illness, injury, or disability.

Sec. 482. Stationery allowances of Representatives.

TITLE V—REGULATION OF LOBBYING

Sec. 501. Definition of Comptroller General.

Sec. 502. Multipurpose contributions and expenditures.

Sec. 503. Five-year preservation of records.

Sec. 504. Substantial purpose controlling.

Sec. 505. Contingent fees; broadcasting.

Sec. 506. Administration by Comptroller General.

Sec. 507. Violation of regulations.

TITLE VI—EFFECTIVE DATES

Sec. 601. Effective dates.

TITLE I—THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM

RULEMAKING POWER OF SENATE AND HOUSE

Sec. 101. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply; and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

PART 1—PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO BOTH HOUSES

COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

Sec. 102. (a) Section 133(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190a) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "If the chairman of any such committee, after the expiration of three days following his receipt of a written request of at least three members of the committee, refuses or fails to call a special meeting of the committee within seven calendar days from the date of said request, then upon the filing with the clerk of the committee of the written and signed request of a majority of the committee for a called special meeting of the committee, the committee shall meet on the day and hour specified in said written request. It shall be the duty of the clerk of the committee to notify all members of the committee in the usual way of such called special meeting. If the chairman of the committee is not present at any committee meeting, the senior member of the majority party who is present shall preside at that meeting."

If the chairman of the committee is not present at any committee meeting, the senior member of the majority party who is present shall preside at that meeting."

(b) Section 133(b) of that Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Meetings for the transaction of business of each such committee, other than the conduct of hearings, shall be open to the public except when the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session. Each such committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action. Such record shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. The results of rollcall votes taken in any meeting of any such committee upon any

measure, or any amendment thereto, shall be announced publicly at the conclusion of that meeting, and such announcement shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to each such measure and amendment by each member of the committee who was present at that meeting or who voted by proxy."

(c) Section 133(c) of that Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "In any event, the report of any such committee upon a measure or matter which has been approved by the committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written and signed request of a majority of the committee for the reporting of that measure or matter. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit immediately to the chairman of the committee notice of the filing thereof."

(d) Section 133(d) of that Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "No vote shall be taken with respect to any measure, or any amendment thereto, by any such committee unless a majority of the members thereof are actually present. No vote of any member of any such committee with respect to any measure, or any amendment thereto, may be cast by proxy, unless such committee adopts a rule or rules permitting the casting of votes by proxy and unless such rule or rules require that proxies shall be in writing and be given only for a specified measure or measures, including any amendment or amendments thereto."

(e) Section 133 of that Act is amended by striking out subsections (e) and (f), and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) If, at the time of approval of a measure or matter by any such committee, any member of the committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental or minority views—

"(1) upon completion of the preparation of a proposed report of such committee upon such measure or matter, a copy of such proposed report shall be transmitted promptly by the clerk of the committee to each member of the committee;

"(2) within two calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after receipt of such proposed report, each such member shall be entitled to file with the clerk of the committee in writing the supplemental or minority views of that member with respect to that measure or matter;

"(3) all such views so filed by one or more members of the committee shall be included within and shall be a part of the report filed by the committee with respect to that measure or matter; and

"(4) the report of such committee upon such measure shall be printed in a single volume which shall include all supplemental or minority views which have been submitted at the time of the filing of the committee report, and shall bear upon its cover a recital that supplemental or minority views are included as a part of the report.

Nothing contained in this subsection shall preclude—

"(A) the immediate filing and printing of a committee report unless a timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental or minority views has been made as provided by this subsection; or

"(B) the filing by any standing committee of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by such committee upon such measure or matter.

"(f) No measure or matter shall be considered in either House of the Congress un-

less a committee report thereon has been available to the Members of that House for at least three calendar days (exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) prior to the consideration of such measure or matter in that House. If there have been hearings held on any such measure or matter so reported in either House, the committee reporting such measure or matter shall make every reasonable effort to have such hearings printed and available for distribution to Members of that House prior to consideration of the measure or matter in that House. This subsection shall not apply to—

"(1) any measure for the declaration of war, or the declaration of a national emergency, by the Congress,

"(2) any executive decision, determination, or action which would become, or continue to be, effective unless disapproved by one or both Houses of Congress, and

"(3) any privileged report as described in clause 22 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives in the Ninety-first Congress.

"(g) Each such committee which, in any year beginning on or after January 1, 1970, requires authorization for the expenditure of funds in excess of the amount specified by section 134(a) of this Act shall offer one annual authorization resolution to procure such authorization. Each such annual authorization resolution shall include a specification of the amount of all such funds sought by such committee for expenditure by all subcommittees thereof during that year and the amount so sought for each such subcommittee. In order to make public full and complete information regarding the total annual authorized expenditures of committees, the report accompanying the annual authorization resolution shall include—

"(1) a specification of the amount or amounts of expenditures which the committee is authorized annually to make under permanent law other than the annual authorization resolution,

"(2) a statement disclosing the total of the annual amount or amounts so authorized under permanent law, and

"(3) the total amount of proposed expenditures for which authorization is sought under the provisions of the annual authorization resolution.

The annual authorization resolution of any such committee of either House of the Congress for each year beginning on or after January 1, 1970, shall be offered not later than February 15 of that year, except that, whenever the designation of members of standing committees of that House occurs during the first session of any Congress at a date later than February 15, such resolution may be offered by any standing committee of that House at any time within thirty days after the date on which a majority of the members of such committee have been designated during that session. After the date on which an annual authorization resolution has been offered by any such committee in any year, or the last date on which such committee pursuant to the preceding sentence may offer such a resolution, whichever date occurs earlier, such committee in any year may procure authorization for the expenditure of funds in excess of the amount specified by section 134(a) of this Act only by offering a supplemental authorization resolution. Each such supplemental authorization resolution shall specify with particularity the purpose for which such authorization is sought, and shall contain an explicit statement of the reason why authorization for the expenditures described therein could not have been sought at the time of, or within the period provided for, the submission by such committee of an annual authorization resolution for that year. The minority shall receive fair consideration in the appointment of staff personnel pursuant

to any such annual or supplemental resolution.

"(h) Each such committee shall cause to be printed annually the rules then in effect which govern the proceedings of that committee. Such rules shall be so printed by each such committee in each year not later than the last day on which such committee pursuant to subsection (g) may offer its annual authorization resolution for that year. When so printed, a copy of such rules shall be transmitted promptly to each member of the committee by the clerk of the committee, and such rules shall be available for public inspection in the office of the clerk. The proceedings of each subcommittee of any such committee shall be conducted in conformity with the rules governing proceedings of the full committee.

"(i) The foregoing provisions of this section do not apply to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives."

COMMITTEE HEARING PROCEDURE

SEC. 103. (a) Part 3 of title I of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by inserting therein, immediately after section 133 thereof, the following new section:

"COMMITTEE HEARING PROCEDURE

"SEC. 133A. (a) Each standing, select, or special committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and each subcommittee thereof, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the committee or subcommittee upon any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee or subcommittee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date.

"(b) Each hearing conducted by each such committee or subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee determines that the testimony to be taken at that hearing may relate to a matter of national security, may tend to reflect adversely on the character or reputation of the witness or any individual, or may divulge matters deemed confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulation. Whenever any such hearing is open to the public, the committee or subcommittee may permit, as a public service and solely under such rules as the full committee may adopt, the broadcasting, telecasting, and photographing by still and motion pictures of that hearing, or the recording and filming of that hearing for later broadcasting or telecasting, except that—

"(1) no witness may be required, against his will, to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting or telecasting of that hearing is being conducted or while a recording or filming of that hearing is being made for later broadcasting or telecasting; and

"(2) no on-the-spot broadcasting or telecasting of that hearing may be conducted under commercial sponsorship, but this prohibition shall not be construed to prevent the broadcasting or telecasting of that hearing as a part of regularly scheduled news broadcasts or telecasts under commercial sponsorship.

"(c) Each such committee or subcommittee shall require, insofar as practicable, all witnesses appearing before it to file in advance written statements of their proposed testimony and to limit their oral presentations to brief summaries of their argument.

"(d) Whenever any hearing is conducted by any such committee or subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority of the committee shall be entitled, upon request by a majority of the minority members to the chairman before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that

measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

"(e) The foregoing provisions of this section do not apply to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, of the House of Representatives."

(b) Title I of the table of contents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 813) is amended by inserting—
"Sec. 133A. Committee hearing procedure."
immediately below—
"Sec. 133. Committee procedure."

COMMITTEE POWERS

SEC. 104. Section 134(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190b(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Except as hereinafter provided, no standing committee of the Senate or the House shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate or the House, as the case may be, is in session. The prohibition contained in the preceding sentence shall not apply to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or to the following committees of the House of Representatives: the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Government Operations, and the Committee on Rules. Any other standing committee of the Senate may sit for any purpose while the Senate is in session if consent therefor has been obtained from the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate. Any other standing committee of the House of Representatives may conduct a hearing while the House is in general debate if consent therefor has been obtained from the Speaker and the minority leader of the House, but the authority contained in this sentence does not permit the conduct of any hearing by any such other standing committee during any period in which a measure is being read for amendment under the five-minute rule. In the event of the absence of any such officer or leader, the consent of such officer or leader may be given by a Member of that House of which such officer or leader is a Member designated by him for that purpose. Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, any standing committee of the Senate may sit without special leave for any purpose as authorized by paragraph 5 of article XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate."

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW BY STANDING COMMITTEES

SEC. 105. (a) Section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190d) is amended to read as follows:

"LEGISLATIVE REVIEW BY STANDING COMMITTEES

"SEC. 136. (a) In order to assist the Congress in—

"(1) its analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of the application, operation, administration, and execution of the laws enacted by the Congress, and

"(2) its formulation, consideration, and enactment of such modifications or changes in such laws, and of such additional legislation, as it deems necessary or appropriate,

each standing committee of the Senate and House of Representatives shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, operation, administration, and execution of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee.

"(b) Each standing committee of the Senate and House of Representatives shall—

"(1) conduct the reviews and studies required generally by subsection (a) of this section;

"(2) analyze, appraise, and evaluate reports and other data of the Comptroller General of the United States, and of any other officer or agency of the Government, which are pertinent to reviews, studies, programs, projects, and other matters within the pur-

view of this section and may request the Comptroller General to investigate any report on any matter relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds under such laws;

"(3) kept currently informed with respect to the regulations, procedures, practices, and policies of the Government pertaining to the application, operation, administration, and execution of the laws, and parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the committee.

"(4) conduct such activities as are necessary and appropriate to carry out the general review and study policies of the committee under this section, including reviews of programs of grants-in-aid referred to in section 252(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969; and

"(5) obtain current information regarding—

"(A) the progress, status, and results of reviews, studies, programs, and projects conducted under this section,

"(B) the regulations, procedures, practices, and policies of the Government referred to in subparagraph (3) of this subsection, and

"(C) all other matters within the purview of this subsection.

"(c) Each standing committee of the Senate and House of Representatives is entitled to employ a Review Specialist as a member of the professional staff of such committee in addition to the number of members of such professional staff to which such committee otherwise is entitled. Such Review Specialist shall be selected and appointed by the chairman of such committee, with the prior approval of the ranking minority member, on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the position. Such Review Specialist shall, under the joint direction and supervision of the chairman and the ranking minority member, assist the committee in the performance of its review functions under this section.

"(d) Each standing committee of the Senate and House of Representatives shall submit, not later than March 31 of each year beginning on or after January 1, 1970, to the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, a report on its activities under this section during the immediately preceding calendar year. Such report shall include—

"(1) an analysis of the reviews, studies, programs, and projects of the committee under this section;

"(2) an appraisal and evaluation of the application, operation, administration, and execution of the laws, and parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the committee; and

"(3) such other matters within the purview of this section as may be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.

Each such committee shall omit in such report all matters which, in the opinion of the committee, should not be made public in the interest of the national security.

"(e) Within ten days after the submission of all such reports to the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, the President of the Senate, with respect to the reports submitted to the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, with respect to the reports submitted to the House, shall transmit such reports to—

"(1) the President, with respect to matters concerning the executive branch;

"(2) the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, with respect to matters concerning the judicial branch;

"(3) the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, with respect to matters concerning the municipal government of the District of Columbia; and

"(4) the heads of other appropriate agen-

cies, corporations, and instrumentalities of the Government.

"(f) As used in this section, the term 'Government' includes the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

"(g) The foregoing provisions of this section do not apply to the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, of the House of Representatives."

(b) Title I of the table of contents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 813) is amended by striking out—

"Sec. 136. Legislative oversight by standing committees."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"Sec. 136. Legislative review by standing committees."

CONFERENCE REPORTS

SEC. 106. (a) The section caption of section 135 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190c) is amended to read as follows:

"CONFERENCE REPORTS"

(b) Section 135 of that Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) Each report of a committee of conference shall be printed as a report of each House of the Congress. As printed in each House, each such report shall be accompanied by an explanatory statement prepared jointly by the conferees on the part of both Houses. Each such statement shall be sufficiently detailed and explicit to inform both Houses as to the effect which amendments or propositions contained in such report will have upon the measure to which it relates. If any conferee on the part of either House desires to submit to the House of which he is a Member an additional individual explanatory statement with respect to any such report to that House, such individual statement may be filed as an appendix to and may be printed together with, the explanatory statement of the committee of conference contained in the conference report to that House of which such conferee is a member, if such individual statement is available at the time of the filing of the report of the committee of conference to that House.

"(d) If time for debate in the consideration of any report of a committee of conference upon the floor of either House of Congress is limited, the time allotted for debate thereon in that House shall be equally divided between the political party having the greatest number of members, and the political party having the second greatest number of members, of the House."

(c) The item relating to section 135 contained in the table of contents of that Act is amended to read:

TITLE II—FISCAL CONTROLS

RULEMAKING POWER OF SENATE AND HOUSE

SEC. 201. Part 3 and part 5 of this title are enacted by the Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply; and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

PART 1—BUDGETING AND FISCAL INFORMATION AND DATA

DATA PROCESSING SYSTEM

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in cooperation with the Comptroller General of the United States, shall develop, establish, and maintain, insofar as practicable, for use by all Federal agencies, a standardized information and data processing system for budgetary and fiscal data.

STANDARD CLASSIFICATIONS

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in cooperation with the Comptroller General, shall develop, establish, and maintain standard classifications of programs, activities, receipts, and expenditures of Federal agencies in order—

(1) to meet the needs of the various branches of the Government; and

(2) to facilitate the development, establishment, and maintenance of the data processing system under section 202 through the utilization of modern automatic data processing techniques.

The initial classifications under this subsection shall be established on or before December 31, 1971.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall submit a report to the Senate and the House of Representatives on or before September 1 of each year, commencing with 1970, with respect to the performance during the preceding fiscal year of the functions and duties imposed on them by section 202 and subsection (a) of this section. The reports made under this subsection in 1970 and 1971 shall set forth the progress achieved in the development of classifications under subsection (a) of this section, and the reports made in years thereafter shall include information with respect to changes in, and additions to, classifications previously established. Each such report shall include such comments of the Comptroller General as he deems necessary or advisable.

AVAILABILITY OF DATA

SEC. 204. The Comptroller General shall provide information to the Congress, as provided in this section, on the location and nature of data available in the various Federal agencies with respect to programs, activities, receipts, and expenditures of such agencies. Upon request of any Member of the House or Senate, of any committee of either House, or of any joint committee of the two Houses, the Comptroller General shall—

(1) furnish to such Member, committee, or joint committee information as to the location and nature of such data, and

(2) to the extent feasible, prepare for such Member, committee, or joint committee summary tables of such data.

COST EFFECTIVENESS STUDIES

SEC. 205. The Comptroller General shall have available in the General Accounting Office employees who are expert in analyzing and conducting cost effectiveness studies of Government programs. Upon request of any committee of either House or of any joint committee of the two Houses, the Comptroller General shall assign, on a temporary basis, employees of the General Accounting Office to assist such committee or joint committee, or the staff of such committee or joint committee—

(1) in analyzing cost effectiveness studies furnished by any Federal agency to such committee or joint committee, or

(2) in conducting cost effectiveness studies of programs under the jurisdiction of such committee or joint committee.

CURRENT BUDGET INFORMATION

SEC. 206. (a) After the submission of the budget for any fiscal year by the Presi-

dent, the Comptroller General shall collect information and data available in the various Federal agencies with respect to changes in the figures shown in such budget as submitted, including changes caused by—

(1) new or supplemental requests for appropriations;

(2) the enactment of appropriation Acts, or the action of either the House or Senate on appropriation bills, or of the Committee on Appropriations, of the House or Senate on appropriation bills or requests for appropriations;

(3) increases or decreases in expenditures of prior appropriations;

(4) increases or decreases in revenue receipts or estimated revenue receipts; and

(5) increases or decreases in expenditures or estimated expenditures by reason of the enactment of laws (other than appropriation Acts).

(b) The Comptroller General shall, from time to time, furnish a report showing revised budget information and totals to reflect the information and data collected by him under subsection (a) to each Member of the House and Senate, each committee of the House and Senate, and each joint committee of the two Houses. All such reports shall identify, to the extent necessary, the sources of the information and data reflected in the revised budget information and totals.

(c) Upon request of any Member of the House or Senate, any committee of either House, or any joint committee of the two Houses, the Comptroller General shall, to the extent feasible, prepare and furnish to such Member, committee, or joint committee tabulations of such budget information and data as collected pursuant to this section.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

SEC. 207. (a) The Comptroller General shall establish within the General Accounting Office such office or division, or such offices or divisions, as he deems necessary to carry out the functions and duties imposed on him by the provisions of this part.

(b) The Comptroller General is authorized to obtain the services of individual experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not in excess of \$200 per diem. Not more than fifteen such experts and consultants may be so employed at any one time and no expert or consultant may be so employed for more than one hundred and twenty days during any calendar year.

(c) The Comptroller General shall include in his annual report to the Congress information with respect to the performance of the functions and duties imposed on him by the provisions of this part.

CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 208. Nothing contained in this part shall be construed as impairing any authority or responsibility of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General of the United States under the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, and the Budget and Accounting Procedure Act of 1950, as amended, or any other Acts.

DEFINITION

SEC. 209. As used in this title, the term "Federal agency" means any department, agency, wholly owned Government corporation, establishment, or instrumentality of the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia.

PART 2—THE BUDGET

SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET INFORMATION

SEC. 221. (a) Section 201(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended (31 U.S.C. 11), is amended by adding a new subparagraph as follows:

"(12) as to each proposal for new legislation in the budget involving creation or ex-

pansion of any function, activity, or authority, and to be in addition to those functions, activities, and authorities then existing, a tabulation showing the amount proposed in the Budget for appropriation and for expenditure for the ensuing fiscal year and the estimated appropriation required on account of such proposal in each of the following four fiscal years during which such proposal is to be in effect."

(b) Section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 11) is amended by striking out subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Not later than June 1 of each year, beginning with 1970, the President shall transmit to the Congress a supplemental summary of the Budget transmitted in January of such year for the ensuing fiscal year with his recommendations. Such supplemental summary shall reflect all changes relating to that fiscal year which have occurred since the transmittal of the Budget, including changes caused by—

"(1) revisions in estimates of expenditures and receipts,

"(2) estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations which were not included in the Budget as transmitted,

"(3) appropriations enacted after transmittal of the Budget, and

"(4) the enactment of laws (other than appropriation Acts) after the transmittal of the Budget.

Such supplemental summary also shall contain current information with respect to items covered by paragraph (8) and clauses (2) and (3) of paragraph (9) of section 201 (a) of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921.

"(c) On or before June 1 of each year, the President shall transmit to the Congress, in such form and detail as he may determine—

"(1) summaries of estimated expenditures, for the four fiscal years following the ensuing fiscal year for which the Budget was transmitted in January of such year, which will be required under continuing programs which have a legal commitment for future years or are considered mandatory under existing law, and

"(2) summaries of estimated expenditures in fiscal years following such ensuing fiscal year of balances carried over from such ensuing fiscal year.

"(d) The Budget shall include information showing the gross amount of expenditures and estimated expenditures of all programs of the Government."

(b) Subsections (c) and (d) of section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (as amended by subsection (a)) shall apply only with respect to the Budget transmitted to the Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for succeeding fiscal years.

PART 3—THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS COMMITTEE HEARINGS

SEC. 231. (a) Each hearing conducted by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate, or any subcommittee of those committees, shall be open to the public except when the committee determines that the testimony to be taken at that hearing may relate to a matter of national security, may tend to reflect adversely on the character or reputation of the witness or any other individual, or may divulge matters deemed confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulation. Whenever any such hearing is open to the public, the committee or subcommittee may permit, as a public service and solely under such rules as the full committee may adopt, the broadcasting, telecasting, and photographing by still and motion pictures of that hearing, or the recording and filming of that hearing for later broadcasting or telecasting, except that—

"(1) no witness may be required, against his will, to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting or telecasting of that hearing is being conducted or while a recording or filming of that hearing is being made for later broadcasting or telecasting; and

"(2) no on-the-spot broadcasting or telecasting of that hearing may be conducted under commercial sponsorship, but this prohibition shall not be construed to prevent the broadcasting or telecasting of that hearing as a part of regularly scheduled news broadcasts or telecasts under commercial sponsorship.

(b) The Committee on Appropriations of the House and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall, within thirty days after the transmittal of the Budget to the Congress each year, hold hearings on the Budget as a whole with particular reference to—

(1) the basic recommendations and budgetary policies of the President in the presentation of the Budget, and

(2) the fiscal, financial, and economic assumptions used as bases in arriving at total estimated expenditures and receipts.

(c) In holding hearings pursuant to subsection (b), the committees shall receive testimony from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and such other persons as the committees may desire.

(d) Hearings pursuant to subsection (b) shall be held in open session. A transcript of all such hearings shall be printed and a copy thereof furnished to each Member of the House or Senate, as the case may be.

(e) Hearings pursuant to subsection (b), or any part thereof, may be held before joint meetings of the two committees.

(f) (1) Section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190e) is repealed.

(2) Title I of the table of contents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 813) is amended by striking out—"Sec. 138. Legislative Budget."

BUDGET REVIEW

SEC. 232. The Committee on Appropriations of the House, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, shall review the Budget transmitted for each fiscal year for the specific purpose of examining and reviewing those programs for which estimated expenditures or proposed appropriations contained in the Budget would be made by, or be under the control of, two or more Federal agencies.

COMMITTEE ACTION

SEC. 233. (a) No vote shall be taken in the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate with respect to any measure, or any amendment thereto unless a majority of the members thereof are actually present. No vote of any member of any such committee with respect to any measure or any amendment thereto may be cast by proxy unless such committee adopts a rule or rules permitting the casting of votes by proxy and unless such rule or rules require that proxies shall be in writing and be given only for a specified measure or measures, including any amendment or amendments thereto.

(b) The report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House or the Senate as the case may be accompanying each appropriation bill shall include an analysis of the major factors taken into consideration by the committee in reporting the bill and recommending the appropriations contained therein. In any case in which any cost effectiveness analysis or study of any program for which funds are appropriated in the bill has been furnished by any Federal agency to any committee of the House or Senate or any joint committee of the two Houses, or has been made by any such committee or joint committee such report shall also state the

consideration given by the Committee on Appropriations to such analysis or study and shall inform the Members of the House or Senate, as the case may be, where they may obtain copies of such analysis or study.

(c) In the case of any bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House or the Senate which makes supplemental or deficiency appropriations for any fiscal year, the report accompanying such bill shall include a complete explanation of the nature of the request for such appropriation and the reason such request was not made or could not have been made for inclusion in the regular appropriation bill for such fiscal year, or could not be withheld for inclusion in the regular appropriation bill for the following fiscal year.

PASSAGE OF BILLS

SEC. 234. The question of the final passage in both the House and the Senate of any general appropriation measure reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the House or Senate shall be decided by a yeand-nay vote.

ROLLCALL VOTE REQUIRED ON MEASURES CHANGING COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

SEC. 235. (a) No bill or joint resolution containing a provision increasing or decreasing the rate of compensation of Members of Congress shall be passed by the Senate or House of Representatives unless (1) such increase or decrease in compensation is set forth as a separate proposition from any other provision in the bill or joint resolution, and (2) such proposition shall have been approved by the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, by a yeand-nay vote.

(b) As used in this section, "Member of Congress" means a Senator, Representative in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

PART 4—UTILIZATION OF REPORTS OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

ASSISTANCE TO COMMITTEES

SEC. 241. At the request of any committee of the House or Senate, or of any joint committee of the two Houses, the Comptroller General shall explain to, and discuss with, the committee or joint committee making the request, or the staff of such committee or joint committee, any report made by the General Accounting Office which would assist such committee in connection with—

(1) its consideration of proposed legislation, including requests for appropriations, or

(2) its review of any program, or of any activities of any Federal agency, which is within the jurisdiction of such committee or joint committee.

REPORTS TO COMMITTEES

SEC. 242. (a) Whenever the General Accounting Office submits any report to the Congress, the Comptroller General shall deliver copies of such report to—

(1) the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate,

(2) the Committees on Government Operations of the House and Senate, and

(3) any other committee of the House or Senate, or any joint committee of the two Houses, which has requested information on any program or part thereof, or any Federal agency, which is the subject of such report.

(b) At the request of any committee of the House or Senate, or of any joint committee of the two Houses, the Comptroller General shall make available to such committee or joint committee a copy of any report made by the General Accounting Office which was not delivered to such committee or joint committee pursuant to subsection (a).

AGENCY REPORTS

SEC. 243. Whenever the General Accounting Office has made a report which contains

recommendations to the head of any Federal agency, such agency shall, in connection with the first request for appropriations for that agency submitted to the Congress more than sixty days after the date of such report, submit a written statement to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate of the action taken by such agency with respect to such recommendations.

PART 5—LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES
COST ESTIMATES

SEC. 251. (a) The report accompanying each bill or joint resolution reported by any committee of the House or Senate shall contain—

(1) an estimate, made by such committee, of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out such bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is reported and in each of the five fiscal years following such fiscal year (or for the authorized duration of any program authorized by such bill or joint resolution, if less than five years), except that in the case of measures affecting the revenues, such reports shall require only an estimate of the gain or loss in revenues for a one-year period, and

(2) a comparison of the estimate of costs described in paragraph (1) made by such committee with any estimate of costs made by any Federal agency in the executive branch of the Government, or

(3) a statement of the reasons why compliance by the committee with the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) is impracticable.

(b) It shall not be in order in either House to consider a bill or joint resolution if such bill or joint resolution was reported in that House after the effective date of this section and the report of the committee of that House does not comply with the provisions of subsection (a).

APPROPRIATIONS ON ANNUAL BASIS

SEC. 252. (a) Each committee of the House and Senate, and each joint committee of the two Houses, which has legislative jurisdiction shall, in recommending the enactment of legislation, endeavor to insure that all continuing programs of the Government are designed, and all continuing activities of Federal agencies are carried on, so that appropriations therefor will be made annually.

(b) Each committee of the House and Senate, and each joint committee of the two Houses, which has legislative jurisdiction over any continuing program for which appropriations are not made annually shall, from time to time, review such program to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefor would be made annually.

(c) Each committee of the House and Senate, and each joint committee of the two Houses, which has legislative jurisdiction over any program under which grants-in-aid are made, shall periodically make a complete review of such program.

COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

SEC. 253. (a) For purposes of the provisions of this Part, a committee of either House, or a joint committee of the two Houses, shall be considered to have legislative jurisdiction over any matter only if, under the rules of the respective Houses, legislation relating to such matter is referred to such committee and such committee is authorized to report and recommend the enactment of such legislation, except that the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses shall not be considered to be legislative committees.

(b) For purposes of the provisions of section 251 of this Part, the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy who are Members of the House shall be treated as a committee of the House, and the members of the Joint Committee who are Members of the Senate shall be treated as a committee of the Senate.

TITLE III—SOURCES OF INFORMATION

PART 1—STAFFS OF SENATE AND HOUSE

STANDING COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE STAFFING AND RELATED PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. (a) Subsection (a) of section 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a(a)), is amended to read as follows:

“(a) Each standing committee of the Senate and House of Representatives (other than the Committee on Appropriations of each House) is authorized to appoint by majority vote of the committee not more than six professional staff members in addition to the clerical staffs. Such professional staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and the ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable, except that whenever a majority of the minority members of such committee (other than the Committee on Standards and Conduct of the House of Representatives) so request, two of such professional staff members may be selected for appointment by majority vote of the minority members and the committee shall appoint any staff members so selected. A staff member or members appointed pursuant to a request by the minority members of the committee shall be assigned to such committee business as such minority members deem advisable. Services of professional staff members appointed by majority vote of the committee may be terminated by majority vote of the committee and services of professional staff members appointed pursuant to a request by the minority members of the committee shall be terminated by the committee when a majority of such minority members so request. Professional staff members authorized by this subsection shall be appointed on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office. Such professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.”

(d) Subsection (c) of such section 202 (2 U.S.C. 72a(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) The clerical staff of each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives (other than the Committee on Appropriations of each House), which shall be appointed by a majority vote of the committee, shall consist of not more than six clerks to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable, except that whenever a majority of the minority members of such committee (other than the Committee on Standards and Conduct of the House of Representatives) so requests, one of the members of the clerical staff may be selected for appointment by a majority vote of such minority members and the committee shall appoint any staff member so selected. The clerical staff shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work, both for the committee staff and for the chairman and ranking minority member on matters related to committee work, except that if a member of the clerical staff is appointed pursuant to a request by the minority members of the committee, such clerical staff member shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work for the minority members of the committee and for any members of the committee staff appointed under subsection (a) pursuant to request by such minority members, on matters related to committee work. Services of clerical staff members appointed by majority vote of the committee may be terminated by majority vote of the committee and services of clerical staff members appointed pursuant to a request by the minority members of the committee shall be

terminated by the committee when a majority of such minority members so request.”

(c) Such section 202 is amended by striking out subsection (h), and by adding after subsection (f) the following new subsections:

“(g) In any case in which a request for the appointment of a minority staff member under subsection (a) or subsection (c) is made at any time when no vacancy exists to which the appointment requested may be made, the person appointed pursuant to such request may serve in addition to any other staff members authorized by such subsections and may be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, until such time as such a vacancy occurs, at which time such person shall be considered to have been appointed to such vacancy.

“(h) Staff members appointed pursuant to a request by minority members of a committee under subsection (a) or subsection (c), and staff members appointed to assist minority members of subcommittees pursuant to authority of Senate or House resolution, shall be accorded equitable treatment with respect to the fixing of salary rates, the assignment of facilities, and the accessibility of committee records.

“(i) (1) Each standing committee of the Senate or House of Representatives is authorized, with the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration in the case of standing committees of the Senate, or the Committee on House Administration in the case of standing committees of the House of Representatives, within the limits of funds made available from the contingent funds of the respective Houses pursuant to resolutions, which shall specify the maximum amounts which may be used for such purpose, approved by such respective Houses, to procure the temporary services (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof, to make studies or advise the committee with respect to any matter within its jurisdiction.

“(2) Such services in the case of individuals or organizations may be procured by contract as independent contractors, or in the case of individuals by employment at daily rates of compensation not in excess of the per diem equivalent of the highest gross rate of compensation which may be paid to a regular employee of the committee, including payment of such rates for necessary travel time. Such contracts shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5) or any other provision of law requiring advertising.

“(3) Any such consultant or organization shall be selected by the chairman, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the committee. The committee shall submit to the Committee on Rules and Administration in the case of standing committees of the Senate, and the Committee on House Administration in the case of standing committees of the House of Representatives, information bearing on the qualifications of each consultant whose services are procured pursuant to this subsection, including organizations, and such information shall be retained by that committee and shall be made available for public inspection upon request.

“(j) (1) Each standing committee of the Senate or House of Representatives is authorized, with the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration in the case of standing committees of the Senate, and the Committee on House Administration in the case of standing committees of the House of Representatives, and within the limits of funds made available from the contingent funds of the respective Houses pursuant to resolutions, which shall specify the maximum amounts which may be used for such purpose, approved by such re-

spective Houses, to provide assistance for members of its professional staff in obtaining specialized training, whenever it determines that such training will aid it in the discharge of its responsibilities.

"(2) Such assistance may be in the form of continuance of pay during periods of training or grants of funds to pay tuition, fees, or such other expenses of training, or both, as may be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration or the Committee on House Administration, as the case may be.

"(3) A committee providing assistance under this subsection shall obtain from any employee receiving such assistance such agreement with respect to continued employment as it may deem necessary to assure that it will receive the benefits of such employee's services upon completion of his training.

"(4) During any period for which an employee is separated from employment with a committee for the purpose of undergoing training under this subsection, such employee shall be considered to have performed service as an employee of the committee at the rate of compensation received immediately prior to commencing such training (including any increases in compensation provided by law during the period of training) for the purposes of—

"(A) subchapter III (relating to civil service retirement) of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code,

"(B) chapter 87 (relating to Federal employees group life insurance) of title 5, United States Code, and

"(C) chapter 89 (relating to Federal employees group health insurance) of title 5, United States Code."

(d) (1) Subsections (e) and (f) of section 105 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1968, are amended to read as follows:

"(e) (1) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (3), the professional staff members of standing committees of the Senate shall receive gross annual compensation to be fixed by the chairman ranging from \$15,721 to \$25,671.

"(2) The rates of gross compensation of the clerical staff of each standing committee of the Senate shall be fixed by the chairman as follows:

"(A) for each committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), one chief clerk and one assistant chief clerk at \$6,766 to \$25,671, and not to exceed four other clerical assistants at \$6,766 to \$11,741; and

"(B) for the Committee on Appropriations, one chief clerk and one assistant chief clerk and two assistant clerks at \$17,512 to \$26,671; such assistant clerks as may be necessary at \$11,940 to \$17,313; and such other clerical assistants as may be necessary at \$6,766 to \$11,741.

"(3) No employee of any standing or select committee of the Senate (including the majority and minority policy committees and the conference majority and conference minority of the Senate), or of any joint committee the expenses of which are paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, shall be paid at a gross rate in excess of \$25,671 per annum, except that—

"(A) four employees of any such committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), who are otherwise authorized to be paid at such rate, may be paid at gross rates not in excess of \$26,865 per annum, and two such employees may be paid at gross rates not in excess of \$28,000 per annum; and

"(B) sixteen employees of the Committee on Appropriations who are otherwise authorized to be paid at such rate, may be paid at gross rates not in excess of \$26,865 per annum, and two such employees may be paid at gross rates not in excess of \$28,000 per annum.

For the purpose of this paragraph, an employee of a subcommittee shall be considered to be an employee of the full committee.

"(f) No officer or employee whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall be paid gross compensation at a rate less than \$1,194 or in excess of \$28,000, unless expressly authorized by law."

(2) If the annual rate of basic pay for positions in level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, is increased effective on or before May 31, 1969, to \$30,000 or more, subsections (e) and (f) of section 105 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1968, as amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection are further amended, effective on the first day of the month following the effective date of such increase in the rate for positions in level V, by striking out "\$25,671", "\$26,865", and "\$28,000" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "\$28,860", "\$29,054", and "\$30,248", respectively.

(e) The additional professional staff members authorized to be employed by a committee by the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be in addition to any other additional staff members authorized, prior to January 1, 1970, to be employed by any such committee.

(f) This section shall not be construed to prevent the appointment of additional professional or clerical staff members, as the case may be, pursuant to the request of the majority of the minority members of any committee of the Senate or House of Representatives in any case in which the total number of professional or clerical staff members, as the case may be, is in excess of the total number of professional or staff members authorized by section 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

PART 2—LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH SERVICE
IMPROVEMENT OF LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
FACILITIES OF CONGRESS

SEC. 321. (a) Section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 166), is amended to read as follows:

"LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH SERVICE

"SEC. 203. (a) The Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress is hereby continued as a separate department in the Library of Congress and is redesignated the 'Legislative Research Service'.

"(b) It is the policy of Congress that—
"(1) the Librarian of Congress shall, in every possible way, encourage, assist, and promote the Legislative Research Service in—
"(A) rendering to Congress the most effective and efficient service,

"(B) responding most expeditiously, effectively, and efficiently to the special needs of Congress, and

"(C) discharging its responsibilities to Congress;

and
"(2) the Librarian of Congress shall grant and accord to the Legislative Research Service complete research independence and the maximum practicable administrative independence consistent with these objectives.

"(c) (1) After consultation with the Joint Committee on the Library, the Librarian of Congress shall appoint the Director of the Legislative Research Service. The basic pay of the Director shall be at a per annum rate equal to the rate of basic pay provided for level V of the Executive Schedule contained in section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

"(2) The Librarian of Congress, upon the recommendation of the Director, shall appoint a Deputy Director of the Legislative Research Service and all other necessary personnel thereof. The basic pay of the Deputy Director shall be fixed in accordance with chapter 51 (relating to classification) and subchapter III (relating to General Schedule pay rates) of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, but without regard to section 5108(a) of such title. The basic pay of all

other necessary personnel of the Legislative Research Service shall be fixed in accordance with chapter 51 (relating to classification) and subchapter III (relating to General Schedule pay rates) of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, except that—

"(A) the grade of Senior Specialist in each field within the purview of subsection (e) of this section shall not be less than the highest grade in the executive branch of the Government to which research analysts and consultants with out supervisory responsibility are currently assigned; and

"(B) the positions of Specialist and Senior Specialist in the Legislative Research Service may be placed in GS-16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, without regard to section 5108(a) of such title, subject to the prior approval of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, by record vote of a majority of the members of the Joint Committee, of the placement of each such position in any of such grades.

"(3) Each appointment made under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection and subsections (e) and (i) of this section shall be without regard to the civil service laws, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the position.

"(d) It shall be the duty of the Legislative Research Service, without partisan bias—

"(1) upon request, to advise and assist any committee or Member of the Senate or House of Representatives and any joint committee of Congress in the analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of legislative proposals, or of recommendations submitted to Congress by the President or any executive agency, and otherwise to assist in providing a basis for the proper evaluation and determination of legislative proposals and recommendations generally;

"(2) upon request, or upon its own initiative in anticipation of requests, to collect, classify, and analyze in the form of studies, reports, compilations, digests, bulletins, indexes, translations, and otherwise, data having a bearing on legislation, and to make such data available and serviceable to committees and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and joint committees of Congress;

"(3) upon request, or upon its own initiative in anticipation of requests, to prepare and provide information, research, and reference materials and services to committees and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and joint committees of Congress to assist them in their legislative and representative functions;

"(4) to prepare summaries and digests of bills and resolution of a public general nature introduced in the Senate or House of Representatives; and

"(5) upon request made by any committee or Member of the Congress, to prepare and transmit to such committee or Member a concise memorandum with respect to one or more legislative measures upon which hearings by any committee of the Congress have been announced, which memorandum shall contain a statement of the purpose and effect of each such measure, a description of other relevant measures of similar purpose or effect previously introduced in the Congress, and a recitation of all action taken theretofore by or within the Congress with respect to each other measure.

"(e) The Librarian of Congress is authorized to appoint in the Legislative Research Service, upon the recommendation of the Director, Specialists and Senior Specialists in the following broad fields:

- "(1) agriculture;
- "(2) American government and public administration;
- "(3) American public law;
- "(4) conservation;
- "(5) education;

- "(6) engineering and public works;
- "(7) housing;
- "(8) industrial organization and corporate finance;
- "(9) international affairs;
- "(10) international trade and economic geography;
- "(11) labor and employment;
- "(12) mineral economics;
- "(13) money and banking;
- "(14) national defense;
- "(15) price economics;
- "(16) science;
- "(17) social welfare;
- "(18) taxation and fiscal policy;
- "(19) technology;
- "(20) transportation and communications;
- "(21) urban affairs;
- "(22) veterans' affairs; and
- "(23) such other broad fields as the Director may deem appropriate.

Such Specialists and Senior Specialists, together with such other employees of the Legislative Research Service as may be necessary, shall be available for special work with the committees and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and the joint committees of Congress for any of the purposes of subsection (d) of this section.

"(f) The Director is authorized—

"(1) to classify, organize, arrange, group, and divide, from time to time, as he deems advisable, the requests for advice, assistance, and other services submitted to the Legislative Research by committees and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and joint committees of Congress, into such classes and categories as he deems necessary to—

"(A) expedite and facilitate the handling of the individual requests submitted by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives;

"(B) promote efficiency in the performance of services for committees of the Senate and House of Representatives and joint committees of Congress, and

"(C) provide a basis for the efficient performance by the Legislative Research Service of its legislative research and related functions generally;

and

"(2) to establish and change, from time to time, as he deems advisable, within the Legislative Research Service, such research and reference divisions or other organizational units, or both, as he deems necessary to accomplish the purposes of this section.

"(g) In order to facilitate the study, consideration, evaluation, and determination by the Congress of the budget requirements of the Legislative Research Service for each fiscal year, the Librarian of Congress shall receive from the Director and submit, for inclusion in the Budget of the United States Government, the budget estimates of the Legislative Research Service prepared separately by the Director in detail for each fiscal year, as a separate item of the budget estimates of the Library of Congress for such fiscal year.

"(h) (1) The Director of the Legislative Research Service is authorized to procure the temporary services (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of individual experts or consultants (including stenographic reporters) and persons learned in particular field of knowledge—

"(A) by contract as independent contractors without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5) or any other law requiring advertising, or

"(B) by employment in the Legislative Research Service without regard to the civil service and position classification laws, at rates of pay not in excess of the per diem equivalent of the highest rate of basic pay set forth in the General Schedule of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including

payment of such rates for necessary travel-time.

"(2) The Director of the Legislative Research Service is authorized to procure by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5) or any other law requiring advertising, the temporary services (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of educational, research, or other organizations of experts and consultants (including stenographic reporters) and persons learned in particular fields of knowledge.

"(1) In order to facilitate its performance of any function specified in this section, the Legislative Research Service may—

"(1) prepare information for machine processing;

"(2) process information by machine by performing mathematical or logical operations thereon, selective retrieval, integration, or other machine operations; and

"(3) prepare for presentation or other use information processed by machine.

The Service may acquire automatic data processing equipment and employ personnel needed for any activity authorized by this subsection.

"(j) The Director of the Legislative Research Service shall file with the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library at the beginning of each regular session of Congress a separate and special report covering, in summary and in detail, all phases of activity of the Legislative Research Service for the immediately preceding fiscal year.

"(k) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Legislative Research Service each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry on the work of the Service."

(b) Title II of the table of contents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 813) is amended by striking out—"Sec. 203. Legislative Reference Service."

and inserting in lieu thereof—"Sec. 203. Legislative Research Service."

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

SEC. 322. Section 223 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 132b) is amended to read as follows:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

"SEC. 223. (a) The Joint Committee of Congress on the Library shall consist of the chairman and four members of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the chairman and four members of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

"(b) In order to provide for the expeditious and efficient consideration of matters within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee, including review of the operations of the Legislative Research Service, the Joint Committee is authorized to employ one professional staff member and not to exceed two employees as members of the clerical staff of the Committee. Such professional and clerical staff members shall be appointed by majority vote of the Committee, on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their positions. The staff, under the joint direction and supervision of the chairman and the vice chairman, shall assist the Committee in the performance of its review functions with respect to matters within the general jurisdiction of the Committee and shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Committee. The chairman and vice chairman shall fix their compensation at rates authorized by section 202(e) of this Act. The Committee may terminate the employment of the members of the professional and clerical staff as it may deem appropriate.

"(c) The expenses of the Joint Committee shall be paid out of the contingent fund

of the House of Representatives, from funds appropriated for the Joint Committee, upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Joint Committee.

"(d) In order to provide the Congress with current information regarding the operation of the Legislative Research Service and regarding other matters within the general jurisdiction of the Joint Committee, the Joint Committee shall submit to the Senate and House of Representatives an annual report with respect to—

"(1) the activities of the Legislative Research Service, and

"(2) such other matters within its jurisdiction as it deems appropriate."

REPEAL OF OBSOLETE LAW RELATING TO THE ABOLISHED OFFICE OF COORDINATOR OF INFORMATION

SEC. 323. House Resolution 183, Eightieth Congress, relating to the Office of the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives, as enacted into permanent law by section 105 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948 (61 Stat. 377; Public Law 197, Eightieth Congress), is repealed.

PART 3—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS PROVIDING INFORMATION FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULEMAKING POWER OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 331. Section 332 of this part is enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those provisions of the Rules of the House of Representatives enacted by such section at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW TO BE SHOWN IN INTRODUCED HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS; DIGESTS OF INTRODUCED HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS; AVAILABILITY OF AMENDMENTS OF TWENTY-FIVE OR MORE WORDS

SEC. 332. Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new clauses:

"7. In each public bill or joint resolution presented for introduction in the House, which amends or repeals a provision of the United States Code or District of Columbia Code codified as positive law or which amends or repeals any other provision of a public law, all proposed new matter shall be underlined and, when printed, shall be in italic type and all matter proposed to be omitted shall bear a horizontal line through the center and, when printed, shall be in linetype. In each amendment to a bill or joint resolution which sets out for the first time a section being amended or repealed, any new matter to be added and any matter to be omitted shall be indicated by the author of the amendment and shall be printed in the same manner as though the section as amended or repealed were a part of the original bill or joint resolution and being printed for the first time. When an entire title of a code or a public law is repealed as part of a codification or recodification or when an entire title, part, chapter, or other division of a title of a code or other general law is repealed, the sections comprising such title, part, chapter, or other division shall not be set forth in the bill or joint resolution or amendment in linetype, when printed. The provisions of this clause also apply with respect to a bill or joint resolution as reported by a committee. This clause does not apply to—

"(A) any measure for the declaration of war, or the declaration of a national emergency, by the Congress, and

"(B) any executive decision, determina-

tion, or action which would become, or continue to be, effective unless disapproved by one or both Houses of Congress.

"(8) No public bill or joint resolution shall be introduced unless it is contained in a cover attached by the Legislative Counsel of the House and is accompanied by a digest, prepared and attached to the bill or joint resolution by the Legislative Counsel, showing the changes in law proposed by the bill or joint resolution and containing a summary of its contents. If any public bill or joint resolution is present for introduction which does not comply with this clause, the bill or joint resolution shall be returned to the Member or Resident Commissioner who presented it. The digest shall be printed in the bill or joint resolution, as introduced, beginning on the first page thereof.

"(9) Whenever a public bill or joint resolution is amended in the House, the Clerk shall request the Legislative Counsel to prepare an amended digest and cause it to be printed on the first page of the bill or joint resolution as amended. The digest shall be amended to show changes in the existing law which are proposed by the bill or joint resolution as amended with any material changes in the digest indicated by the use of appropriate type.

"(10) If a material error in a printed digest is brought to the attention of the Legislative Counsel, he shall prepare a corrected digest which shall show the changes made in the digest as provided for amendments to bills or joint resolutions. He shall deliver the corrected digest to the Clerk. If the correction warrants it in the opinion of the Speaker of the House, a corrected print of the bill or joint resolution as introduced shall be ordered with the corrected digest printed thereon.

"(11) No amendment to a public bill or joint resolution proposing to add twenty-five words or more to the bill or joint resolution shall be in order unless and until a copy of the proposed amendment has been made freely available for distribution to the Members. The amendment shall be read in its entirety by the Clerk prior to action thereon."

QUARTERLY REPORTS OF SALARIES PAID FROM CLERK HIRE ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS

SEC. 333. In addition to any other reports required by law, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit to the Committee on House Administration, at the close of each quarter of each calendar year, beginning with 1970, a report of the name, the nature of the services performed, the time employed, the position title, the total amount of salary in each quarter, and the per annum aggregate pay rate, of each employee paid from the clerk hire allowances of Members of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. Such report shall be printed as a House document and such document shall be made available under regulations prescribed by the committee.

PERIODIC PREPARATION BY HOUSE PARLIAMENTARIAN OF SIMPLIFIED VERSIONS OF HOUSE PRECEDENTS

SEC. 334. The Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives shall prepare, compile, and maintain on a current basis and in cumulative form, at the beginning of each Congress commencing with the Ninety-second Congress, a condensed and up-to-date version of all of the parliamentary precedents of the House of Representatives which have current use and application in the House, together with informative text prepared by the Parliamentarian and other useful related material in summary form. The Parliamentarian shall have such matter printed for each Congress on pages of such size and in such type and format as he deems advisable to promote the usefulness of such matter to the Members of the House and shall dis-

tribute one printed copy thereof to each Member and make such other distribution of such printed copies as he deems advisable. In carrying out this section, the Parliamentarian may appoint and fix the pay of personnel and utilize the services of personnel of the Library of Congress and the Government Printing Office.

TITLE IV—CONGRESS AS AN INSTITUTION PART 1—JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

SEC. 401. (a) There is hereby created a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations (hereafter in this part referred to as the "Joint Committee").

(b) The Joint Committee shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) six Members of the Senate, appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate; two from the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate, two from the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, and two from among the remaining Members of the Senate (including but not limited to members of the committees referred to in this paragraph); and

(2) six Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; two from the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives, two from the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, and two from among the remaining Members of the House of Representatives (including but not limited to members of the committee referred to in this paragraph).

(c) Of each class of two members referred to in subsection (b), one shall be from the political party having the greatest number, and one shall be from the political party having the second greatest number, of Members of the Senate, or of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

(d) Vacancies in the membership of the Joint Committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Joint Committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

(e) The Joint Committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The chairmanship and the vice chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and the House of Representatives with each Congress. The Chairman during each even-numbered Congress shall be selected by the Members of the House of Representatives on the Joint Committee from among their number and the chairman during each odd-numbered Congress shall be selected by the Members of the Senate on the Joint Committee from among their number. The vice chairman during each Congress shall be chosen in the same manner from that House of Congress other than the House of Congress of which the chairman is a Member. The vice chairman shall not be of the same political party as the chairman.

DUTIES OF JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 402. (a) The Joint Committee shall—

(1) make a continuing study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution of the United States;

(2) make a continuing study of automatic data processing and information retrieval systems with a view to determining the

feasibility of the use of such systems in the operations of the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, and make such recommendations with respect to the use of such systems as the Joint Committee may deem appropriate; and

(b) The Joint Committee shall exercise all functions vested in it by sections 406 and 407 of this part.

(c) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, the Joint Committee shall report, from time to time to the Senate and the House of Representatives its recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee.

(d) In addition to the studies and activities of the Joint Committee under subsection (a) of this section, the Joint Committee shall—

(1) conduct a study of each of the matters described in subparagraphs (A) to (H), inclusive, of this subsection; and

(2) submit to the Senate and House of Representatives, within the time limit specified with respect to that study, a report of the results of that study, together with the recommendations of the Joint Committee, as follows:

(A) a study of the procedures of both Houses in connection with citations for contempt of Congress;

(B) a study of the facilities, including gallery facilities, available to the public in its visits to the United States Capitol and the means of improving such facilities in order to present to the public an informative view of the Congress;

(C) a study of the role of the Congress, and the exercise, application, and effect of its authority, with respect to the engagement of the Armed Forces of the United States in armed conflict in overseas areas without a formal declaration of war by the Congress;

(D) a study of the problems relating to the application, operation, and enforcement of the provisions of section 1913 of title 18, United States Code, relating to lobbying with appropriated funds;

(E) a study of the procedures of the Senate and the House of Representatives in connection with contested elections in their respective Houses.

The report and recommendations of the Joint Committee with respect to each of the studies described in subparagraphs (A) to (H), inclusive, of this subsection shall be submitted to the Senate and House of Representatives within the time limit specified with respect to that subparagraph of this subsection in which that study is described, as follows:

(i) subparagraphs (A) and (B)—not later than one year after the effective date of this section;

(ii) subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E)—not later than two years after such effective date;

POWERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 403. The Joint Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of Congress, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths and affirmations, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The Joint Committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary, except that no recommendation shall be reported from the Joint Committee unless a majority of the Joint Committee assent. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the Joint Committee or of any member designated by him or by the Joint Committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such chair-

man or member. The chairman of the Joint Committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

STAFF OF JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 404. (a) In carrying out its functions under subsections (a) and (c) of section 402 of this Part, the Joint Committee is authorized, by record vote of a majority of the members of the Joint Committee—

(1) to appoint, on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform their duties, not more than six professional staff members and not more than six clerical staff members;

(2) to prescribe their duties and responsibilities;

(3) to fix their compensation at rates authorized by section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; and

(4) to terminate their employment as the Joint Committee may deem appropriate.

(b) In carrying out its functions under section 406 of this Part, the Joint Committee is authorized, by record vote of a majority of the members of the Joint Committee—

(1) to appoint, on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties concerned, such additional personnel as the Joint Committee deems necessary;

(2) to prescribe their duties and responsibilities;

(3) to fix their compensation at rates authorized by section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; and

(4) to terminate their employment, as the Joint Committee may deem appropriate.

(c) In carrying out any of its functions under this Part, the Joint Committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government, and to procure the temporary (not to exceed one year) or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof by contract at rates of pay not in excess of the per diem equivalent of the highest rate of basic pay of the General Schedule of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including payment of such rates for necessary traveltime.

RECORDS OF JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 405. The Joint Committee shall keep a complete record of all Joint Committee actions, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. All records, data, charts, and files of the Joint Committee shall be the property of the Joint Committee and shall be kept in the offices of the Joint Committee or such other places as the Joint Committee may direct.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 406. There are transferred to the Joint Committee all of the functions, records, and property of the Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers, created by the Act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), and such joint committee is hereby abolished.

OFFICE OF PLACEMENT AND OFFICE MANAGEMENT

SEC. 407. (a) There is hereby established for the Congress an Office of Placement and Office Management which shall be subject to the supervision and control of the Joint Committee. The Joint Committee is authorized, by record vote of a majority of the members of the Joint Committee—

(1) to appoint, on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform his duties, a Director of the Office of Placement and Office Management to serve as the head of the staff of the Office;

(2) to prescribe his duties and responsibilities;

(3) to fix his compensation at a rate authorized by section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; and

(4) to terminate his employment, as the Joint Committee may deem appropriate.

Subject to the prior approval of the Joint Committee, the Director shall appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the Office under this section.

(b) It shall be the duty of the Office, upon request, to assist Members, committees, and officers of the Senate and House of Representatives seeking competent personnel with specified qualifications and to furnish advice and information with respect to office management procedures. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Office shall—

(1) operate as a central clearinghouse for applications for employment with the Congress;

(2) test the qualifications of individuals submitting such applications for employment;

(3) furnish advice and information to Members, committees, and officers of the Senate and House of Representatives, on request, with respect to better office management practices and efficient utilization of office equipment; and

(4) maintain, for the benefit of such Members, committees, and officers desiring detailed office studies to improve the efficiency of their operations, a list of private management concerns capable of rendering such service on request.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be held or considered to require the use of the facilities of the Office by any Member, committee, or officer of the Senate or House of Representatives, if, in the opinion of such Member, committee, or officer, the use of such facilities is inappropriate.

EXPENSES

SEC. 408. The expenses of the Joint Committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, from funds appropriated for the Joint Committee, upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

PART 2—AUTHORITY OF OFFICERS OF THE CONGRESS

AUTHORITY

SEC. 421. (a) Any officer of the Congress having responsibility for the supervision of employees, including employees appointed upon recommendation of Members of Congress, shall have authority—

(1) to prescribe a period of training to be completed by any such employee prior to or upon his assignment to duties;

(2) to promulgate rules and regulations governing the performance by any such employee of his assigned duties;

(3) to remove or otherwise discipline any such employee (A) who falls or refuses to complete satisfactorily the period of training referred to in paragraph (1), or (B) who falls or refuses to abide by rules or regulations referred to in paragraph (2) or otherwise fails to perform his assigned duties in a satisfactory manner.

(b) As used in this section, the term "officer of the Congress" means an elected officer of the Senate or the House of Representatives who is not a Member of the Senate or House, the Architect of the Capitol, and the Postmaster of the Senate.

CAPITOL POLICE

SEC. 422. (a) The Capitol Police Board is authorized and directed to formulate a plan for converting the Capitol Police force to a professional force which shall operate under rules and regulations promulgated by the Capitol Police Board. In the formulation of such plan, consideration shall be given to the feasibility of providing for the operation of such force on the basis of standards for personnel which are the same as the standards for personnel of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia. Such plan shall include provisions for giving members of the existing Capitol Police force such additional instruction and training as the Capitol

Police Board shall deem necessary to improve the quality of their performance, and for replacing such members with persons recruited solely on the basis of their fitness to perform police duties.

(b) The Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall provide the Capitol Police Board with such information and assistance as it may require in carrying out its duties and responsibilities under this section.

(c) The Capitol Police Board shall make a report to the Senate and House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date setting forth the plan formulated pursuant to this section, together with its recommendations for any legislation necessary to effectuate such plan.

SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES

SEC. 423. (a) A person shall not be appointed as a page of the Senate or House of Representatives—

(1) unless he agrees that, in the absence of unforeseen circumstances preventing his service as a page after his appointment, he will continue to serve as a page for a period of not less than three months; and

(2) until complete information in writing is transmitted to his parent or parents, or to his legal guardian, with respect to the nature of the work of pages, their salaries, their working conditions (including hours and scheduling of work), and the housing accommodations available to pages.

(b) A person shall not serve as a page of the Senate or House of Representatives—

(1) before he has completed the twelfth grade of his secondary school education; or

(2) except in the case of a chief page, telephone page, or riding page, during any session of the Congress which begins after he has attained the age of twenty-two years.

(c) The pay of pages of the Senate shall begin not more than five days before the convening of a session of the Congress or of the Senate and shall continue until the end of the month during which the Congress or the Senate adjourns or recesses, or until the fourteenth day after such adjournment or recess, whichever is the later date, except that, in any case in which the Congress or the Senate adjourns or recesses on or before the last day of July for a period of at least thirty days but not more than forty-five days, such pay shall continue until the end of such period of adjournment or recess.

(d) The pay of pages of the House of Representatives shall begin not more than five days before the convening of a session of the Congress and shall continue until the end of the month during which the Congress adjourns sine die or recesses, or until the fourteenth day after such adjournment or recess, whichever is the later date, except that, in any case in which the House adjourns or recesses on or before the last day of July in any year for a period of at least thirty days but not more than forty-five days, such pay shall continue until the end of such period of adjournment or recess.

(e) (1) There are hereby repealed—
(A) section 243 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 88a);

(B) the proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Education of Senate and House Pages" in title I of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947 (2 U.S.C. 88b);

(C) the proviso under the heading "Senate" and under the caption "Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper", which relates to the pay of pages of the Senate, in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1952 (65 Stat. 390; Public Law 168, Eighty-Second Congress; 2 U.S.C. 88c); and

(D) the proviso under the heading "House of Representatives" and under the caption "Office of the Doorkeeper", which relates to the pay of pages of the House of Representatives, in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1949, as amended (62 Stat. 426, 78 Stat. 1084; Public Law 641, Eightieth Congress, Public Law 88-652; 2 U.S.C. 88c).

(2) Title II of the table of contents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (80 Stat. 813) is amended by striking out—"Sec. 243. Senate and House pages."

(f) (1) Subsection (b) of this section shall become effective on January 3, 1970, but the provisions of such subsection limiting service as a page to persons who have completed the twelfth grade of secondary school education shall not be construed to prohibit the continued service of any page appointed prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) The repeal of existing law by subsection (e) (1) (A) and (B), and the amendment made by subsection (e) (2), of this section shall become effective at the end of the 1969-1970 school year.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE

SEC. 424. (a) There is hereby established an organization under the Congress of the United States to be known as the Capitol Guide Service which shall be subject to the direction, supervision, and control of a Capitol Guide Board consisting of the Architect of the Capitol, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

(b) The Capitol Guide Service is authorized and directed to provide guided tours of the interior of the United States Capitol Building for the education and enlightenment of the general public, without charge for such tours.

(c) The Capitol Guide Board is authorized—

(1) with the prior approval of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, to appoint, on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform their duties, a Chief Guide, an Assistant Chief Guide, and such number of guides as may be necessary to carry out effectively and efficiently the activities of the Capitol Guide Service;

(2) to prescribe their duties and responsibilities;

(3) to fix and adjust, from time to time, their respective rates of pay at single per annum (gross) rates, with the prior approval of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations; and

(4) to terminate their employment as the Board deems appropriate.

(d) The Capitol Guide Board shall—

(1) prescribe a uniform dress, including appropriate insignia, which shall be worn by personnel of the Capitol Guide Service when on duty; and

(2) from time to time as may be necessary, procure and furnish such uniforms to such personnel without charge to such personnel.

(e) The Capitol Guide Board shall establish and maintain and, from time to time, may revise, a system of annual and sick leave for employees of the Capitol Guide Service.

(f) An employee of the Capitol Guide Service shall not charge or accept any fee, or accept any gratuity, for or on account of his official services.

(g) The Capitol Guide Board may detail personnel of the Capitol Guide Service to assist the United States Capitol Police by providing ushering and informational services, and other services not directly involving law enforcement, in connection with the inauguration of the President and Vice President of the United States, the official reception of representatives of foreign nations and other persons by the Senate or House of Representatives, and other special or ceremonial occasions in the United States Capitol Building or on the United States Capitol Grounds which require the presence of additional Government personnel and which cause the temporary suspension of the performance of the regular duties of the Capitol Guide Service.

(h) With the prior approval of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, the Capitol Guide Board shall prescribe such regulations as the Board deems necessary and appropriate for the operation of the Capitol Guide Service.

(i) The Capitol Guide Board may take appropriate disciplinary action, including, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without pay, reduction in pay, demotion, or removal from employment with the Capitol Guide Service, against any employee who violates any provision of this section or any regulation prescribed by the Board pursuant to this section.

(j) The expenses of the Capitol Guide Service shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, from funds appropriated for the Service, upon vouchers approved by the Capitol Guide Board.

(k) Section 2107 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the definition of "congressional employee", is amended—

(1) by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (7);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(9) an employee of the Capitol Guide Service."

(l) Section 8332(b) of title 5, United States Code, relating to creditable service for retirement purposes, is amended—

(1) by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (5);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and";

(3) by adding immediately below paragraph (6) the following paragraph:

"(7) subject to sections 8334(c) and 8339

(h) of this title, service performed on and after February 19, 1929, and prior to the effective date of section 424 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969, as a United States Capitol Guide."; and

(4) by inserting at the end thereof the following sentence: "The Civil Service Commission shall accept the certification of the Capitol Guide Board concerning service for the purpose of this subchapter of the type described in paragraph (7) of this subsection and performed by an employee."

(m) Section 8348(g) of title 5, United States Code, does not apply with respect to annuity benefits resulting from the enactment of this section.

(n) The initial appointments, under authority of this section, of personnel of the Capitol Guide Service shall be effective on the effective date of this section. The Capitol Guide Board shall afford, to each person who is a member of the United States Capitol Guides immediately prior to such effective date, the opportunity to be appointed, at a per annum (gross) rate of pay determined by the Board, with the approval of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, to be fair and equitable under the existing circumstances, to a comparable position in the Capitol Guide Service without reduction in level of rank and seniority. For the purposes of the initial appointments of such persons, the appointments and number of such persons shall be considered to have been authorized and approved for the Capitol Guide Service under subparagraph (1) of subsection (c) of this section.

(o) The United States Capitol Police Board shall transfer, on the effective date of this section, to the Capitol Guide Board, all personnel records, financial records, assets, and other property of the United States Capitol Guides, which exist immediately prior to such effective date.

(p) As soon as practicable after the effective date of this section but not later than the close of the sixtieth day after such effective date, the Capitol Guide Board shall, out

of the assets and property transferred under subsection (o) of this section, on the basis of a special audit which shall be conducted by the General Accounting Office—

(1) settle and pay any outstanding accounts payable of the United States Capitol Guides.

(2) discharge the financial and other obligations of the United States Capitol Guides (including reimbursement to purchasers of tickets for guided tours which are purchased and paid for in advance of intended use and are unused), and

(3) otherwise wind up the affairs of the United States Capitol Guides,

which exist immediately prior to such effective date. The Capitol Guide Board shall dispose of any net monetary amounts remaining after the winding up of the affairs of the United States Capitol Guides, in accordance with the practices and procedures of the United States Capitol Guides, existing immediately prior to the effective date of this section, with respect to disposal of monetary surpluses.

PART 3—CONGRESSIONAL ADJOURNMENT

CONGRESSIONAL ADJOURNMENT

SEC. 433. (a) This section is enacted by the Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively; and such rule shall supersede other rules only to the extent inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

(b) Section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 198) is amended to read as follows:

"CONGRESSIONAL ADJOURNMENT

"SEC. 132. (a) Not later than the last day in the month of July in each year, the two Houses shall adjourn—

"(1) sine die, or

"(2) to a day certain subsequent to August 31 of such year, which shall be fixed by concurrent resolution adopted in each House by rollcall vote.

"(b) This section shall not be applicable in any year if on the last day of July of such year a state of war exists pursuant to a declaration of war by the Congress."

PART 4—APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL

SEC. 441. Section 3311 (relating to method of appointment of postmasters) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3311. Method of appointment

"(a) The Postmaster General shall appoint postmasters at post offices of the first, second, and third classes in the competitive civil service without term. He shall make the appointments in accordance with the civil service laws and rules by—

"(1) competitive examinations; and

"(2) promotions from within the postal service.

"(b) The Postmaster General shall appoint postmasters at post offices of the fourth class without term.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law but subject to subsection (g) of this section, the Postmaster General shall make each appointment to a position of postmaster at a post office of any class without regard to any recommendation or statement, oral or written, with respect to any person who requests, or is under consideration for, appointment to a position of postmaster of any class, made by—

"(1) any Member of the Senate or House

of Representatives (including the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico);

"(2) any elected official of the government of any State (including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) or of any county, city, or other political subdivision of such State or Commonwealth;

"(3) any official of a National, State, county, or municipal, or other local political party; or

"(4) any other individual or organization.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law but subject to subsection (g) of this section, a person or organization referred to in subparagraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (c) of this section is hereby prohibited from making or transmitting to the Postmaster General, or to any other officer or employee of the Federal Government, any recommendation or statement, oral or written, with respect to any person who requests, or is under consideration for, appointment to a position of postmaster at a post office of any class. The Postmaster General and any other officer or employee of the Federal Government, subject to subsection (g) of this section—

"(1) shall not solicit, request, consider, or accept any such recommendation or statement; and

"(2) shall return any such recommendation or statement, if written, received by him, appropriately marked as in violation of his section, to the person or organization making or transmitting the same.

"(c) A person who requests, or is under consideration for, appointment to a position of postmaster at a post office of any class is hereby prohibited from requesting or soliciting any such recommendation or statement from any person or organization within the purview of subparagraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (c) of this section. Any person making such solicitation or request, knowing the same to be in violation of this subsection, is disqualified for appointment to the position of postmaster concerned.

"(f) Each application, information, or other form of the Federal Government used in connection with an appointment to a position of postmaster at a post office of any class shall contain appropriate language, in conspicuous and legible type in contrast by typography, layout, or color with other printing in the form, informing the applicant, or person under consideration, for such appointment, of the provisions of this section.

"(g) This section shall not be held or considered to prohibit—

"(1) the solicitation, acceptance, and consideration by the Postmaster General or other authorized officer or employee of the Federal Government, or

"(2) the furnishing and transmission to the Postmaster General or such authorized officer or employee by any other individual or organization.

of any statement with respect to a person who requests, or is under consideration for, appointment to a position of postmaster, if—

"(A) the statement is furnished pursuant to a request or requirement of the Postmaster General and consists solely of an evaluation of the work performance, ability, aptitude, and general qualifications of an employee in the postal service who is under consideration for promotion to a position of postmaster in accordance with subparagraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section;

"(B) the statement is furnished by an individual or organization referred to in subparagraph (4) of subsection (c) of this section pursuant to a request made by an authorized representative of the Federal Government solely in order to determine whether the person who requests, or is under consideration for, appointment to a position of postmaster meets—

"(1) the loyalty, suitability, and character requirements for employment with the Federal Government;

"(ii) the residence requirements for postmasters imposed by section 3312 of this title; or

"(iii) both; or

"(C) the statement is furnished by a former employer of the person who requests, or is under consideration for, appointment to a position of postmaster, pursuant to a request of the Postmaster General, and consists solely of an evaluation of the work performance, ability, aptitude, and general qualifications of such person during his employment with such former employer."

VACANCIES IN POSITIONS OF POSTMASTER

SEC. 442. Section 3315 (relating to the filling of vacancies in positions of postmaster) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The prohibitions, restrictions, and related provisions of section 3311 of this title governing the appointment of postmasters also shall apply with respect to the interim appointment, assignment, or designation of any person in accordance with subparagraphs (1) to (4), inclusive, of subsection (a) of this section."

VACANCIES ON RURAL ROUTES

SEC. 443. Section 3338 (relating to the filling of vacancies on rural routes) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) The prohibitions, restrictions, and related provisions of section 3311 of this title governing the appointment of postmasters also shall apply with respect to the appointment of any person to a position of rural carrier and the application and assignment of any rural carrier with respect to any rural route."

SAVING PROVISION

SEC. 444. The amendments made by this Part shall not affect the status or tenure, on the effective date of this Part, of—

- (1) postmasters in office;
- (2) persons appointed, assigned, or designated in accordance with subparagraphs (1) to (4), inclusive, of section 3315(a) of title 39, United States Code; and
- (3) persons holding positions of rural carrier.

PART 5—PAYROLL ADMINISTRATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONVERSION OF PAY TO AGGREGATE RATE BASIS IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 471. (a) Whenever the rate of compensation of an employee, except an employee subject to the House Employees Position Classification Act (2 U.S.C. 291 and following), whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives is fixed or adjusted on or after the effective date of this section, such rate as so fixed or adjusted shall be a single per annum gross rate which is a multiple of \$199.

(b) (1) The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall convert, as of the effective date of this section, the rate of compensation of each employee whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk and, immediately prior to such date, was fixed at a basic rate with respect to which additional compensation was payable by law, to the lowest per annum gross rate which is a multiple of \$199 and which is not less than the aggregate rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation provided by law) which such employee was receiving immediately prior to such date.

(2) The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall adjust, as of the effective date of this section, the rate of compensation of each employee, except an employee subject to the House Employees Position Classification Act (2 U.S.C. 291 and following), whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk and, immediately prior to such date, was fixed at

a single per annum gross rate which is not a multiple of \$199, to the lowest per annum gross rate which is a multiple of \$199 and which is not less than the per annum gross rate of such employee immediately prior to such adjustment.

(c) The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall prepare, establish, and maintain a compensation schedule of single per annum gross rates for all employees whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk, except employees subject to the House Employees Position Classification Act (2 U.S.C. 291 and following). Such compensation schedule shall be designated the "House General Schedules" and have the symbol "HGS".

(d) The clerk hire allowance of each Member of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at a single per annum gross rate—

- (1) which is a multiple of \$199;
- (2) from which the aggregate of the payments to employees of single per annum gross rates of compensation at any one time shall not be at a rate in excess of such single per annum gross rate of clerk hire allowance; and
- (3) which shall be determined on the basis of the population, as currently estimated by the Bureau of the Census, of the constituency of such Member or Resident Commissioner within one of the following categories, as applicable—

- (A) a population of less than 500,000, or
 - (B) a population of 500,000 or more.
- An employee shall not be paid compensation from such clerk hire allowance at a single per annum gross rate in excess of \$23,482.

(e) The Clerk of the House of Representatives initially shall convert, as of the effective date of this section, to two single per annum gross rates, the two per annum basic rates of clerk hire allowance of the Members of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico provided pursuant to section 11(a) of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956 (2 U.S.C. 60g-1), and any other provision of law supplementary thereto, as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section, in a manner, as determined by the Clerk, as follows:

(1) with respect to constituencies the population of which is less than 500,000, in a manner which constitutes the most favorable single projection, of the per annum basic clerk hire allowance rate applicable to those constituencies to a per annum gross clerk hire allowance rate, which may be attained by any Member or the Resident Commissioner, if his constituency is within such population category, and

(2) with respect to constituencies the population of which is 500,000 or more, in a manner which constitutes the most favorable single projection, of the per annum basic clerk hire allowance rate applicable to those constituencies to a per annum gross clerk hire allowance rate, which may be attained by any Member or the Resident Commissioner, if his constituency is within such population category.

A per annum gross clerk hire allowance rate determined under subparagraph (1) or subparagraph (2) of this subsection shall be adjusted, if not a multiple of \$199, to a per annum gross rate which is a multiple of \$199 and which is not less than the rate determined under such subparagraph. A per annum gross clerk hire allowance rate as finally determined (or adjusted if necessary) under this subsection shall be the initial per annum gross clerk hire allowance rate of each Member and the Resident Commissioner representing the constituency to which such rate is applicable.

(f) Each allowance for personal services of employes from which payments of compensation are disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, other than a clerk

hire allowance under subsection (d) of this section, shall be at a single per annum gross rate—

(1) which is a multiple of \$199; and
(2) from which the aggregate of the payments to employees of single per annum gross rates of compensation at any one time shall not be at a rate in excess of such single per annum gross rate of such allowance for personal services of employees.

(g) The Clerk of the House of Representatives initially shall convert, as of the effective date of this section, to a single per annum gross rate, each per annum basic rate allowance for personal services of employees from which payments of compensation are disbursed by the Clerk, as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section, other than a basic rate clerk hire allowance referred to in subsection (e) of this section, in a manner, as determined by the Clerk, which constitutes the most favorable single projection of such per annum basic rate allowance for personal services of employees to a per annum gross rate allowance which may be attained by the authority having jurisdiction over such basic rate allowance for personal services. A per annum gross rate allowance for personal services determined under this subsection shall be adjusted, it not a multiple of \$199, to a per annum gross rate which is a multiple of \$199 and which is not less than the rate determined under this subsection prior to such adjustment. A per annum gross rate allowance for personal services as finally determined (or adjusted if necessary) under this subsection shall be the initial per annum gross rate allowance for personal services of the authority concerned.

(h) Section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a(e)), is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Each employee on the professional staff, and each employee on the clerical staff, of each standing committee of the House of Representatives shall be paid compensation at a single per annum gross rate, to be fixed by the chairman, which does not exceed the highest rate of basic pay, then currently in effect, of the General Schedule of section 5332(a) of title 5, United States Code, adjusted, if such highest rate of basic pay of the General Schedule of such section of title 5 is not a multiple of the multiple dollar figure then currently in effect with respect to the House General Schedule of single per annum gross rates of compensation disbursed by the Clerk of the House, to the lowest single per annum gross rate of compensation which is a multiple of such then currently effective multiple dollar figure and which is not less than such highest rate of basic pay of the General Schedule of such section of title 5."

(1) This subsection is enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rule amended by this subsection at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

(2) Clause 29(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Each employee on the professional staff, and each employee on the clerical staff, of each standing committee of the House shall be paid compensation at a single per annum gross rate, to be fixed by the Chairman, which does not exceed the highest rate of basic pay, then currently in effect, of the General Schedule of section 5332(a) of title 5, United States Code, adjusted, if such highest rate of basic pay of the General Schedule of such section of title 5 is not a multiple of the multiple dollar figure then currently in effect with respect to the House General Schedule of single per annum gross rates of compensation disbursed by the Clerk

of the House, to the lowest single per annum gross rate of compensation which is a multiple of such then currently effective multiple dollar figure and which is not less than such highest rate of basic pay of the General Schedule of such section of title 5."

(j) In any case in which the rate of compensation of any employee or position, or class of employees or positions, the compensation for which is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or any maximum or minimum rate with respect to any such employee, position, or class, is referred to in or provided by statute or House resolution, and the rate so referred to or provided is a basic rate with respect to which additional compensation is provided by law, such statutory provision or resolution shall be deemed to refer, in lieu of such basic rates, to the per annum gross rate which an employee receiving such basic rate immediately prior to the effective date of this section would receive (without regard to such statutory provision or resolution) under subsection (b) (1) of this section on and after such date.

(k) Each Member of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall certify any rearrangements or changes of salary schedules of employees in his office, in writing to the Clerk of the House, on or before the tenth day of any month in which such arrangements or changes of salary schedules are to become effective. The Clerk of the House shall disburse the compensation of such employees in accordance with such rearrangements or changes of salary schedules.

(l) No employee whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall be paid compensation at a single per annum gross rate which is less than \$1,194, unless expressly authorized by law.

(m) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the foregoing subsections of this section shall not be construed to—

(1) limit or otherwise affect any authority for the making of any appointment to, or for fixing or adjusting the compensation for, any position for which the compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives; or

(2) affect the continuity of employment of, or reduce the compensation of, any employee whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

(n) There are hereby repealed—

(1) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to increase clerk hire, and for other purposes", approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 831; Public Law 512, Seventy-eighth Congress; 2 U.S.C. 60g); and

(2) section 11(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1956 (2 U.S.C. 60g-1).

(o) All provisions of law inconsistent with this section are hereby superseded to the extent of such inconsistency.

PART 6—MISCELLANEOUS

USE OF HOUSE CONTINGENT FUND TO PAY SALARIES OF EMPLOYEES PAID FROM CLERK HIRE ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS AND ABSENT FROM DUTY BECAUSE OF ILLNESS, INJURY, OR DISABILITY

SEC. 481. (a) The contingent fund of the House of Representatives is made available to pay, in lieu of payment from the applicable clerk hire allowance, the salary of each employee—

(1) whose salary is disbursed from the clerk hire allowance of a Member of the House of Representatives or the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico;

(2) with respect to whom a written statement is submitted to the Clerk of the House by such Member or Resident Commissioner to the effect that such employee is currently absent from duty, and has been absent from duty for a continuous period of at least

thirty days, because of his illness, injury, or disability, accompanied by a verification by a qualified physician of such illness, injury, or disability; and

(3) whose salary has been disbursed from the clerk hire allowance of such Member or Resident Commissioner for a period of at least one year, without break in service, immediately prior to such absence.

(b) Payments of salary to an employee from the contingent fund of the House, in lieu of payment from the applicable clerk hire allowance, under this section shall be made only for a period beginning on the first day of the first month following the submission to the Clerk of the House, by the Member or Resident Commissioner concerned, of the written statement described in subsection (a) (2) of this section and ending at the close of—

(1) the day on which the Clerk receives written notice from such Member or Resident Commissioner that the employee has returned to duty, that the injury, illness, or disability of the employee no longer exists, or that the degree of such illness, injury, or disability no longer warrants payments of salary to such employee from the contingent fund of the House, or

(2) the sixth month following the commencement of such payments, whichever first occurs.

(c) Payments of salary to an employee from the contingent fund of the House under this section shall be made—

(1) without reduction in or charge to the clerk hire allowance of the Member of Resident Commissioner concerned who has submitted the written statement described in subsection (a) (2) of this section, and

(2) at a rate not more than the rate which the employee was receiving from such clerk hire allowance immediately prior to the beginning of the period for which payments of salary are made to such employee from the contingent fund of the House under this section.

(d) An employee is not entitled to receive payment of salary under this section and compensation for illness, injury, or disability under any other provision of Federal law covering the same period of time; but this provision does not bar the right of such employee to the greater benefit conferred by this section or other provision of Federal law for any part of the same period of time.

(e) The Committee on House Administration shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to govern the operation and administration of this section.

STATIONERY ALLOWANCES OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 482. The stationery allowance, as authorized by law, for each Member of the House of Representatives and each Resident Commissioner shall hereafter be available only for (1) purchases made through the House stationery room of stationery and other office supplies for use for official business, and (2) reimbursement upon presentation, within thirty days after the close of the session for which the allowance is provided, of receipted invoices for purchases elsewhere of stationery and other office supplies (excluding items not ordinarily available in the House stationery room) for use for official business in an office maintained by a Member in his home State. Any part of the stationery allowance which remains unobligated at the end of the session for which it is available shall be withdrawn from the revolving fund established by the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948 (61 Stat. 366; 2 U.S.C. 46b-1), and covered into the general fund of the Treasury.

TITLE V—REGULATION OF LOBBYING

DEFINITION OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

SEC. 501. Section 302(d) of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (2 U.S.C. 261(d)) is amended to read:

"(d) The term 'Comptroller General' means the Comptroller General of the United States."

MULTIPURPOSE CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES

SEC. 502. (a) The caption of section 305 of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (2 U.S.C. 264) is amended by changing "CLERK OF HOUSE" TO READ "COMPTROLLER GENERAL".

(b) Subsection (a) of such section is amended—

(1) by changing "Clerk" to read "Comptroller General"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"Where contributions are received or expenditures made in part for the purposes described in subparagraphs (a) and (b) of section 307 of this title and in part for any other purpose, the statements required to be filed by this subsection shall include only that part of the amount of any such contribution or expenditure which was for the purposes described in such subparagraphs, except that if the relative proportions cannot be ascertained with reasonable certainty, such statements shall show total receipts and expenditures together with an estimate by the registrant of the part thereof which was for the purposes described in such subparagraphs, and an estimate of the part thereof which was for other purposes."

(c) Title III of the table of contents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 813) is amended by striking out—

"Sec. 305. Statements to be filed with Clerk of House."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"Sec. 305. Statements to be filed with Comptroller General."

FIVE-YEAR PRESERVATION OF RECORDS

SEC. 503. Section 306 of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (2 U.S.C. 265) is amended—

(1) by changing "Clerk" to read "Comptroller General" all four times it appears therein;

(2) by striking out "of the House of Representatives"; and

(3) by changing "two" to read "five".

SUBSTANTIAL PURPOSE CONTROLLING

SEC. 504. Section 307 of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (2 U.S.C. 266) is amended—

(1) by changing "to be used principally" to read "a substantial part of which is to be used"; and

(2) by changing "the principal" to read "a substantial".

CONTINGENT FEES; BROADCASTING

SEC. 505. (a) The caption of section 308 of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (2 U.S.C. 267) is amended by changing "SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND CLERK OF THE HOUSE" to read "COMPTROLLER GENERAL".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 308 of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (2 U.S.C. 267(a)) is amended—

(1) by changing "Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and shall give to those officers" to read "Comptroller General and shall give to that officer"; and

(2) by changing "Clerk and Secretary" to read "Comptroller General".

(c) Such subsection is further amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof: "Any person required to register pursuant to this subsection in connection with any activities for which he is to receive a contingent fee shall, before doing anything for which such fee is to be paid, file with the Comptroller General, in such detail as he may require, a description of the event upon the occurrence of which the fee is contingent, and, depending on the arrangement, a statement of the amount of the fee either in terms of a dollar amount or in terms of

percentage of recovery. A copy of any such contingent fee contract may be filed with the Comptroller General by any registrant, and shall be so filed at the request of the Comptroller General."

(d) The next-to-last sentence of such subsection is amended by changing "publications in which he has caused to be published" to read "publications, or any broadcasting stations, in or from which he has caused to be published or broadcast".

(e) Such subsection is further amended—

(1) by inserting "any licensed radio or television broadcasting station or" before "any newspaper or other";

(2) by changing "newspaper or periodical" to read "broadcasting station, newspaper, or periodical";

(3) by inserting "or broadcasts" before "news items, editorials,"; and

(4) by inserting "broadcasting station," before "newspaper, periodical, or individual,".

(f) Subsection (b) of such section (2 U.S.C. 267(b)) is amended by changing "Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly," to read "Comptroller General of the United States shall be compiled by him and transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate".

(g) Title III of the table of contents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 813) is amended by striking out—

"Sec. 308. Registration with Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"Sec. 308. Registration with Comptroller General."

ADMINISTRATION BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

SEC. 506. (a) Sections 310 and 311 of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act are respectively redesignated as sections 311 and 312.

(b) That Act is amended by inserting therein, immediately after section 309 thereof, the following new section:

"POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

"SEC. 310. The Comptroller General as the agent of the Congress shall—

"(1) develop and prescribe methods and forms for the filing of reports and statements required by this title, and promulgate regulations of the administration of this title;

"(2) make available for public inspection all reports and statements filed pursuant to this title;

"(3) ascertain whether any persons have failed to file reports or statements as required by this title, or have filed incomplete or inaccurate reports or statements under this title, and notify such persons that they are obligated to file such reports or statements in compliance with the requirements of this title;

"(4) refer to the Department of Justice for appropriate action any information coming to his attention, through complaints or otherwise, of any failure to register, or the filing of any false, improper, or incomplete registration or information under this title;

"(5) make such studies and transmit to the Congress such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem to be necessary or appropriate to further the objectives of this title;

"(6) retain for a period of not less than five years each report and statement filed under this title, and during such period, make such reports and statements, or true and correct copies thereof, available as public records open to public inspection; and

"(7) transmit to the Congress annually a full and complete report on the administration of this title."

(c) Title III of the table of contents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946

(60 Stat. 813) is amended by striking out—

"Sec. 310. Penalties.

"Sec. 311. Exemptions."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"Sec. 310. Powers and duties of the Comptroller General.

"Sec. 311. Penalties.

"Sec. 312. Exemptions."

VIOLATION OF REGULATIONS

SEC. 507. Section 311 of such Act (that is, the section which, prior to the redesignations made by section 506 of this Act, was section 310 of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, 2 U.S.C. 269) is amended—

(1) by striking out "(a)" in subsection (a) thereof;

(2) by inserting "or any regulation of the Comptroller General issued pursuant to this title," immediately before "shall, upon conviction," in the first sentence thereof; and

(3) by striking out subsection (b) thereof.

TITLE VI—EFFECTIVE DATES

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 601. This Act shall take effect as follows:

(1) Section 201 of title II, Parts 1, 4, and 5 of title II, Part 2 of title III, Parts 1 and 2 of title IV, and section 301(d) of Part 1 of title III shall take effect on the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Title I, Part 2 and 3 of title II, title III (except section 301(d) thereof), Parts 3, 4, and 5 of title IV, and title V shall take effect on January 1, 1970.

(3) Part 5, and section 481 of Part 6, of title IV shall take effect on the first day of the third month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) Section 482 of Part 6 of title IV shall take effect with respect to the stationery allowance for the first session of Congress beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH STUDENTS SUPPORT THE ESTABLISHMENT

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the May 10 issue of the Salt Lake Tribune contained a full-page paid political advertisement entitled: This ad serves notice to all that the silent majority has had enough. The ad contains the names of several hundred University of Utah students and it reads as follows:

As students of the University of Utah in Salt Lake City, we wish to make it absolutely clear that we do not support—in fact we resolutely oppose—the loud and disruptive activities of those self-styled "patriots of the New Left" who think that the calling of a general strike or the take-over of a University are the only ways in which change can be wrought in America today.

We believe in America, and we believe in the democratic processes and the institutions of government established among us.

We recognize that no society is without its problems, but we do not believe that our government and our society are inherently unresponsive to the problems that exist among us. We believe, rather, that the lines of communication can and must be maintained between young and old, rich and poor, black and white, and between the governors and the governed, and that through rational discussion and legitimate methods, order can be preserved and grievances remedied. To these ends we remain firmly and irrevocably committed.

ANTHONY HARRIGAN PROVIDES
SOUND ADVICE

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months there has been an intensification of the various arguments used for strategic arms limitations and other manifestations of dismantling the Nation's defensive preparedness. Unfortunately, there always seems to be a certain naivete which permeates this type of discussion, and while I certainly would not impugn the motives of any person sincerely interested in world peace, as indeed every sensible citizen is, we must remember that our adversaries have rarely, if ever, negotiated in good faith. Therefore, it is reassuring to have the good advice of experts like Mr. Anthony Harrigan, who have achieved great scholarship in both foreign policy and military preparedness.

Mr. Harrigan is known and respected by a number of our colleagues. We should all sit up and take notice of his wise counsel, especially during the critical days that lie ahead on the arms discussions. Thus, I want to call to the attention of the Congress and the Nation a very perceptive and thought-provoking article that Mr. Harrigan has prepared for the American Security Council on current attempts to weaken our military posture. It is as follows:

A PROFILE OF DEFEATISM: DISMANTLING THE
NATION'S DEFENSES

(By Anthony Harrigan)

History shows that soft thinking and faint-hearted 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.

ANTI-PREPAREDNESS 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 re-

sorts 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 education 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. Edward Kennedy's anti-ABM book published in 1969. Two other contributors to the Kennedy 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 any 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 unreality permeates the statements of anti-preparedness elements in the country. Congressman William S. Moorhead of Pennsylvania 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. Moorhead 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.

NAIVETE IN THE SENATE

For naivete, Americans have only to read the comments of Sen. Edward W. Brooke (R-Mass.). In a recent Senate debate on the ABM and MIRV, Sen. Brooke 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. Brooke must be aware that there is no representative government—in the voice of the people—in the Soviet Union and that the party, military and organizational hierarchs make all the decisions, irrespectively 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. Brooke's 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 process of the members of the anti-preparedness bloc understandably strike realistic citizens as strange indeed. Take, for example, the statement of Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine) 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. Muskie 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 editor 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 Eu-

rope. Nevertheless, the anti-preparedness claimants 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. George McGovern (D-S.D.) 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. McGovern, "whether it would not be wise to allow the phasing out of the entire fixed site ICBMs. At the very least we should forego 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. McGovern's intent, for he emphasized that he favors "phasing out" the Minuteman. Hopefully, the meaning of this statement will not be lost or 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 McGovern 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. McGovern 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.

AUGUSTA: LIVE AMMUNITION

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the Kerner Commission told the Nation that violence in the urban areas comes about from the elements of poverty, hunger, and unemployment which lay bare and exposed to combustion in a racist society. Monday, May 11, we witnessed such an explosion in Augusta, Ga. When it was over, six black citizens were dead.

Tuesday, May 12, I wired the Attorney

General of the United States requesting that the FBI be sent into Augusta to determine whether Federal law specifically, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, were violated by the Augusta, Ga., police force during and/or prior to the outbreak of violence which resulted in the deaths of six black citizens. I asked that Federal authorities determine who was responsible for the death of the black prisoner which gave impetus to the ensuing violence.

I am appalled by the Augusta incident and I am deeply distressed that the National Guard, under the command of Gov. Lester Maddox, was sent into the area with live ammunition with no clear-cut instructions upon its use. And I am fearful that the black population of the State of Georgia will suffer further oppression at the hand of its admittedly racist Governor.

I applaud the Washington Post for contributing some timely perspective and concern for the violence and death which rocked the southern city of Augusta, Ga. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial carried in the Washington Post, May 14, 1970:

AUGUSTA: LIVE AMMUNITION

Suddenly an officer leveled his revolver and fired a single shot into the store. At the back, the remaining looter crashed to the floor, a bullet in his head. An enormous jar of candy topped and jell, showering him with red, white and blue gum balls.

"God damn you honkies you killed one of my brothers," cried the man in custody.

"Shut your Goddamned mouth," snapped a patrolman, "I'd like to see you try and run."

"It looked like he went for a gun," said the patrolman who shot the man. . . . Other patrol cars pulled up.

"Who got him?" asked the newcomer. The man in the first car looked away. None spoke.

"It's a senseless waste of life," said patrolman C. C. Simmons, one of the original officers on the scene. "It's a damn shame. But what could we do?" (UPI report from Augusta in Wednesday's Washington Post.)

In Augusta, Ga., a quiet Southern city noted largely for its golf course, racial violence in the past day or two has so far left several human beings shot to death and dozens more injured. We say "so far" because—despite an edgy calm—Georgia's amiable governor, Lester Maddox, the man who was catapulted from nonentity to the governorship by brandishing an ax-handle at Negroes who sought to patronize his restaurant, seems to have little aversion to enlarging the toll. He sent the National Guard to restore order in Augusta, saying as though it were engaged in some sort of turkey shoot, "They're going in with live ammunition. We're not going to tolerate anarchy in this state."

Well, of course, no governor can tolerate anarchy, since the preservation of public order is the first imperative of any government. But neither should he foment it, and public order, history has made plain, depends upon a general sense that the laws are equitable and are being equitably enforced. When any segment of a population has reason to know that it is the victim of across-the-board injustice and oppression, it is likely—especially in a land where freedom is openly extolled—to rebel and to resort to violence.

Governor Maddox and his Guardsmen may have been strong-stomached enough to bring the violence under control in Augusta. But they have, at best, applied a bandaid to an abscess. The infection is still there. And the governor apparently has no understanding of its causation. The killing of a 15-year-old black boy, allegedly by cellmates in an Augusta jail, seemed to have touched off the

riot, was not actually its cause, according to Mr. Maddox. He has a simpler, traditional, all-purpose explanation. It was a "planned thing," he says, "a Communist conspiracy."

The governor, who does not seem to be a particular imaginative man, has never stopped to consider, we suppose, what it must mean to black people in Georgia to see the stars and bars of the Confederacy flying over the statehouse as part of the state flag. He has never troubled to reflect much, we surmise, as to what it means to black people to see inequality in social life, in economic opportunity, in schooling and even in law enforcement, practiced, condoned and supported by the highest authority in the state. He has never asked himself evidently, what it would be like, if one were a black man, to see a white, avowedly racist governor in the governor's mansion.

There is the live ammunition, Governor. Rancor, frustration, an awareness of injustice are far more menacing to law and order than a trumped up "Communist conspiracy." There is too much live ammunition in Augusta, and it spells death. The problem in Augusta is to live—and let live.

MORE ON CANADA

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the estrangement existing between the youth of our country and its elders over the war in Vietnam continues. Draft resistance is on the increase. Emigration of our draft-eligible youth to Canada is unabated. Ultimately, we will have to deal with this painful problem and consider what options should be made available to these young people.

I have heretofore placed in the RECORD the statements of church and synagogue leaders. Today, I would like to add the comment of a prince of the church, Richard Cardinal Cushing, as well as a report of a young American now exiled in Canada at this point.

FROM THE EASTER SERMON OF HIS EMINENCE, RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING

Would it be too much to suggest this Easter that we empty out our jails of all the protesters—the guilty and the innocent—without judging them; call back from over the border and around the world the young men who are called "deserters," drop the cases that are still awaiting judgment on our college youth? Could we not do all of this in the name of life, and with life hope, both of which we celebrate at Easter? Wherever our young people, even for reasons we do not know, stand in need of mercy let us reach out to them. The fruit of Easter is reconciliation and so much of our world remains unreconciled; the hope of Easter is our salvation and so many are waiting to be saved.

I call upon all those who hear these words to seek and find new life for their weary souls, and to offer new life to others in the spirit of this great feast.

[From the New Republic, May 16, 1970]

GO NORTH, YOUNG MAN—THE NEW EXODUS

(By Roger Williams)

(NOTE.—Roger Williams, 27 years old and married, has lived in Canada the past year. He is author of a forthcoming book, *The Reflections of an American Exile.*)

MONTREAL, CANADA.—Meeting recently with a delegation of Canadian Mennonites, Pierre Elliott Trudeau was urged not to close Canada's borders to military deserters from

draft. Despite the pejorative label the de-"other countries." (Can one imagine Nixon meeting with Mennonite pacifists?) The prime minister replied that the government had no such intention: "I, too, hope Canada will become a refuge from militarism." As the northward exodus continues, that is what Canada is becoming. The exact number of deserters and draft resisters residing in Canada is unknown, though the figure 60,000 has become "enshrined," as one conservative MP put it, and has been carried south by the N.Y. Times and by Rep. Edward Koch (D, N.Y.). The conservative figure is "at least 30,000." Qualified observers in Canada's three largest cities insist there are many more than that.

Vance Gardner, director of the Montreal Council to Aid War Resisters, bases his extrapolation on immigration department tables which show approximately 14,000 male, draft-age landed immigrants from the U.S. here now. He concludes, along with Jim Wilcox of the Ottawa anti-draft group, Bill Hertzog of the American Deserters Committee in Montreal and Bill Spira of the Toronto Anti-Draft Programme that the national figure is three or four times that, since a great many young men don't become landed immigrants. They move through the underground, work illegally, live off money they've brought with them or have sent, generally hang around and don't bother to apply for official immigrant status. The largest agglomeration of draft resisters and deserters is to be found in the cities. Mr. Gardner also points out that there are many thousands of young American males studying at Canadian universities, perhaps ten thousand across Canada; most are eligible for the draft. Few plan to return to the U.S. if and when they are called.

The Toronto Anti-Draft Programme has counseled some ten to twelve thousand young men during its three and a half years. Groups in Vancouver, Montreal and Ottawa—there are two active counseling and assistance groups in each city—together have seen at least 20,000 young Americans in the past four years. These figures do not take into account the many who don't need assistance and stay clear of these groups.

The sharp increase during the past year in the number of "political refugees," as they are coming to be called, is attributable to a change in policy on the deserter question. (Not only have more deserters-resisters been coming here, but general American immigration to Canada is rising. This last year there was a 14 percent increase over 1968 in the number of Americans of all ages and sexes who have immigrated to Canada; for the second year in a row, the northward flow is larger than the number of Canadians moving south. America has gone from first place to second, ranking behind Great Britain, in the list of nations that provide immigrants to Canada.) In the past 12 months beginning May 22, 1969, when Canada decided to accept U.S. military deserters as landed immigrants, all the counseling groups report handling at least twice as many men as before. The number of draft resisters remains constant and deserters now make up one-half to two-thirds of all the men these organizations see. Contrary to the Pentagon's announcement (Dec. 31, 1969) that there are 576 deserters in Canada, the American Deserters' Committee in Montreal has counseled 700 in the past nine months. Three times as many go to Toronto and twice as many to Vancouver. A reasonable estimate of the number of American deserters in Canada would be five to eight thousand.

Although many deserters are not qualified for white collar jobs, and thus threaten blue-collar Canadians in a country already beset with unemployment, Canadian support seems as strong as it was when the nation was only confronted with draft-dodgers, a harmless appellation, in a country with no

deserters are stuck with and highly publicized cases of criminal acts—assault, armed robbery—the deserters have found nearly as much public sympathy as they have in Sweden. (Perhaps more. The Swedes recently asked a Canadian NATO delegation: "How do you get away with allowing American deserters into Canada? You wouldn't believe the amount of pressure put on us by the U.S. when we admitted deserters—the pressure from the Americans that we still suffer.") The Canadian government first clarified its policy on desertion several months after a delegation of anti-draft leaders, churchmen, National Democratic Party MPs, civil servants and lawyers presented their petition and brief to Allen MacEachen, Minister of Immigration. A young Liberal MP from Montreal, Marcel Prudhomme, brought together parliamentary support for a study session caucus, and ultimately word went out that deserters were not to be turned back at the border as visitors and were to be treated the same as other applicants when applying for immigration.

The draft dodger question and now the deserter issue seem to be ready-made pegs on which Canadians can hang their anti-Americanism. Despite pressure overt or covert, to return all these young men like a good friendly neighbor, Canada hasn't done so.

Conservatives and liberals use the deserter-resister issue to assert Canadian independence. They smile and point out that nothing in Canadian law prevents their nation from accepting servicemen still in the active service of their respective countries. They remind outsiders that America accepted Canadian deserters as immigrants before World War II. Canada hostile to the U.S.? Never! The government is simply enforcing its laws and making sure its policies are implemented impartially.

An indication of public attitudes toward deserters is the recent outcry over the handling of three American deserters by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in British Columbia. The deserters were taken to the border and turned over to U.S. authorities. One of the young men escaped and returned to Canada where he told his story to the press. Members of parliament and several Canadian dailies pressed for an investigation. A federal inquiry in April accused the RCMP and local immigration officers of illegal action. While the government fretted over RCMP interference with "the letter of immigration law," the Montreal Star editorialized on the "spirit of its enforcement." "Canada's liberal policy towards United States military deserters is apparently being undermined by the zealotry of law enforcement officers in this country . . . the deserters' welcome has become tarnished." The Star's Weekend, a Sunday supplement included in 39 Canadian papers, recently featured a very sympathetic cover article on the American deserters, focusing on the ADC in Montreal, and ran an editorial in defense of that article and in response to a number of critical letters denouncing "the creeps," "cowards" and so on. Frank Lewis, the editor, drew a parallel between the deserters and the United Empire Loyalists who settled Ontario during the American Revolution. He asked rhetorically how these Canadians would have regarded their own forebears and then he asked Canadians to recall "one of the most memorable quotes of the decade: 'I had to obey the rules of war and my flag. I am ready.' Those were the last words of Adolph Eichmann."

As the position of the American emigrés, especially the deserters, becomes more secure and the counseling and aid groups are more and more able to count on many liberal MPs, several Conservatives, the New Democratic Party, the media and the gracious acceptance by the Canadian people, young men denounced by the Vice President of the United States as common criminals are turning to political activism. There is now less and less hesitancy to use the word exile and

to call oneself that, though there is a commensurate sensitivity to Canada's official attitude, which is to encourage immigration for the betterment of Canada. Forming exile communities is not the best way to become integrated into Canadian life. This exile-immigrant contradiction will not be soon resolved. Toronto's newly-formed "Red White & Black," growing out of the Union of American Exiles, now defunct, encompasses the contradictions in an attempt to "bridge the gaps—cultural, social, economic, organizational, educational, political—between the expatriate and the exile, the idea and the act, the old involvements with the crisis in the U.S. and the new involvements with Canadian life." This ambivalence, stemming from the resister-deserter having been an organizer, a radical, in the U.S. out of love of country, and now having to become a good Canadian concerned with Canada, appears in print in *Am Ex* (American Exile), an exile magazine published independently every month in Toronto. In Montreal, the American Deserters' Committee makes room for young men who never intend to return to the U.S., and also for those who still look south. The ADC sends its materials south through ties with the coffee house projects and the GI press, and encourages GI resistance within the army, with Canada as an option when a soldier faces either the stockade or Vietnam.

Unity comes on the question of amnesty. No one wants it, though reasons for disparaging the idea differ. Individuals and groups concerned primarily with bringing the young refugees into Canadian life, making sure they are an asset and not a political liability, know that to discuss amnesty or work for it is to impinge on the welcome here—"What? Isn't Canada good enough for you?"—and to psychologically disorient the newcomer, distracting him from taking Canada and his new life seriously. These groups know that there has never been an amnesty in the U.S. Likewise, the politicized, the radicals who do want to go back, or who think of themselves only as temporary residents, are insulted by the very discussion of amnesty, as Rep. Edward Koch was surprised to discover during his visit here last fall. The analogy to Nazi Germany is drawn: Willy Brandt didn't ask for, nor would have accepted, amnesty from the Third Reich, and yet his civil rights as a German citizen were eventually restored as were those of thousands of others. Amnesty implies guilt, they say, and they do not feel guilty.

LEGAL ASPECTS OF INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently one of this country's outstanding regulators, Judge Whitney Gilliland, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, addressed the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council on the legal aspects of intermodal transportation. He has outlined the CAB's power and views on this important subject. I insert Judge Gilliland's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY WHITNEY GILLILAND

I welcome this opportunity to appear here today since the Board, like this group, is highly sympathetic toward finding improved ways to facilitate intermodal transportation.

As I understand the invitation, members of the three regulatory commissions have been asked to present "a view of the National

Transportation Policy respectively of the agencies as it is determined by statute, custom, administrative decisions, court decisions, and otherwise." The Declaration of Policy to be found at section 102 of the Federal Aviation Act is in most respects similar to the National Transportation Policy which governs the Interstate Commerce Commission, but unlike that policy it does not specifically direct fair and impartial treatment for competing modes. It does not forbid it either. It simply says nothing about it. However, it does direct the Board to bend its efforts towards encouraging and developing an air transportation system adapted to our national needs. Indeed, the strength of the promotional language is such as to render it unique among transportation regulatory statutes.

Nevertheless, the Board has always regarded the development of an appropriate air transportation system as embracing efforts to increase intermodal transportation of freight by surface and air. Our reasoning has been that the full promise of air cargo can be achieved only by facilitating the movement of freight between transportation modes. Cargo cannot make a complete journey from the door of the shipper to the door of the consignee by air.

On the other hand, international aviation is inherently free of many of the impediments applicable to intermodal surface transportation. I understand that, if a shipment travels by surface between an inland U.S. city like Denver and a foreign port like Rotterdam, it will be transported by land and water carriers which are regulated by separate agencies and which may be subject to separate schemes of liability, documentation, and rate-making. Aviation is obviously different: today's jet aircraft can carry cargo nonstop from Denver to Rotterdam in a matter of hours. Both airlines and air freight forwarders can thus provide shipper-to-consignee international freight service at single-factor rates, with simplified shipping documentation, and with single-carrier liability.

Board-authorized "air transportation" typically includes not only airport-to-airport line-haul but also extensive pickup and delivery services. Although both truckers and airlines combine to provide this transportation, the typical "intermodal" problems are not present. This is because Congress sought to avoid a jurisdictional conflict by exempting from ICC regulation motor transportation "incidental to transportation by aircraft,"¹ while requiring air carriers to file with the Board all rates and charges "in connection with . . . air transportation."² The Board's regulations allow air carriers to file tariffs covering pickup and delivery services to any place within a 25-mile radius of the airport or the city limits. In addition, the Board adopted a 1964 regulation which allows carriers to ask for permission to file tariffs covering pickup and delivery services beyond the 25-mile zone.³ Air freight forwarders in 14 airport cities have filed tariffs for pickup and delivery services to communities located up to 68 miles beyond the airport cities. Since these pickup and delivery services are provided by air carriers, they can be offered at single-factor rates, under single bills of lading, and with single-carrier liability.

For service beyond the pickup and delivery areas, the Federal Aviation Act (section 1003) allows airlines and surface common carriers to establish through service and joint rates. In the case of common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, the airlines and ICC-regulated carriers must file their rates with their respective commissions, which have jurisdiction over the rates through a joint regulatory board. Under this statutory mechanism, airlines and truckers offer coordinated truck-air

transportation to 3329 communities located away from our major airport cities.

In addition, the Board has exercised its licensing powers in a manner designed to encourage intermodal transportation. For many years, the Board has freely authorized surface forwarders and regional motor carriers to become air freight forwarders. More recently, the Board has begun permitting long-haul motor carriers to become air freight forwarders on an experimental basis.⁴ And the Board has also permitted common control of air freight forwarders and ocean carriers.

This is not to say that the Board has unfettered discretion to endorse everything which may promote intermodal transportation. There are, for example, statutory inhibitions on the Board's power to license a single transportation company operating both aircraft and surface vehicles or vessels. When Congress enacted the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, it followed the pattern of the Motor Carrier Act by precluding a surface carrier from acquiring an air carrier unless the surface carrier shows that it can use aircraft to public advantage in its operations.⁵ The Board has recognized that this statutory provision controls where a surface carrier seeks to "acquire" a direct carrier; and the Board has applied what it deemed to be the provision's policy where a surface carrier requests a license to operate its own aircraft. Following this line of reasoning, a Board examiner recently ruled that U.S. Steel Corporation, because of its affiliation with railroad common carriers, should not be allowed to acquire Johnson Flying Service, a direct air carrier.⁶

It is to be noted that the statute does not in terms preclude a surface carrier from entering air transportation by means other than acquisition of an air carrier, nor forbid the acquisition of a surface carrier by an air carrier, although such transactions require submission to the Board and must meet public interest tests. After a substantial early period of internal dispute, the Board settled to a position based on the context and history of the Act. This is, in substance, that the policy of the Act precludes approval where significant conflicting interests adversely affecting air transportation may be present.⁷ Accordingly, it has been the practice of the Board to deny applications of surface carriers for licenses to enter direct air transportation, and likewise to deny air carrier applications for approval of surface carrier acquisition, except in limited cases where it appears that prospects of meaningful competition between modes are slender and conflicts of interest remote.

The Board has two cases presently before it in which this long-standing doctrine, or its limitations, may again be put to the test. In the first of these,⁸ Overseas National Airways, Inc., a supplemental carrier, proposes to create a wholly-owned foreign subsidiary which, in turn, will own and operate a passenger cruise vessel. The applicant sought a disclaimer of jurisdiction or, alternatively, approval. The examiner denied relief on conflict of interest grounds and the case is now before the Board for review.

In the second of these,⁹ Trans World Airlines, Inc., proposes the acquisition by a majority-owned TWA subsidiary of two corporations operating cruise vessels. It likewise seeks disclaimer of jurisdiction or, alternatively, approval. This case is in its preliminary stages.

Another limitation on the Board is the statutory prohibition against air freight forwarders filing joint rates with ICC-regulated motor carriers. The 1968 "Trade Simplification Bill," which the Department of Transportation sponsored, proposed to eliminate this limitation; and the Board supported that legislation. Indeed, the Board has consistently joined with other agencies to support legislation (such as the tripartite joint

board proposals and the "trade simplification" bills) aimed at improving the existing system.

I am aware that some persons concerned with existing impediments to intermodal transportation have suggested that the only solution is to merge the CAB, the ICC, and the FMC into a single independent transportation agency or into the Department of Transportation. Whatever the pros and cons of such a proposal, and there are obviously several of each, I believe experience has demonstrated that many intermodal problems may be solved or lessened under the present regime, particularly by cooperative effort, and that each of the agencies concerned has a most important responsibility to devote continuing and assiduous attention to them. First, the agencies can act within existing law to develop compatible regulatory schemes covering intermodal transportation. To illustrate, when the Board adopted its 1964 regulation covering extended pickup and delivery areas, it did so pursuant to consultation with ICC. There is no reason why similar consultations between the agencies cannot produce similar accommodations, including a single set of simplified tariff rules and regulations. Second, although statutory restrictions obviously cannot be resolved by interagency consultations, the agencies can jointly sponsor specific remedial legislation such as the Trade Simplification Act, above referred to.

Finally, it would appear that one of the best ways to eliminate many of the impediments to coordinated international transportation may be through international agreements. In the aviation industry, the Warsaw Convention has imposed a unified system of carrier liabilities, and the air carriers have thus been able to use a standardized air waybill. I am told that the European nations have proposed a draft Combined Transportation Convention which would govern intermodal transportation and which would establish rules of documentation and of liability. Although I also understand that the draft convention requires revision, an international agreement in this area would be a major step forward.

It is, of course, not possible to foresee at this point whether a measure to establish a single transportation regulatory agency will be adopted or even seriously proposed. Furthermore, it is not possible to anticipate the structure of such an agency, or whether its capabilities might be greater or less than those enjoyed by the existing agencies. However any of those questions might be answered, it is clear that there are in fact many capabilities to facilitate intermodal transportation within the existing regime which have proven fruitful when exercised, offer potentials for future use, and should continue to be exploited aggressively until and unless better means are found.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Interstate Commerce Act, Part II, § 203 (b) (7).

² Federal Aviation Act § 403 (a).

³ *Law Motor Freight, Inc. v. CAB*, 364 F. 2d 139 (1 Cir. 1966); *National Motor Freight Traffic Assoc., Inc. v. CAB*, 374 F. 2d 266 (D.C. Cir. 1966). Certiorari was denied in both cases on May 15, 1967, 387 U.S. 905.

⁴ *ABC Air Freight Co., Inc., et al. v. CAB*, 419 F. 2d 154 (2 Cir. 1969), cert. denied. — U.S. — (March 30, 1970).

⁵ Federal Aviation Act § 408 (b).

⁶ *Harilee Branch Jr., et al. and United States Steel Corporation*, Docket 20946, et al.

⁷ *American Export Lines—American Export Airlines*, 3 CAB 619 (1942); *4 CAB 104* (1943); *Pan American Airways Co. v. CAB*, 121 F. 2d 810 (1941); *Air Freight Forwarder Case*, 9 CAB 473 (1948); *Pacific Air Freight*, 17 CAB 561 (1953); *Modern Air Transport*, 32 CAB 137 (1960).

⁸ Docket 21047.

⁹ Docket 22136.

THE LATE JEAN HOXIE

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, my hometown, Hamtramck, Mich., has long been a major city in the tennis map of the world.

The major reason for this eminence was one remarkable woman, Mrs. Jean Hoxie, who taught tennis—and character—to thousands of Hamtramck youngsters and to famous persons at home and abroad.

A few days ago, Mrs. Hoxie died in a tragic accident. She was my friend and I would like to have her remembered by this Nation, for which she did so much. Accordingly, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I set forth below a series of articles describing more fully Mrs. Hoxie's extraordinary record and extraordinary personality:

[From the Detroit Free Press, May 8, 1970]

SHE TAUGHT PERFECTION

She was a tough girl, Jean Hoxie, but you knew the reason she was such a stern coach was because she loved her young people so much she couldn't stand their being second-rate.

So she drove them hard, by the thousands, keeping them banging at the wall hour after hour. If their tennis balls were worn and their old rackets loose in the strings it didn't matter. They would just be better when they acquired decent equipment.

And first-rate they became, making Hamtramck somewhat the tennis capital of the world. Tennis coaching is an unlikely field for somebody to gain international prominence in, but Mrs. Hoxie made it and was just as non-nonsense with Gen. Franco as she was with the east side kids who worshipped her.

She spent most of her 72 years urging her students in pursuit of perfection. They sweated and complained but a lot of them became champions and the rest are very hard to beat. They'll never forget her.

[From the Detroit Free Press, May 7, 1970]

BRASH JEAN HOXIE—SHE WAS BEAUTIFUL

(By George Puscas)

Jean Hoxie is dead. A thousand men who believed they were her one special man, mourn.

She was the most loved woman this town had seen in her time.

She was short and stout with a face weathered by 71 years of summer sun. She had a voice loud and gravelly and a manner brash and demanding.

She was beautiful.

She had nestled in her palm, men like Bill Ford, George Romney, Ralph McIlvenny and Soapy Williams, and countless others who reacted to her whim.

You had to wonder why.

She was frequently outrageous. She would stroll noisily into the sports department here, plant a kiss on my cheek, announce that her tennis kids were upstairs getting their picture taken.

"I'm leaving for South America in two days," she would say, "so make sure the picture is in the paper tonight. I want to take the clipping with me."

She got away with it. Invariably.

She was an out-and-out tennis huckster. No game has known a better one. She taught her game, preached it, sold it.

But she was something more.

She was salvaging people long before sociologists thought it might be a fine idea. She was Old World discipline with a hard-as-a-hammer exterior and a marshmallow heart.

That's why the guys all loved her. The girls, many of them, were not always so sure.

Memorial Park in Hamtramck sits alongside Jos. Campau in an area that once was rat-a-tat-tat and booze and broads. It was that way when Jean arrived in the 1930s.

Occasionally, she'd tell about it.

"There's nothing fancy about this neighborhood now," she'd say. "But in those days, it was much worse. Kids were hungry and aimless, and so were their parents."

"It all seems so simple now. But remember, in those days and in that area, kids were embarrassed to be seen with a tennis racquet in their hands."

"I won them over by collaring the gang leaders and forcing them to play against my kids. When they say how futile they were, they'd lay off. Some of them even joined us. They know who they are."

Over the years, the Hoxie Hamtramck tennis crew won more than 100 national championships. There was nothing mystical about her technique. It was simply work. Work until the feet blistered, the hands puffed, the mind dulled. Hour and hour, days on end, through winter and summer.

There were kids who played for Jean and her husband, Jerry, who died two years ago, who swear they hated her. Now, having moved through college or into Hoxie-promoted jobs, they say they owe whatever they are to her.

I remember sitting with Peaches Bartkovic in a restaurant across from Memorial Park several years ago. I'd taken Peaches there because Mrs. Hoxie always interrupted her kids' conversations, making sure they'd say the right thing.

"You practice six hours a day every day," I said to Peaches. "Doesn't a 17-year-old girl occasionally think about boys?"

From behind me, came the Hoxie voice.

"She's got plenty of boys right here to play tennis with," said Jean. "She can date when she's 25."

Not surprisingly, perhaps, most of the girls who once rose to prominence at Hamtramck drifted away from the game after graduation. It's a bit different with the Hoxie men, who remain devoted, and grow more appreciative with the passing years.

Ted Jax, once a Hoxie teen great, was in tears Wednesday morning when we came off the courts at Bloomfield Tennis House. He'd just heard the news of Mrs. Hoxie's death.

"Do you people ever make mistakes on things like this?" he asked, almost pleading. Jax had kidded in the past about Jean and her ways.

"She's really something," he said. "She calls up and tells me there is something I absolutely have to do. Right away. I tell her I'm busy, I have lessons to teach and other plans."

"She always comes on with that line, 'Other people did it for you once and don't you forget it.' I know they did, so I do it. I know I wouldn't be where I am now without her."

The little guys and dolls, the seven- and eight-year-olds, had a special adoration for Jean.

She'd line them up in her office to inspect their hands and faces and then demand her nickel-a-week payment.

"That nickel really works," she said. "At the end of the summer, the racquet is theirs. One dollar for a 20-dollar racquet. But the nickel makes them aware that they have something at stake. So they don't miss a practice."

When the collection was done, the line began anew, each kissing Mrs. Hoxie goodbye for the day.

She never had children of her own, though her home on the riverfront almost always is

occupied by a dozen or more boarding youngsters.

She never really regretted the lack of a personal family.

"Have you ever noticed," she told me once, "how closely attached young boys are to their high school coaches?"

"Most coaches are closer to the kids than the fathers and mothers. It stays that way for years afterward."

"I've had a thousand kids of my own."

A thousand and more of her special ones mourn.

[From the Detroit News, May 6, 1970]

COACH JEAN HOXIE KILLED—RUN OVER BY OWN CAR

(By Joe Dowdall)

Jean Hoxie, Michigan's internationally famous tennis teacher, was killed in Midland today by a stroke or heart attack which caused her to be run over by her own auto.

Mrs. Hoxie, 71, was the surviving member of the team of Jean and Jerry Hoxie—a coaching combination which taught royalty, made champions of youngsters and put Hamtramck on the world tennis map.

She was backing her car out of the driveway at her Midland home, en route to a tennis class at Northwood Institute, when she was stricken.

The attack, termed a "circulatory spell" by Dr. Donald J. Cline, the Midland County deputy medical examiner, caused Mrs. Hoxie to fall from her moving car.

The car, according to witnesses, continued backing in a tight circle and ran over Mrs. Hoxie before Dean Stellas, a sophomore from Glenview, Ill., was able to stop the car after it had hit a parked station wagon.

Mrs. Hoxie had helped more than 300 youngsters to national and international tennis championships with her tireless energy and driving and forceful teaching methods.

In recent months she had been the tennis coach of Northwood Institute, where the tennis field house was named for her.

Mrs. Hoxie's most recent tennis protegee was Peaches Bartkovic, a 20-year-old Hamtramck girl who has the famed Wimbledon championship among her crowns.

Mrs. Hoxie met her late husband, Jerry, on the tennis court in 1925 and together they formed the most successful of husband-wife coaching teams. He died in 1967 at 65.

Wealth or poverty meant little to the Hoxies.

"Start 'em young and keep them interested in the game is the way to develop champions," the gruff but kind Mrs. Hoxie used to say when asked the secret of her success with youngsters.

"All it takes is for a kid to have a tennis-racket and a ball and the determination to stay with it. I'll take them to the wall of an alley garage or to the wall of one of the finest tennis houses and have them hit and hit and hit the ball."

"A wall is the best teacher. You work at it until you know exactly what you, the racket and the ball are going to do every time. Then you play someone else."

This was the method Mrs. Hoxie used on Fred Kovaleski, who was to become her first player of national stature. Other top-flight players who followed were Allen Hetzeck, Ted Jax, Ken Angyal, Ray Senkowski and Chuck Brainard.

Elaine Lewicki and June Slack, preceded Miss Bartkovic as Mrs. Hoxie's girl champion.

In the early 30's and the 40's, Mrs. Hoxie led Hamtramck High School netters to 15 state championships in 16 years. She coached at Hamtramck High and in the city's recreation program for 30 years.

Her fame took Mrs. Hoxie on 22 trips around the world. She taught King Paul of Greece, two daughters of Queen Juliana of the Netherlands, the nephew of the late King

Farouk of Egypt, the Crown Prince and Princess of Japan and, more recently, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis.

Yet she treated her pupils alike, either at an exclusive tennis club or on the playgrounds of Hamtramck. She had the driving force of a Marine Corps drill sergeant.

"Discipline, that's what make champions," Mrs. Hoxie said. "I'm not a Mrs. Hitler, but you got to impregnate winning."

Mrs. Hoxie insisted that all her pupils practice long hours daily. "If it rains, practice inside somewhere. If it's hot, practice harder. Then you'll be ready to play when you have to in a match and the weather won't affect you as much."

Yet after a tireless session dictated from her throne on a wooden bench overlooking the courts, Mrs. Hoxie would gently wipe the sweat from one of her youngsters and softly praise the child's improvements.

"I work all my pupils hard," Mrs. Hoxie once said. "But out of every 100 students you get one champion—and 99 good players. I'm a fundamentalist and I teach and insist that all my players be fundamentalists."

She had no peer as a tennis coach of youngsters. Only Mrs. Hoxie knew how many championships her proteges had won.

Mrs. Hoxie was named to the Michigan Hall of Fame in 1966 and was honored as the Sportswoman of the Year in 1969 by the United Foundation. She had enough "testimonial dinners" alone to keep a normal person on the run.

"The older I get, the more I enjoy living," was her creed right up to her final moment, a moment spent en route to teach tennis to another crop of youngsters.

Mrs. Hoxie's body will be brought to Detroit by the William R. Hamilton Funeral Home. It will handle the arrangements, which are still incomplete.

HOXIE'S "CHILDREN": ROMNEY'S YOUNGSTERS
(By Curt Sylvester)

Jean Hoxie coached tennis over most of the world. She coached royalty and she coached the kids on the playgrounds of Hamtramck.

None of them forgot her. Some of them loved her. A few disliked her. But all of them respected her and her death Wednesday brought shock to all of them.

"I'm greatly shocked at Jean Hoxie's tragic untimely death" said former Michigan governor George Romney now the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

"It is regrettable that young people will miss her inspiration as an unequalled instructor in the sport she loved and her great qualities as a human being.

"In addition Jean was a dedicated American and a great asset to Detroit, Michigan, and the country. Our whole family mourns her loss."

Both the former governor and his wife, Lenore, had taken instruction from the lively little woman who put Hamtramck on the world tennis map.

Detroit Lions' owner William Clay Ford was another of the Hoxie students who was jolted by her death.

"I'm really shocked," said Ford. "She called me yesterday (Tuesday) to invite me as her guest to the Hall of Fame banquet next week. She was a grand woman."

"I've known her for 30 or 35 years," said Ford. "She taught me and both of my daughters. I used to go with her to the National Juniors and other tournaments."

Ralph McElvenny, president of the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., has been a booster of the Hoxie tennis program for 20 years.

"She's one of the great sports figures in America," said McElvenny. "She was a friend of American presidents and of the Khrushchevs."

"She was a great leader of young people. She did a tremendous amount of good be-

cause all of her 'children' were not only fine tennis players—they were good citizens. Their court manners were perfect and they were always clean . . . not like a lot of tennis players that are spoiled brats."

Although Mrs. Hoxie was known and loved by the Romneys and the Fords, she was probably best known by the youngsters she taught on the playgrounds, where she turned out one great player after another.

Ray Senkowski, a former Wimbledon player, a two-time All-American at Michigan and now the pro at Franklin Racquet Club, was one of her favorite pupils.

"People could not help but respect the kind of dedication she had for the causes she believed in," said Senkowski. "And, what she was doing was, through tennis, building character in the young people she dealt with."

"She and her husband never had any children of their own," Senkowski added. "All of us were her children . . . the hundreds of children that grew up in Hamtramck felt they were our second parents."

"He was a real student of the game and she was the finest fundamentalist—getting young kids started—in teaching tennis in the United States. She generated enthusiasm and interest."

Another of her students was Ken Angyal, a former Notre Dame star, former pro at the Lakeshore Tennis House and now an English instructor at Wayne State University.

Mrs. Hoxie's demand for perfection didn't always make her proteges love her, according to Angyal.

"I wouldn't say, except for some rare cases, it was love," said Angyal. "But it was family loyalty. She didn't especially care if a kid had great ability. As long as you'd come back she'd take you."

Angyal recalled fondly how he met Mrs. Hoxie some 25 years ago, the way in which she probably "hooked" most of her tennis pupils.

"I just lived next door to the park and went out to play one day," Angyal remembered. "This crazy lady started bossing me around and I went back every day—she just got me hooked on it."

"I think most of the kids will tell you she was more like a mother than a coach."

MRS. HOXIE'S LAST PLANS—ARRANGED OWN RITES

(By George E. Van)

Jean Hoxie would have been pleased by the tribute given by Arthur Turner, president at Northwood Institute, of Midland, at the final services for the great Hamtramck tennis teacher yesterday.

The final rites were just as she had arranged them. Her life as a perfectionist was extended after death.

More than 350 persons jammed the William R. Hamilton Funeral Home on Cass Avenue. They were there because they had known Mrs. Hoxie's compelling influence and personality.

People like William Clay Ford, who had worked with Mrs. Hoxie on programs to help the young idea in tennis. She also taught Ford youngsters.

And she also taught Semon Knudsen's children, and he was there, along with G. Mennen Williams, Jerry Cavanagh, Nick Kerbaw and a veritable who's who of the Detroit area's tennis great and tennis small for the last 40 years.

Turner had been requested to "handle my sendoff" by Mrs. Hoxie and a moving tribute it was. The request also included that the 12 stalwart palbearers be from Northwood. And some of these had been among her tennis proteges at Hamtramck High School.

"Jean became a tradition in her own lifetime," said Turner. "She taught that play is work and worked at it. She left a legacy

of integrity, honesty and pride in everything one does. . . . She was a builder of champions."

"A racquet, a ball and a wall." That was Mrs. Hoxie's oft-repeated basic teaching tenet that served as a cornerstone of a career that made her famous internationally.

And her proteges hit the ball back forever in a never-ending routine of shots.

"It was a hard discipline but one that produced champions," said Henry Collins, Hamtramck High School principal and a lifelong friend of Mrs. Hoxie.

Most of those who knew that discipline and profited thereby were in the chapel. Some were too far away to make it. One of her greatest, Fred Kovaleski, now lives in Australia. Peaches Bartkovicz, now an internationalist, was in the south of France.

But Peaches' young sister, Plums, was there. So were many other players who made Mrs. Hoxie a living legend, stars like Ed Roszak, June Stack, Walter English, Al Hetzek, Ed Angyal, Esther Poltizer, John Wagner, John Reindel, Ray Senkowski, Del Russel and Jack Cornish.

There is a line from a Roman philosopher that fits Jean Hoxie.

"Not only is there an art in knowing a thing, but also a certain art in teaching it."

MANPOWER TRAINING

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, Mr. Gordon Nesvig, the personnel director of Los Angeles County, representing the National Association of Counties, testified before the House Select Subcommittee on Labor on the various manpower training bills before that committee. His testimony called for a reorganization of manpower training programs to provide decentralized administration and more flexible funding. He also stressed the need for a larger role for county officials in the planning, coordination, and implementation of manpower programs, especially because of the development of so many new programs throughout an existing patchwork of agencies.

In summarizing his testimony, Mr. Nesvig pointed to specific principles that should be incorporated in any reform manpower bill. His major recommendations included: First, a guaranteed job after training; second, local control, determination of an area prime sponsor to be made by the area's elected officials so that the program can focus on total area-wide needs; third, automatic pass-through of funds for all metropolitan areas; fourth, specific emphasis on public service employment; fifth, 1-year advance appropriations; sixth, 4-year authorizations, with specific figures written into the legislation—at the very least 2-year authorizations; seventh, elimination of categorical programs and assigned slots; eighth, automatic increase of funds when unemployment reaches a certain level; ninth, control by the Governor of all State-administered manpower programs; and 10th, a simplified payment plan for enrollees in any program.

Mr. Nesvig's testimony follows:

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES BY MR. GORDON NESVIG, DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIF., BEFORE THE HOUSE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, my name is Gordon Nesvig, and I am Director of Personnel for Los Angeles County, California. I am here today representing the National Association of Counties and its 21,000 members in support of H.R. 13472, the Manpower Training Act of 1969. In addition to my prepared statement, which I would like to submit for the record, I would like to share with the Subcommittee some of our general opinions and local experiences in dealing with the myriad of Manpower programs that, because of their fragmented and uncoordinated nature, have failed to make an impressive dent in local unemployment levels.

Manpower training and development—that name we have created to round up a vast array of programs and concepts—is inextricably linked with such other equally broad fields as welfare and unemployment. We have separated these huge problems from each other merely to look at them in manageable places, but we must never forget that they are greatly intertwined. On the other hand, we cannot allow the vastness of the whole problem, which we might call poverty, to overwhelm us and thereby keep us from doing anything at all to overcome it.

The report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders recognized the crucial implications of unemployment for public economic policy. In the words of this report: "Unemployment and underemployment are among the most persistent and serious grievances of our disadvantaged minorities. The pervasive effect of these conditions on the racial ghetto is inextricably linked to the problem of civil disorders." On the local level, we are well aware of the problems of the poor, the economically and socially disenfranchised, the unemployed, and the underemployed. They beseech us daily for services and assistance. Yet, it seems that every time the Federal government has looked into the unemployment and manpower problems facing all of us, it managed to create dozens of manpower programs with different requirements, techniques, aims and rewards—and each responsible to different federal agencies, funded from different sources, and administered by every type of public or private agency we could manufacture. It appears that every time we saw a problem, we created a new program which was supposed to handle it, without regard for existing programs or consideration for the new program's ability to fill the newly observed need.

In an attempt to deal with this excessive proliferation of categorical programs, duplicative administrative systems and an over-centralized and uncoordinated manpower programs system, the Administration has proposed a comprehensive new Manpower Training Act. As set forth in H.R. 13472, this Act would:

- (1) "consolidate major manpower development programs;
- (2) "provide flexible funding; and
- (3) "decentralize administration of manpower services to states and metropolitan areas."

The National Association of Counties strongly endorses these basic principles of Manpower Reform.

Faced, the way we are, on the local level with providing services for an ever-expanding community need, we too have been looking for ways of making manpower programs meet the needs of our citizens in ameliorating their personal plight, and in strengthening the basic public economy.

The National Association of Counties, meeting recently at their annual Legislative Conference in Washington, D.C., discussed

policy positions relative to any national manpower programs reform. A National Task Force on Manpower presented basic principles of reform that would be necessary to make any manpower program viable. At the top of a list of ten positive principles that any manpower bill should have, was a guaranteed job after training.

Although data are sparse supporting the notion that a "training only" program is the least desirable of all manpower programs, several observations can be made:

(1) Occasionally, programs are initiated for training areas where there are no severe shortages;

(2) Occasionally, prospective employers do not know the existence of such training programs and do not hire the graduates; conversely, the graduates are unable to find employers with jobs;

(3) Frequently, the training is not pertinent to the job requirements of prospective employers, i.e., the training is generic, rather than specific;

(4) Training stipends are considerably lower than reasonable income standards, and people are unable or are loathe to remain in a training program, especially when there is no guarantee of a job at its end;

(5) Training programs without specific jobs create a new kind of person: the "professional program participant," who either voluntarily or involuntarily moves from one program to another, but never to a job.

Juxtaposed against this is the program which insures having a job at its end. Such a program not only provides an inherent enticement to the participant to complete the program, but it provides to the participant a direct means of coping with, and overcoming the "system." The person in a job begins to acquire that valuable commodity known as experience. He acquires both seniority and rights for vacation and other purposes. And, most important of all, he becomes essentially self-sufficient, or is launched in that direction.

The JOBS Program and other programs are beginning to build upon what was learned from earlier manpower programs of various kinds, including, for example, the New Careers Programs. Although the New Careers Programs provided wages for participants (as well as training money), it did not have built into it a guarantee. Administrators were not compelled to find the ways and means of keeping new careerists. Although such guarantees are not yet attached to any manpower program, the fact that some programs urge employers to hire first and train afterwards, is very attractive. Many unknowns are removed, and the process of recruitment for manpower programs is made a little more easy. The "job first" concept insures a somewhat greater return for the manpower dollar.

It is not suggested herein that all programs without job guarantees be terminated. The basic thrust of the argument here is that programs which provide for the immediate or early hiring of participants are very attractive. There are many communities and many situations in which other kinds of programs must be pursued.

Also high on the list of our basic manpower development principles, and a way of solving needs of the first principle, is the need for specific emphasis on public service employment. State and local governments engage in a vast and growing number of activities, ranging from education to air and water pollution control. In 1965, State and local governments spent \$87 billion and employed nearly 7.7 million workers. Over the ten-year period from 1955 to 1965, expenditures rose by \$30 billion, and employment grew by 3 million. In the coming years, state and local governments will be called on to supply even more services. Population growth and rising personal incomes will be partially responsible, along with demands for more urban redevelopment, better fire and police protec-

tion, less crowded schools, and improved medical care and facilities. County government is becoming increasingly important in the furnishing of these services to the people.

There seems to be an increased confidence of the people in the ability of counties to perform functions efficiently, as a result of reorganization and modernization of county structures in many areas. But probably most important is the realization that counties are logical areas for the performance of area-wide functions, resulting in a quite noticeable trend toward transferring functions from smaller units of government. In an attempt to provide an expanding variety of services to the community, county government has felt the strong pressures for manpower development. In the five-year period from 1962 to 1967 alone, the total employees of all the counties in the United States increased 24% as compared to an increase of 15.5% for all the municipalities. If county services are to expand to meet the growing needs, then financial and program support will be essential. Public service employment must be developed in order to allow for job development and improved governmental services at the local level.

Identifiable potential jobs could be created in almost every department of county government to provide and expand the services that counties do not provide now, but are being asked to respond to every day. Los Angeles County's various human services departments could immediately absorb 2,200 New Careerists to be utilized in our service delivery systems. Half of the identified potential jobs would provide services that the County does not provide now. The remainder would be expanding the outreach of services traditionally available from the agencies, but limited because of manpower shortages. These service jobs are not "make work" jobs—rather, they are a response to the crying needs of the community, and I dare say that each of our 3,049 counties could cite similar examples. Gentlemen, the need is there. We would definitely support a major program to create hundreds of thousands of public service employment jobs.

The National Association of Counties has always operated under a basic principle that elected officials with their responsibility to the electors, must control programs within their jurisdiction. Operating from that basic premise, we believe that the determination of an area prime sponsor (as defined in this bill) should be determined by the area's elected officials so that the program can focus on total metropolitan areawide needs. And, in the same light, we believe that state-administered manpower programs should be controlled by the Governor.

As elected officials, you are well aware of the need for programs that are responsive to the needs of the citizens. Responsibility can best be guaranteed through the auspices of elected officials at each level of our federal system. As we explained earlier, county government is increasingly responding to the areawide needs of our citizens. With the continuing out-migration of people and industry to the suburban areas of the nation, it seems logical to conclude that counties will continue to have a large role in the developing and providing of job opportunities for the unemployed city dweller. Statistically, almost half (113) of the 233 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's) are single county jurisdictions. An additional 40 SMSA's are composed of two counties. And, if we are to avoid continued proliferation of programs, then we should turn to the county as a responsive level of government to coordinate areawide manpower program contracts at the local level. If it is a major objective of this bill to decentralize and coordinate manpower programs at the state and local levels, then it is of prime importance to place control in the hands of elected officials. And, specifi-

cally, the determination of an area prime sponsor should be made by the area's elected officials so that the program can focus on the total areawide needs, and be responsive to the community. We also recommend automatic pass-through of funds to metropolitan areas.

Of major concern to all levels of government is realistic planning and evaluation. In order to develop viable programs, we at the local level need built-in advanced planning conditions. Too often we have found ourselves actively engaged in a manpower training program that is meeting the needs of the community, only to have federal funds to that project discontinued and the programs closed short of their promised goals. This type of situation could be averted by providing for multiple year funding so that planning and some continuity can be built into each project.

The National Association of Counties recommends that all Manpower Training programs have one-year advance appropriations and four-year authorizations, with specific figures written into the legislation at the very least for two-year authorizations. Gentlemen, we don't feel that this is an inordinate request. Congress has for years endorsed advanced planning concepts in various building programs; it is time that we systematically plan programs for people with at least the same type of advance guarantee.

The concept of automatic increases of funds when unemployment reaches a certain level would strengthen the ability of all manpower programs to meet the continually changing needs of the community.

It is also important that we avoid developing National programs that all local communities must fit their needs to. This could be avoided by the elimination of categorical programs and assigned slots. Every community's needs are different. This national program should allow for innovative programs on the local level.

Let us not simply mandate a national program, but allow for the exploration of innovative concepts beyond strict categorical projects.

And finally, our Association recommends that a simplified payment plan be established for enrollees in any program. This would relieve added administrative problems and make manpower programs more responsive to needs of the enrollees. This would also cut down on the present tendency for enrollees to shop around from one program to another, in order to receive better benefits, rather than the appropriate training.

Next, let me cite more specific conditions and concerns within my own county.

Within the past 30 years the cost of governing Los Angeles County has soared from \$94,333,218 to \$1,771,142,559, larger than most States' budgets. Well over one billion dollars of that increase occurred in the last decade. Our primary source of revenue is the Real Estate Tax, now close to \$10 per \$100 assessed valuation.

If county services are to expand to meet the growing needs, financial support will be essential.

Although the Federal manpower commitment has grown from approximately \$50 million in first year appropriations for the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to about \$2.5 billion in Federal manpower legislation only eight years later, a substantial reduction in unemployment and underemployment and concomitant poverty depends to a considerable extent upon more adequate manpower policy and programs.

During this period in which the Federal Government has increased by 50 times the financial resources devoted to manpower development, we have seen very little improvement on the local level. As a matter of fact, since we began participating in manpower

training programs in 1965, the size of the programs funded locally has actually diminished.

Just a few months ago, one of our work experience programs was closed down completely. The program had some operational problems, but we worked them out. We developed a modified program design working cooperatively with our local Community Action Agency people. But the Labor Department said there were no funds and the program would have to be cut. We got local approval to resubmit it, but even though everyone locally thinks it looks good the Labor Department is crying poverty. Somebody ought to tell them how they can get hold of some of that two and one-half billion dollars. We only need one ten-thousandth of it for this project.

Our experience with Federal manpower programs to date has resulted in much frustration and has pointed out major inadequacies in the administration of the Federal manpower program.

As a matter of fact, there is no Federal manpower program. There are bits and pieces of a program which are administered by several departments; OEO, LABOR, HEW, HUD, DEFENSE, and perhaps others that we don't even know of. The program is further fragmented among various bureaus within these departments.

There seems to be little coordination of Federal agencies' funding, even when funds are available from different bureaus within the same department. Duplicate projects are funded, State and local agencies are circumvented, and programs proliferate without a cohesive design. This leads to ineffective use of resources and limited capability to establish information and evaluation systems for future planning.

When Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz testified before the House Committee on Education and Labor last month, he stated that the proposed Manpower Training Act of 1969 was a proposal for comprehensive manpower legislation which would "break new ground by creating a new framework for a constructive partnership between Federal, State and local governments in the spirit of New Federalism."

Supporters of the present State vocational education system immediately expressed concern that the bill did not include sufficient assurances that vocational education would be given preferential status in providing skill training and, further, that the bill could interfere with the independent status of State vocational education systems.

It is this kind of provincialism at the Federal level which makes it impossible for us to coordinate programs at the local level. When we first read the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, we were impressed with their far-reaching implications, and saw potential applications of these new funds which could support our Neighborhood Youth Corps Program and our New Careers Program. The legislature had recognized the need for the development of close, cooperative systems between employers and training institutions, and there was a heavy emphasis on the development of New Careers models.

We attended the State hearings on implementation of the bill and saw that the plan was to keep the money with the Vocational Education people. We expressed an interest in participation but got no response. We were told we would be contacted when the guidelines were completed.

On December 23, 1969, we learned through a magazine article that the guidelines had been out for some time and that the deadline for submitting proposals for experimental programs under Part D of the VEA of 1968 was January 1, 1970. We sent a telegram to the U.S. Office of Education that day requesting a copy of the guidelines and an extension of the deadline. We received a call from Washington on December 29, 1969

informing us that the guidelines were on the way but that there could be no extension on the January 1, 1970 deadline.

This may point out a related problem. Information flow between Federal, State and local agencies gets delayed, sidetracked and distorted. This is true not only where new programs are involved, but also for established programs.

Local agencies feel shut out of the planning process and are resistant to information demands which they do not fully understand. Federal agencies do not get timely or accurate information on local programs and local needs.

We had a program funded under Title V of the EOA of 1964. We operated the program for about nine months before we saw the guidelines. During the second year, we had to re-vamp the program to meet the guidelines. We just about got through doing this when in the third year the program was cancelled. The program was being coordinated through the State. We sent reams of information to them without understanding their use. We never knew what the State needed, what the Federal Government needed, or whether the information was getting through. We subsequently found out that the program people in Washington did not get accurate information or what was going on.

Our Neighborhood Youth Corps Program offers another example of the need for improved communications. The Labor Department has never really understood the capability of this program. They consistently refer to NYC out-of-school as an aging vat. They have no systematic way of keeping informed on local programs. Locally we see NYC as an innovative tool for engaging youth who have dropped out of the education and employment system. But we have been fighting restrictive guidelines for the last four and one-half years.

We currently have what appears to be the beginning of an effective model for engaging drop-outs and other estranged youth. Basic and remedial education programs are tied to work experience. Youth can explore a variety of worker roles in over twenty-five occupational areas. An in-service group counseling program which is well accepted by the youth helps them to integrate the work and education experience into a cohesive self-development and career planning program.

All NYC work site supervisors participate in a special inservice training program to prepare them to work more effectively with their enrollees. Our success rate seems to be growing from 40% to almost 50%, and we are well on our way to our goal of 75% successes this year.

We learned recently, however, that the Labor Department wants to transfer many of the program functions to the State Employment Service (now a part of the new California Department of Human Resource Development). Apparently Labor knows little of our local efforts and feels it is time to try something new. Locally, the Employment Service has not even demonstrated the capability of reaching disadvantaged youth, let alone counseling them. When the Labor Department cut the age limit for out-of-school NYC youth from 22 to 18, the Employment Service could not fill our program recruitment needs. We had to develop our own recruitment program through our Welfare and Probation Departments. We have learned from our NYC enrollees that the Employment Service does not have a good image or reputation in the disadvantaged community. These youth are discouraged by red-tape and bureaucratic run-around.

Referrals made to us by the Employment Service frequently demonstrate a failure to meet individual applicant needs and abilities. Applicants are encouraged to accept whatever the counselor has a job order for,

even if it is not at all suitable for the individual.

There is an inadequate utilization of available resources, both within the Employment Service itself and within the Community. This is apparent when we try to use the Employment Service as a resource for placement of job ready youth outside of our own employment system. Although this should logically be the role of the Employment Service, we have had to set up our own job development function in order to provide outside employment opportunities for youth in addition to County employment.

Of the various programs we are participating in, our NYC program has been in operation the longest. We are quite proud of the model which has evolved, but it has evolved under the most adverse circumstances. A quick description of these circumstances may give you an understanding of the types of problems which are common to all of our Federally funded Manpower programs.

The one year Federal funding cycle and the delay in passing the appropriations bill has resulted in erratic funding periods. During one fiscal year, the program was renewed five times. This meant the development of five budgets and the negotiation of five contract modifications. In several of these periods slot allocations were changed and new guidelines introduced. This makes it impossible to plan effectively.

As the program grew more successful, the size of the program shrank. We went from an allocation of 1200 trainee slots in 1965 to 199 slots today. The erratic funding periods and concomitant poor planning, coupled with the diminishing program size and uncertain assurance of program continuance made it difficult to maintain staff morale and keep all persons associated with the NYC program motivated toward meeting its goals.

With this climate established, it was hard to cope with conflicting guidelines and frequent changes in program requirements.

The most burdensome changes were in the area of information requirements. Federal information requirements were apparently established prior to availability of specific information or program structure, goals, etc. As Washington learned that the information they were getting did not meet their needs, new demands were made. Much time was lost in the redesign of data collection and processing subsystems. Information requirements usually exceeded the budgeted staff's capability. Important data may not have been documented in the early stages of a program. Inputs were based on rough estimates rather than documented data. During all of this, the strategists in Washington were accumulating data on local programs and concluding that NYC appeared to be nothing more than an aging vat for youth.

Their conclusion amazes us, especially in light of the nature of the data collected. It seems to a great extent the Federal emphasis is on documenting how money is being spent rather than on accumulating information that would be useful in evaluating success with respect to program goals.

In September of 1967, the County of Los Angeles entered into an agreement with the local Community Action Agency to operate a New Careers project which was a part of the Concentrated Employment Program in Los Angeles. We had gained some experience with the New Careers concept using enrollees from our NYC program and enrollees from a local community action project called the Neighborhood Adult Participation Project. We felt that the concept would be as effective as it was creative. After over two years of experience, we now think that New Careers, if viewed as an approach instead of a specific project, has greater implications for improving the responsiveness of government and reducing the problems of poverty than anything else that has come out of the War on Poverty.

New Careers is more than an anti-unemployment measure. It is an approach for meeting projected manpower shortages in human services, while at the same time improving the quality of those services. The idea that persons from the client system can provide useful service to the client system is not new and has been implemented in various settings, including the more popular Alcoholics Anonymous and Synanon. What is new is the idea that this new source of manpower for the human services can be developed through a planned sequence of work experience and training, and that this process can become an alternate route of entry into many professional service occupations. In the process, we establish college accreditation for life experience, specific work experience and in-service training. At the same time, we influence educational institutions to make educational content more relevant to student employment needs, develop a variety of alternate models for dispensing knowledge and evaluating learning processes, tie educational services more closely to learning styles, and develop closer working relationships between education and employment resources.

There is currently concern that large bureaucracies have evolved to a point where they are no longer responsive to the needs of the publics they serve. The January-February, 1969 issue of the Public Administration Review has a symposium on Alienation, Decentralization and Participation. In addition to the need for change in the kinds and quality of services rendered, the articles in this symposium postulate a need for structural change in governmental systems to make them more responsive to the needs of the total constituency.

New Careerists are demonstrating that they can become the change agents for bringing about organizational adjustments. Their sensitivity and first-hand awareness of needs and their intolerance of procedures which put process before purpose enable them to critically evaluate gaps in service and pressure the system internally for the much needed change.

From a personnel management point of view, this approach enables us to make the most effective use of available human resources. It enables us to establish new routes of entry into professional occupations, leading from jobs which can be performed by indigenous community aides to the full professional level. Service objectives and goals must be reassessed. Jobs at all levels need to be re-evaluated and re-designed. Minimum requirements must be tied more realistically to job performance demands. Training needs must be more readily identified and tasks allocated to the lowest level at which they can be effectively performed. At the same time, competing models can be established to determine the cost effectiveness of alternate service delivery systems.

We were glad to see that our legislators in Washington were also aware of the potential of New Careers. As you know, although the Administration had asked for a simple two-year extension of the poverty program, the bill that was approved by the House contained some new provisions added by the House Committee. The Committee Report singled out New Careers and Operation Mainstream as having "experienced an unusually high degree of success and usefulness." These two programs were removed from Title I-B in the bill and given special separate status in a new Part E of Title I. The bill specifically earmarks \$110,000,000 for the programs, double the amount requested by the Administration, with \$50 million going to New Careers and \$60 million to Mainstream.

We'd like, at this point, to touch briefly on some of the highlights of our New Careers experience. In the first place, this experience has enabled us to provide employment and promotion opportunities to the poor, and to make our services more respon-

sive to the need of the poor. More importantly, it has identified new areas of service that the County can get engaged in which could alleviate, and possibly eliminate, many of our burgeoning urban problems. But these services go beyond the revenue resources of the County. Although \$50 million is twice what the Administration asked for on a national level for New Careers, we could use \$10 million of that money in County Government right now to develop 2,000 New Careers jobs. This would include a movement into non-human service occupations as well as expansion in the traditional human service areas of health, medicine, mental health, welfare, probation, law-enforcement, community organization, and human relations, and would require a permanent Federal subsidy which could grow to \$120,000,000 a year and 10,000 jobs by 1975.

Currently, our experimentation in New Careers has focused on the County's traditional human service areas. Limited fiscal resources from the Concentrated Employment Project, and the local Mexican-American Opportunity Foundation programs have thus far only allowed us to test the impact that the introduction of a non-professional service worker will have on a services traditionally provided for by professionals. Even so, the results are encouraging.

The East Los Angeles Child and Youth Clinic was established in 1968 under a grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare for the purpose of developing new ways to provide optimum total health services for children in specified disadvantaged areas and for their families. Though equipped in staff and facility to handle a considerable segment of the immediate neighborhood in the East Los Angeles area, the professional staff at the Clinic anticipated accurately that a problem of first priority would be to establish their presence in the "barrio" and to develop an image as a haven for local families with children that were ill. To solve this problem, the Clinic proposed the introduction of a Community Health Worker as an integral part of their staffing pattern. The function of this worker, or Health Assistant as the title came to be, would be to assist the professional staff to spread the word in the local neighborhood about services available at the Clinic, and to make patients feel comfortable and accepted when they appeared.

Within a few months after a dozen Health Assistants had joined the staff, the Clinic was overwhelmed with new patients. Far more patients, by the way, than their statistical data had led them to believe should have needed their service within the established geographic boundaries. This result has caused the Clinic to consider substantial adjustments in its service approach, including the expansion of its New Careers staff in number and in the areas of service they will provide.

In March of 1967, the Probation Department established the RODEO (Reduction of Delinquency Through Expansion of Opportunity) project. The hypothesis was that juvenile offenders, who would normally be assigned for residence in a probation camp, could, in many cases, be maintained in their own community under special supervision with at least equally successful results and at considerably lower costs to the County. The special conditions of supervision in this case called for a reduction of the caseload of a Probation Officer. It also meant a change from the traditional one-to-one counselling role of the professional to that of a catalyst for the redistribution of community and family resources, in order to provide the ward with maximum support in his readjustment. The professional's traditional role, as the counselor, behavior model and expeditor for the juvenile, to a great extent was reassigned to a responsible, mature, sub-professional adult from the ward's own com-

munity, who demonstrated an ability to provide more realistic behavior goals and to teach the ward how to take advantage of available personal and community resources.

The results after the first year of experimentation in South Central Los Angeles indicated that this approach was successful in all respects. It was determined that in controlling recidivism patterns normally expected of juvenile offenders and in re-establishing the juvenile with the positive institutions in society, school, employment, etc., this approach was more successful than either the camps programs or traditional supervision methods. In rough figures, each juvenile participant in this project represented a dollar savings of \$1200 per year to the County in services provided by the staff when compared to the costs of his residence in a Camp. This was in spite of the fact that the reduction of caseload ratios and attachment of New Careers staff is a substantially more expensive staffing pattern than the department's traditional supervision program.

Probation Department has since then increased its utilization of the "RODEO method", and has introduced New Careerists in various other programs with comparable success.

The Department of Hospitals, has only recently begun participation in New Careers, but indications are that this Department will be among the most enthusiastic participants in this area. At present, New Careerists in our hospitals are being trained to improve the communication and understanding between patient and physician. Physicians who serve in our hospitals, especially "Big General" (Los Angeles County-USC Medical Center, largest General Hospital in the United States, 2377 beds, and trains the majority of physicians in the Southern California area), are beginning to question the specialist system in medicine as that system which affects the care provided residents of disadvantaged areas. Ghetto residents, because of cultural and economic deprivation, view the field of medicine as a resource of the last resort, to be used only in cases of impending death or serious illness or accident. Cast into an enormous, impersonal facility to be served after hours of agonizing waiting by a corps of busy, ever-changing, necessarily curt professionals, they find little motivation to continue participation in their medical care program. Increasing numbers of "no-shows" to follow-up clinics and return of patients to the hospital due to poor after-discharge treatment reflects the little worth that is attached to the service provided by the impersonal specialist after specialist.

New Careerists are being trained as Nurses Aides, Clinic Aides, Pharmacy Aides, etc., primarily responsible for assisting the patient to communicate more accurately and completely the source of their complaints to the doctor. They are valuable to the doctor in explaining after treatment care and motivating the patient to continue on the rehabilitation program by using the idiom and language most effectively understood by the patient. Use of New Careerists has helped uncover a peculiar heart disease characteristic to patients that have immigrated from a specific location in Mexico to Los Angeles. This research, which may lead to a cooperative project between Mexican and American health agencies, was almost impossible to conduct without the New Careerists' help.

A patient who leaves our County Hospital with a chronic or potentially recurrent ailment is rarely followed without his own initiative, outside of an outpatient clinic or when he relapses and returns in an ambulance. The Department of Hospitals is not staffed with follow-up, outreach personnel and yet, this function, or rather the lack of it, is probably a major cause of the overburdening of its in-patient services. The development of a manpower resources, recruited from within the patient population, and

adequately trained, could provide this function and relieve many of the related problems.

The newly arrived residents were reluctant to share their immigration information with professionals because they feared that this would have an adverse effect on their alien status. New Careerists, former aliens themselves, and conversant in immigration laws, were able to alleviate these fears and complete the research.

Sixty percent of the prescriptions issued at the hospital's pharmacies can now be labeled and explained in Spanish as a result of cooperation between a multi-lingual computer and bilingual New Careerists.

The hospitals are facing the critical point in the problem of the shortage of physicians. Medical schools are increasingly unable to graduate enough doctors to fill the enormous need now reflected in the service problems of our facilities. The prospect for improvement of this situation in the traditional way is dim. Medical administrators are seriously considering a comprehensive re-evaluation of the existing roles played by medical and technical staff in hospitals to determine to what extent nonprofessionals, well-trained and seasoned with sound experience, can alleviate this problem.

The Department of Public Social Services is staffed with New Careerists as part of the services function in thirteen districts in the County. Their involvement ranges from being interpreter, assistant counselor and resource agent to assuming in some areas almost total responsibility for serving a full caseload of clients requiring minimum services. The DPSS has demonstrated that a well-trained New Careerist can successfully relieve the professional Social Worker from his inappropriate traditional roles of family and client counselor, housing and employment agent, and budget advisor. This adjustment in roles allows for more profitable utilization of the conceptual skills of the college graduate to deal with the broader problems of relieving the local causes of deprivation. It also results in more extensive and relevant services to the client provided by the New Careerists since the New Careerist himself, often a former client, brings a wealth of experience in the hard techniques of surviving on a welfare budget.

The Department has also seen the value of the New Careerist as a vehicle for more effective communication of the interest of the agency in the welfare of the client. Complaints that used to either go unanswered or were handled by routine response are now more effectively handled personally by the New Careerist, and as a result, fewer appeals are being submitted by frustrated clients.

Based on their positive experiences, the Department, as with most of our New Careers Departments, is able to speculate on the expansive potential that the New Careers concept holds for dramatically decreasing the breach between its long-range service objectives and its ability to meet them with traditional service approaches. Rather than concentrating efforts on remedial welfare services, the department would, with sufficient staff and funds, be able to enter the areas of preventive and rehabilitative welfare services. Already, New Careerists are helping to identify how their unique role can be instrumental in reducing the epidemic of the welfare and poverty cycle. With more support in planning staff and program manpower, the agency could begin to more effectively attack many of the root problems of the disadvantaged.

Homemakers, heretofore assigned to assist with the physical maintenance of a disabled client's home, represent a natural vehicle for the extension of these preventive welfare services in the home. Trained in techniques of home health care, asepsis, employment counseling, budget management, preventive health care, they will be equipped

to identify and deal with idiosyncracies of the welfare family that contribute to their continuance on the welfare rolls. They can provide, in the most effective manner, the kind of positive direction to welfare families that our service professional cannot afford to offer because of their overwhelming workload.

The Probation Department sees the New Careers concept as among the most successful methods of meeting its responsibilities as currently legislated. With the freedom of fully supported research, many of the premises postulated during the RODEO experience could be developed and tested as a basis on which to expand and increase the effectiveness of its services.

The Mental Health Department, faced in this decade with the responsibility of combatting a serious urban malady—emotional illness anticipates that its role as an agency will change from that of a consultant to a provider of service. The immediate focus will be to deal with patients who may be a danger to others or to themselves. But a total and effective assault on the problems of mental health by this department calls for a massive expansion of its area of responsibility. It calls for training hundreds of auxiliary, non-professional technicians to not only be available to deal with persons with a critical need, but also to identify symptoms of impending emotional crises and connect those persons with the appropriate resources to secure professional treatment.

Our recreation and parks establishment recognizes the critical role it must play more aggressively to solve the problems of the cities. Youth, whose contact with the establishment is marginal, the potential delinquent or school dropout, needs recreational activities designed especially for him. Los Angeles, already crippled with the least amount of park area per capita of any city in the nation is unable, because of the budget limitations, to make maximum use of the park and recreation areas available with imaginative and non-traditional experimentation, plus the wherewithal to buy the public service manpower needed to implement these approaches. The Department of Parks and Recreation, as with all our human service departments, could begin to meaningfully utilize the available manpower in our disadvantaged communities in an earnest effort to eradicate the ills of our country.

Although we see a great deal of promise in New Careers and have met with some short-run successes, this program, like NYC, has been plagued with problems created by poor Federal administration.

Over the past few years, we have developed 450 permanent New Careers jobs in County departmental budgets. This has enabled us to hire over 90 percent of our program graduates. Since continued participation requires the commitment of local funds as well as increased Federal revenues, it is necessary that the hypotheses regarding program benefits be systematically assessed, and that the social and economic effects be carefully weighed so that priorities for the allocation of available funds can reasonably be set.

How can this be accomplished with sporadic funding cycles, program extensions of two to three months, no planning money, no evaluation money, no technical assistance, poor communications through a multitude of levels in the Federal system as well as the State and local prime sponsor?

From the onset, we contended that New Careers was an inappropriate program for funding through CEP. A portion of the available overhead was siphoned off to support elaborate job development and referral systems which were not required in New Careers. The user agency hires all of the trainees. All resources should be available to the public employer as they are to the private employer in MA-5 contracts in the JOBS Program.

The CEP boundaries cause restrictive restraints to program expansion. Participating departments want to hire indigenous aides from other poverty neighborhoods which they serve. Our Model Neighborhood staff is required by HUD to use residents of the Model Neighborhood. The CEP boundaries are contiguous with, but do not overlap, our Model Neighborhood boundaries. Federal guidelines indicate that CEP boundaries can be expanded to include Model Neighborhoods but Labor says we have to work through the local Sponsor and the local Sponsor says the guidelines won't permit it.

There is talk at the Federal level of improved coordination and communications, and improved program linkages. The elaborate time-consuming systems which have been worked out for coordination appear to require more effort than a simple call to an operating agency to identify program progress and needs. The only reward evident in these systems is that they shelter the program funders in Washington from the critical review and analysis of local program operators.

In the midst of all of our coordination locally, we have been unable to get our Manpower Director invited to the local CAMPS group.

NYC youth who complete their stay in the program and who demonstrate capability for New Careers training cannot be referred to our New Careers Program because they generally do not live in the CEP target area.

The cutback in age limit from 22 to 18 on the NYC out-of-school program leaves us with limited programming capability to accommodate 18 to 22 year olds. The Federal programs which were to fill the gap are not yet operational.

An NYC youth who has completed his stay and is not yet job ready must be referred back to the State Employment Service. Even if an additional few months might prepare him for a permanent job with the County, program time limits require termination. So youth are referred back to the Employment Service where they are re-routed and reshuffled. It is no wonder why they soon throw in the towel and drop out of the job market; another hidden statistic that keeps the unemployment figure from looking bad.

In the midst of all this confusion, we are being approached constantly by various Community Action Agencies within the County who are looking to develop employment programs with us, or by community groups which have been funded by a CAA, but have no job-training placement opportunities for the slots they have received. Can they use County departments to train their enrollees? This could result in a County District Office having 15 trainees from ten different programs, all of which have slightly different schedules, job site demands and reporting requirements.

While these requests are being evaluated (and consistently turned down), the County is unable to get an adequate number of slots to justify a minimum size administrative staff that could organize and implement a comprehensive manpower program within County government.

The establishment of WIN as a new part of the national manpower effort which operates apart from, but coordinates with, other elements of the Manpower Program demonstrates another splintering of the total manpower effort.

A whole new level of bureaucracy has been established to coordinate WIN placements. The Employment Service staff get welfare referrals whom they process, counsel and refer to other manpower program centers where they are processed, counseled and referred on to operating programs. To the maximum extent possible, WIN will use the existing resources of NYC, CEP, MDTA, JOBS, etc. The WIN Program also provides for de-

velopment of additional work experience and training sites beyond those available through existing resources.

The County has been working with the Employment Service to identify possible WIN enrollee placements. But there is no money available to support in-service training efforts, or to cope with the administrative problem of separation of programs within County government so as to ensure individual program standards are being met, evaluate results, and fulfill appropriate reporting demands. All of the available funding support in FY 1969 went to the State to support the new WIN bureaucracy in the Employment Service and to provide for training through the State Department of Vocational Education.

The \$21,325,000 available to California in FY 1970 is similarly earmarked. It is no wonder that few employers have been able to make the commitment to participate. Because of our limited revenue resources for training purposes, we can only participate in a marginal way. It is too bad that the model recognized by the Labor Department as being effective in the private sector's JOBS Program ("put the entire training job into the hands of the employer"), is seen by Labor to be inoperative in the public sector.

If the County, as a large employer (over 65,000 employees), were funded directly to provide training and employment for 2,000 persons, a coordinated system could be developed in which we could accept referrals from WIN, CEP, CSES, Welfare, Probation, etc. and provide a resource for the training and hiring of their referrals. This would avoid the splintering of programs within an employment source, and enable that employment source to focus all of its resources on the problems of training and hiring. Although the concept of coordination is essential, we have been coordinating at the wrong level. When we set up coordinating agencies, coordination gets confused with administration. Perhaps we ought to think in terms of facilitating, rather than coordinating.

Of the 23,781 eligible welfare recipients we have referred to WIN, only 9,500 have been accepted for participation. About 6,200 of this 10,000 are currently participating in some type of program or training activity. The number placed in permanent jobs since the program began one and a half years ago is approximately 2,400, of which some 900 have been removed from welfare as a result of this employment.

The WIN model appears to be heading in the same futile direction as many of the previous programs; training jobs with no commitment for permanent jobs. Our welfare recipients and "hard core" unemployed have heard that before. "When the funding goes, the job disappears." And round and round we go till the next program.

An independent local task force set up by the County's Commission on Delinquency and Crime discovered in 1968 that of some 8,000 plus Federally funded training jobs, only about 400 had permanent job security tied into the program. (About 300 of these were in our New Careers Program.)

The trainees in the various programs had been in and out of many "training jobs" that folded over the past few years. Thousands of Head Start jobs were created only to prepare community people for non-existent careers. The jobs just weren't there. The large employers were not sufficiently involved in the planning and program implementation processes, etc., etc.

There needs to be a recognition, which the Manpower Bill of 1969 doesn't seem to make, that the identification and development of real jobs must be tied to any job-training efforts.

THE ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATION IN ITHACA MEANS CLEANUP WORK

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I was most pleased and encouraged to note an article in the Ithaca, N.Y., Journal relative to the efforts of some 350 Cornell University students to protest U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia by cleaning up and painting two buildings housing the Ithaca YMCA and the Mental Health Adult Day Center. This type of protest, vividly illustrating what these students feel "war funds" can and should do "back home," should not go unheralded, and I commend the following article to my colleagues' attention:

ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATION HERE MEANS CLEANUP WORK

The Ithaca YMCA and Mental Health Adult Day Center sport brighter faces today after some 350 Cornell students labored to clean and paint both buildings Saturday in protest of American involvement in Southeast Asia.

While thousands of their fellow students massed in Washington, D.C. to demonstrate against the war, those here armed themselves with paint brushes as well as placards in an effort to point out the cost of the war—an estimated \$752 per hour—to Tompkins County residents.

"Our aim is to dramatize what the Vietnam war costs . . ." said Cyrus Fishburn, one of the demonstration's organizers. "I hope that the money and labor spent here today will show Ithacans what could be done if their money now being thrown into a war machine could be redirected to more useful community activities."

Financed by the Cornell Vietnam Mobilization Committee, the students began their demonstration with a noon-hour march from Cornell's Willard Straight Hall to the YMCA at 202 E. Buffalo St. While more than 40 from the overflow crowd moved on the Day Center, at the northwest corner of Meadow and State Sts., and to Stewart Park, the remainder grabbed cleaning rags, sandpaper, rakes, and shears and set to work on the building.

Why here and not on lawns near the White House?

"I feel that I should have gone to Washington, but since I couldn't I thought I'd do my best to demonstrate," said Cornell graduate student Robert Lowenstein.

"We wanted to show the public some constructive action, but this doesn't mean we're not supporting the march in Washington," added Eleanor Weisman, a 19-year-old freshman from Tulsa, Okla.

"This was a way we could participate with something in the community," agreed Ellen Rathje, a freshman from Cortland. "We hope to make people realize we want to do something peaceful and nonviolent."

In their splashdown at the YMCA the students tackled every sort of job from washing to landscaping.

"It's amazing, isn't it; and they'll do anything no matter how grimy," said a surprised Jack Hagaman, executive director of the YMCA. "They were tremendously good kids who did a hard job."

When that job was finished some five hours later, the second floor of the YMCA was paneled; floors were sanded and varnished; walls,

the entranceway, and a large portion of an exterior brick wall were painted; the Y's stone facade had been wire-brushed; and the surrounding shrubbery was pruned. * * *

Those students who moved to the Day Center were equally active.

Setting their signs—labeled with such slogans as "\$750 an Hour Goes to the War—See What It Can Do at Home"—against the building's red brick wall, the students waded into clean-up efforts.

Contributing an estimated \$400 in labor, they washed windows, painted doors, built shelves, and hung window shades in face-lifting the building.

"... It's a great way of people pointing out the need for concern in one's own community; the students do care," said Mrs. Midge Waldman, executive director of the Day Center. "... Translating this into human terms is much more difficult to put into words... and certainly the 'price tag' goes beyond measurement."

While students labored at the clean-up efforts at the Y and Day Center, others canvassed the city itself distributing literature on American involvement in Southeast Asia and soliciting signatures for a petition to Rep. Howard Robison calling for an end to the Vietnam war.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, continuously threatened by territorial conflicts, Poland in the 18th century was an uneasy nation. Her geography left her with few natural defenses, and powerful nations on either side, Russia and Prussia. When Russia and Austria became involved in a war against the Ottoman Turks, the pressures against the Poles were lessened on one side. Then Prussia entered an alliance with Great Britain and Holland against the Russians, which provided the Poles a sense of security not felt in years.

Added to this unstable situation were the reforms which grew from the French Revolution, and the radical ideas of freedom and liberty that came from the new democracy arising in Western Europe. In 1788, the Polish Diet began deliberations on new, vitally needed political reforms which had been at least partially postponed because of the external threats to the nation. In early 1791, after 3 years of debate, discussion, and argument—under a renewed threat from the Russians, who were in the final stages of their war with Turkey—the Diet began the final drafting of a new constitution.

In the middle of the year, King Stanislas read the constitution to an immense crowd of Diet members and citizens. He believed that the constitution would make Poland one of the most liberal and modern states in Europe. The response to the document was of overwhelming approval, and national pride rose as King Stanislas swore allegiance to the constitution.

The newly established freedoms of Poland were perceived as a threat to her Russian neighbor, then under the strong leadership of Empress Catherine II. On April 8, 1792, the Russian armies invaded

Poland, and, within a year, they had destroyed not only the constitution but the country as well. On September 23, 1793, Poland was partitioned between the Prussians and the Russians, and the constitution of May 3, 1791, was dead.

The memory of that short period of democracy and freedom remained with the Polish people; liberty-loving Poles anxiously await the day when once again Poland, under a democratic constitution, will rejoin the council of democratic nations.

SILENT MAJORITY

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the "silent majority" is threatening to go the way of the silent movie.

A lot of people whose silence was mistaken for consent are no longer holding their tongues in the wake of President Nixon's decision to invade Cambodia. The outcry can be heard throughout the land; but it is naturally loudest on the campuses, where the President has succeeded in mobilizing an overwhelming majority of students against his policies. It can no longer be imagined, even by an administration not distinguished by the firmness of its touch with reality, that antiwar feeling is confined to a minority of students at a minority of schools.

Illustrative of the extent of the disaffection with the war and the President's handling of it is an eloquent statement by Neil A. Oxman, student body president at Villanova University. The statement, which appeared in the New York Times on May 13, is signed by student governments and student leaders at colleges not previously noted for antiwar protests:

SILENT MAJORITY

MR. NIXON: For almost two years American citizens have been deceived and intentionally misled concerning our country's policy of war in Southeast Asia. Lyndon Baines Johnson left office with the realization that an aggressive policy in Viet Nam was no longer acceptable to the American people. In your every speech both before and after your inauguration, you pledged unstinting efforts to gain peace in Southeast Asia. The Congress of the United States, at your behest, allowed two years to pass, during which time peace was ever promised and never delivered. The end result of these promises has not been peace, but rather a reescalation of the war, and an illegal, immoral, unsupported invasion of neutral Cambodia.

At present with the country in turmoil, we, as American citizens, feel it our moral obligation to state irrevocably our opposition, not only to the unwarranted invasion of Cambodia, but to the entire Southeast Asian war. We must further decry the shroud of deception you have allowed to grow around all your actions. Primarily, we refer to your war policy and the usurpation of delegated constitutional authority you have adopted to forward your policies.

Rather than add fuel to the present campus unrest by rioting, we are asking every concerned American to help foster the defeat of your policies through constitutional means. We are asking every American to

write to his or her congressman, expressing not only dissatisfaction with your Cambodia decision, but voicing support for the bill now being proposed by Senators Hatfield, Goodell, Hughes, McGovern, and Cranston. This bill (H.R. 17123) will not only force a firm declaration of war or complete withdrawals from Cambodia within 30 days after its passage, but will also require that all funds delegated to Southeast Asia after December 30, 1970 be designated as strictly for troop withdrawal. Finally the bill will provide for the removal of all troops from Southeast Asia no later than June 3, 1971.

Possibly Mr. Nixon, you should allow yourself to realize that there are many Americans who will no longer seek peaceful means to halt the war. At Kent State, at the University of Maryland, and at many other campuses, this fact has been painfully and tragically realized.

Upon you, Mr. Nixon, must the complete onus of responsibility fall. As Commander-in-Chief total liability for those killed or injured in Indo-China rests with you. As President the wanton slaying at Kent State and strife on many other campuses must lie on your conscience.

We no longer appeal to you as our President or our leader, but as a human being with an interest in the life of every person in this country.

Respectfully,

NEIL A. OXMAN,

President, Student Body, Villanova University.

Student Union, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.

Student Government Association, University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Connecticut.

Association of Bucknell Students, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania.

Student Government Association, William A. Navero, President, Canisus College, Buffalo, New York.

Drew University Community, Drew University, Madison, New Jersey.

Student Government Association, Joseph George, Vice President, Georgetown University, Washington, District of Columbia.

Student Government Association, Leonard A. Perrett, President, Kings College, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania.

Student Government Association, Leanne Mells, President, Marymount Manhattan College, New York, New York.

Student Government Association, David McKenzie, President, La Salle College, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Strike Committee, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York.

Student Government Association, Newton College of the Sacred Heart, Newton, Massachusetts.

Student Government Association, Debbie Rifenburg, President, Rosemont College, Rosemont, Pennsylvania.

Student Government Association, Robert Barry, President, University of Scranton, Scranton, Pennsylvania.

Student Body, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York.

Student Government Association, Dale Saffir, President, Harcum Junior College, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania.

Student Association, Nancy Terrill, President, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Chaplain's Office, Villanova University, Villanova, Pennsylvania.

Student Congress, Mark A. Billington, President, Providence College, Providence, Rhode Island.

Colby College Community, Colby College, Waterville, Maine.

Student Government Association, Chas. Dougherty, President, St. Bonaventure University, Olean, New York.

Student Body, Bryant College, Providence, Rhode Island.

John Gunn, Member Villanova University Senate, Villanova, Pa.

Student Government Association, James Seward, Chairman, College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.

PLAN FOR PEACE DEVISED AT MACALESTER COLLEGE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the frustrations that we share over present administration policies in Southeast Asia have led a group of students from Macalester College to develop a plan for bringing about an end to the war.

They call for the United Nations to take control of all peace-keeping efforts by initiating and maintaining a ceasefire. They ask the U.N. to send in a supervisory force and to create an Indochina Relief Agency. The plan is endorsed by more than 1,000 members of the academic community.

Students at the University of Minnesota are similarly initiating new activities of persuasion and protest. I would like to place into the RECORD this article from the Minneapolis Tribune:

FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA: MACALESTER GROUP OFFERS PEACE PLAN

A group of Macalester College students, who said they sought a "viable alternative" to present United States involvement in Southeast Asia, Tuesday proposed that the United Nations send a supervisory force to Indochina to effect and maintain a ceasefire.

The proposal also calls for an international conference of all nations involved, and the creation of a U.N. Indochina Relief Agency.

Student spokesmen announced the proposal at a news conference. They said the proposal was written by about 20 Macalester students, and that it has been endorsed by more than 1,000 students, faculty and administrators.

The plan calls for the U.N. supervisory force to implement the withdrawal of "all external forces." Student spokesmen said that included United States forces, and North Vietnamese forces in South Vietnam and Cambodia.

They said they think North Vietnam is now weak and might accept such U.N. solutions to the war intervention.

In other developments on area campuses yesterday:

Leaders of the strike committed at the University of Minnesota announced plans yesterday for a mass "graduation ceremony" Thursday on the mall in front of Northrop Auditorium.

The event—announced at a noon rally by Evan Stark, one of the strike leaders—would symbolize the graduation of students from the traditional university to the Strike Experimental College.

Meanwhile, Thursday of this week and a day in each of the next three weeks were officially designated as "days of reflection" at the university.

A student-faculty committee said that Thursday, May 20, May 26 and June 3 will be days of special activities. The committee recommended that classes be suspended or excused and that Civil Service employees also be allowed to participate.

The faculty of St. John's University in Collegeville, Minn., voted yesterday to give

students the option of ending their semester studies immediately to work for peace or finishing the normal academic year. Those who quit now will get a grade of incomplete, to be made up later. The Rev. Coleman Barry, president, said the university is not on strike.

"LOVE-PEACE" BECOMES "HATE AMERICA" THE PSYWAR CONTINUES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Americans are not told that a psychological war is being waged in our country—a non-shooting war—which the enemy is daily prosecuting to the fullest.

The technique of thesis and synthesis, and the "slide-off" manipulations and distortions of Communist education are explained by J. Edgar Hoover in his book, "Masters of Deceit." Education in this misapplication is a weapon in the battle.

Failing to understand Red techniques, many do not understand the development and exploitations of incidents such as Kent State, Cambodia, Augusta, and Jackson State as emotional "hate America" propaganda to further confuse and divide our people against the real enemy.

The initial psychological thrust was to indoctrinate impressionable youth that love is synonymous to peace and that love-peace is imperative to life. Since hate is the opposite of love, and war the opposite of peace, all who do not participate in the love-peace movement are to be regarded as haters and warmongers.

To transfer the abhorrence of war into a hatred of country, it was then only necessary to relate incidents such as would identify the horrors of war with our own country. Kent State and Jackson State—the National Guard; Cambodia—the military; Augusta—the police department. The over exposure of these incidents served as the means to transfer hate of the war to hate of our country—our system of government and everyone who supports it.

In the minds of these psycho-indoctrinated young people most adults, including parents, are made the enemy and their every effort for reason is regarded as repression.

Overlooked is the common enemy—communism—the root cause of all. How long—how long—how long.

Mr. Speaker, "Sensing the News" by Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of Southern States Industrial Council, carried a straightforward plea for action. And his paper follows:

SENSING THE NEWS: BEHIND THE KENT STATE RIOT

(By Thurman Sensing)

Leftists and liberals in the United States and around the world already are trying to portray the slain students at Kent State University in Ohio as heroic workers for peace, whereas in fact they were part of an ugly and brutal mob engaged in transforming a university into a scene of anarchy and bloodshed. The deaths were tragic, yes, but understandable—violence begets tragedy.

There are notable exceptions to this praise of the rampaging mob at Kent State. One in particular is a newspaper of Johannesburg in far away South Africa which described Kent students as "silly asses" who were "stirred up by anarchists and Red agents to oppose the war effort in Vietnam and Cambodia"—a very true observation.

Had the National Guardsmen failed to defend themselves, they might have been stoned to death. One can be sure that the leftists and the liberals wouldn't have shed any tears for dead Guardsmen—no more than they weep for the many policemen who have died in the line of duty, defending communities against anti-war demonstrators and other political hoodlums.

Glorification of the four dead protesters—members of the campus mob—is not without design. Radical elements seek an opportunity to marshal opinion against Guardsmen, policemen, and regular soldiers. The objective of the radicals is to force disarmament of troops and police forces, even as in the propaganda treatment of the My Lai incident in Vietnam they seek to discredit and undermine the morale and combat effectiveness of American troops in Southeast Asia.

If the leftists and liberals succeed in disarming the Guardsmen, if they manage to shift the blame to those who were protecting law and order, then the forces of revolution will have scored a tremendous victory. For the safety of the country, it is imperative that the American people stand behind the Guardsmen, in Ohio and in the other 49 states. They are the people's shield against the revolutionists in our midst.

Bloody insurrection by revolutionary elements seems much nearer than anyone expected a year or so ago. The involvement of several thousand students at Yale University in protests against the trial of Black Panthers accused of murder and kidnapping, shows how far the country has gone towards the mindless chaos sought by those who hate the United States and seek its destruction from within. At Yale, almost an entire university went berserk, with faculty members and even the President of the institution lending prestige to the Panther cause—a display of academic irrationality unprecedented in American history.

Obviously the time for mild measures of law and order is past. The mob attack on the National Guardsmen at Kent State University shows that vicious, open revolution confronts us as a result of permissiveness in dealing with the hoodlums who have established sanctuaries on college and university campuses.

The time has come for legislation and governmental action of the most comprehensive kind so as to eliminate the evil that threatens the survival of our free country.

As Vice President Spiro T. Agnew said in a recent address in Florida, the problem of the disturbed universities is not for the Philosophy Department or the English Department, but the Justice Department. It may take scores of additional U.S. attorneys and hundreds of extra FBI agents, but no effort should be spared in apprehending and prosecuting those who have engaged in criminal leftist activities on college and university campuses in recent weeks. The possibility of mass sedition trials should be seriously considered, for that is the condition the country now faces.

The first target of governmental action should be the rioters who attacked the National Guardsmen at Kent State University. They and others like them should be the subject of legal action. In college after college, the need is to locate and root out the radicals, whether in the student body or on the faculty. It may be that the states and the federal government will have to enact new laws to accomplish that purpose. If need be, the states should call special sessions of their legislatures to get the laws necessary

to keep the peace and protect decent people against the political hippies who believe they can burn public buildings, loot stores, and bombard police and Guardsmen with rocks and other missiles.

The time is past for half-way measures. The country is on the verge of a crisis in which its very future and survival are involved. Every effort should be exerted now to crush the criminal leftists who seek to paralyze and then take over the United States.

KENT STATE STUDENT SPEAKS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. George T. Atwood of Horseheads, N.Y., a graduate student in psychology at Kent State University, has written, for the Elmira, N.Y. Star-Gazette, a most interesting account and analysis of the tragic events of late at Kent State. His fine article is worthy of widespread consideration, and I include it here in the RECORD for that purpose:

"OHIO HAS PLAYED INTO MILITANTS' HANDS"
(By George T. Atwood)

Although the events I am writing about took place in Ohio, I feel that they have implications which effect everyone everywhere.

I am a student at Kent State. I was not present at the shooting Monday. (I was in a shopping center several miles outside of town, spread-eagled across my car with a riot gun and two .38s pointing at me. Somebody told the police I had a gun. I didn't.)

I have been a college student or living among college students at six different schools during eight out of the past 11 years.

I do not claim to know everything that led up to the shooting. I doubt that anyone ever will know, but I can say something about the students at Kent, about the sorts of people and attitudes that must necessarily have been involved.

Much has been said about agitators, about people who define "democracy" as their right to impose their own ideas on the rest of us, about people who practice the art of organizing "demonstrations" and rioting for their own ends. These people exist; make no mistake of it. But there simply were not thousands of "agitators" on the commons at Kent Monday.

Among those who have supported the various anti-war activities are people who have been taken in by the pro-Fanoi propagandists, people who have been swept up in the emotionality of the current college atmosphere, conformists, people who are desperately afraid of being sent to Vietnam and people who have lost friends and relatives in the war.

There are also true pacifists who fully understand the implications of their philosophy and people who have honestly reviewed the evidence and believe that American involvement in Indochina is self defeating.

These, then, are the people who, doubtless, were on the commons when the Guardsmen opened fire.

Also present, we may assume, were the curious, the excitement seekers, the people who think that "throwing rocks at the pigs is a groove, man" and, apparently, a few people who had started across campus to go to classes, which were still being held, and who got caught when the trouble started.

There were people with uncommon understanding and there were self-righteous bigots.

I was last on campus Sunday afternoon. Students and Guardsmen were talking and

joking together. Less than 24 hours later, the Guard had fired into a mass of the students.

Students are friendly people, but they tend to think highly of themselves, overly so, I feel. "The people," to many students, means themselves and anyone who agrees with them. Because of their somewhat arrogant attitude, students often are rather inconsiderate and imperceptive of the point of view of others, their protestations of love and brotherhood to the contrary.

In addition, "the revolution" is supposed to be fun. And it is fun, so long as it is the "pigs" who are getting hurt.

When students begin to get hurt, it becomes another matter.

This student egocentricism, which must have played a part in the tragic estrangement which occurred between the students and the Guardsmen, and certainly has done a great deal towards developing the alienation between the students and a large part of their society, is not the students' fault.

Our entire educational system, with considerable aid from the society as a whole, has taught the students that the academically successful are truly superior people. Their teachers, products of the same system, often see themselves in the same way, and the arrogance of the teacher passes on to the student. Faculty members, and others, while claiming to deplore student violence, give it support by treating the violent students as heroes, hoping, apparently, that violence may help to force worthwhile change—meaning, of course, the change which they themselves advocate—a form of dishonesty inconsonant with the intellectual ideals which these faculty claim to represent.

The student is in no position to see that he is being used and misled in this way because our educational system does not teach him to think critically.

What it teaches as "critical thinking" is, in reality, various currently stylish ideas which pass as "critical thought."

Wednesday, in a series of comments made by some other Kent students, you published a statement to the effect that militant students "have very firm beliefs" and "are incredibly dedicated." This statement, as it was written, seemed to imply that the dedication to the belief justifies that belief and any action which is taken from it.

This sort of thinking is disturbingly familiar on college campuses.

If an Ohio National Guardsman were to say that he had fired into the students, and explained that he sincerely believed that the demonstrators were doing grave disservice to humanity, and that only by shooting them could he put an end to the injustice of their action, we would not accept his dedication as justifying his act.

Yet, we seem willing to accept the dedication of the militants as justifying theirs.

So far, I have attacked student attitude for contributing to tragedy. However, in no way does the student contribution shift the blame from Ohio public officials for perpetrating tragedy. I did not know any of the slain students and I cannot possibly feel anywhere near the bitterness which their friends and families must feel today, but I am bitter all the same.

If the troops did, in fact, fire without orders, stated or implied, the officials are, at the very least, guilty of culpable negligence for sending unsteady troops into an explosive situation. I'm not even going to talk about the possibility that the troops fired on order.

Governor Rhodes of Ohio has stated his belief that the Kent State riots were not wholly spontaneous. As I indicated earlier, I suspect that his belief is correct.

The Governor also likened student rioters to Hitler's brownshirts. Considering that, in the three days prior to the shooting, students had wrecked a part of downtown Kent, burned the ROTC building, attacked and beat firemen trying to extinguish the blaze,

stage an obviously planned raid on a university-owned airfield, doing considerable damage, stoned the police and Guardsmen, hospitalizing several, were apprehended carrying firearms, and threatened to burn any businesses which did not display anti-war signs, and considering that, elsewhere around the country, student extremists have intimidated, beaten and killed students and others who have opposed them, Governor Rhodes' simile seems to have substance.

After the shooting, though, it is doubtful that many will listen to the Governor's charges of fascism.

From news reports and public statements in the days and months preceding the Kent disaster, I got the feeling that Governor Rhodes and other state officials were acting out of anger.

I applaud officials who are firm in their support of public order, but this firmness must stem from honest conviction, not from rage because the official considers the disorder to be an affront to his dignity, or because he wants to make a grandstand play to please "the voters back home." Too often, I think, public officials act from the wrong motives, and the result is that they help to destroy the order which they purport to uphold.

Kent State could be an excellent example of this. The day before the shooting, Governor Rhodes vowed to "eradicate the radicals."

In 30 seconds, his National Guard did more to advance the cause of these radicals at Kent than all of the radicals themselves have been able to do in their entire lifetimes.

Ohio has played into the militants' hands. The militants now have four martyrs to wave at us. Ohio has four murdered students on its head.

I can appreciate how people are offended and frightened by the growing campus disturbances.

I am offended and frightened too. After all, I'm living in the middle of it.

I am often upset when the disturbances are allowed to grow, unchecked or when instigators are turned loose to instigate again.

There are times when I really feel like getting a baseball bat and breaking somebody's head, but I realize that a large part of the militant program is designed to get me upset and frightened enough that I lash out in panic. I know that when I act out of hatred and fear, I am beaten.

DISCRIMINATION BY TAX-FREE MANIPULATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the tax-free foundations continue to make news in their own newspapers.

I insert the following newsclippings from the Washington Post:

MEYER FOUNDATION GIFTS TOTAL \$837,300 FOR '69

The Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation yesterday announced that grants totaling \$837,300 were made in 1969 for support of community services, education, health and the humanities.

George Washington University received the largest single grant, \$100,000, for development of new medical school facilities.

The Meyer foundation was begun in 1944 with funds provided by Eugene Meyer, former chairman of the board of The Washington Post, and his wife.

Community services accounted for the largest of the grants, \$341,000. Among agencies receiving funds were Bonabond, Inc., \$10,000; the Fides Neighborhood House, \$2,000; and the Friends of the Juvenile Court, \$12,000.

Also receiving funds in this category was the Law Student in Court Program, granted \$20,000. This project, made possible by a 1968 change in court rules, allows third-year law students to represent indigent defendants in small claims and landlord and tenant cases in the Court of General Sessions.

Washington Area Business Service, Inc., which seeks to bring about minority business ownership by providing a number of advisory and technical services, was granted \$25,000.

In educational programs, the foundation made \$274,300 in grants, giving \$10,000 to Washington Preschools, Inc.; \$7,000 to the Teachers, Inc., and \$40,000 for annual scholarship grants.

Humanities' grants, totalling \$72,000, went to the National Ballet Society Inc., \$15,000; the Shakespeare Festival of Washington, \$5,000; the Washington Community School of Music, Inc., \$10,000; and to a number of other cultural groups.

STERN FUND AIDS LAW FIRM TO TACKLE SOCIAL PROBLEMS
(By Carol Honsa)

A new public interest law firm that will tackle Washington area problems through the courts will open here in July with a \$150,000 grant from the Philip M. Stern Family Fund.

The new Stern Community Law Firm will be headed by George Washington University law professor Monroe H. Freedman, a lawyer long involved in civil rights and civil liberties issues here.

Public interest legal firms generally press class action or test cases involving broad social problems, like education or welfare reform, affecting large groups of people besides the individual plaintiffs.

Already contemplated are suits challenging restrictive adoption policies, pollution by federal agencies and private industries here, unequal city services in Washington neighborhoods, and zoning and land-use policies adversely affecting the environment.

Stern, whose family fund will pour virtually all its available money for the coming year into the venture, said the law firm would seek "reform, not relief" through class action suits or individual cases with broad public implications.

Instead of trying to remedy one person's particular problem, he explained, the law firm would take legal action to change the institutions or practices that cause such hardships for people in general.

"Our mandate is to make waves and rock boats," said Freedman, who will start operations with a staff of three top-ranking June law graduates.

Freedman will take leave without pay from his teaching duties to direct the law firm, which will be located near the GWU campus.

The Stern grant will actually go to the Lincoln Memorial Congregational Temple at 1701 11th St. NW, where the Rev. Channing E. Phillips, a Democratic national committeeman, was pastor until his resignation took effect Sunday. The church in turn will engage the law firm for public interest litigation.

"The church saw it as a vehicle for extending its ministry into use of legal procedures for providing justice," Mr. Phillips said.

Mr. Phillips, who remains in the Lincoln Temple congregation, and three other church members will sit on the law firms seven-member governing committee along with Freedman and Mr. and Mrs. Stern.

The committee will define, in effect, the "public interest" and decide which cases the law firm will pursue.

Freedman expects the firm to become immediately embroiled in a challenge to a section of the legal profession's canon of ethics that forbids lawyers to solicit clients. Freedman, who thinks the prohibition is unconstitutional, said the firm will openly seek out clients with cases involving issues of broad public interest.

The establishment of the new firm coincides with a period of growing militancy among lawyers, particularly aggressive young attorneys, who see the courts as an instrument for social reform.

Taxpayer-supported legal programs such as the Neighborhood Legal Services Program actively advocate the interests of the poor, while organizations like the Washington Research Project and Center for Law and Social Policy study, issue reports, and litigate on broad social issues.

Freedman said the Stern-sponsored community firm differs from such groups in its independence from clients' fees or public funds; its emphasis on D.C. area problems, and its focus on lawsuits instead of studies and reports.

CREATING A WELFARE CLASS

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion in recent weeks relative to the family assistance program on which the House acted several weeks ago.

I opposed this bill when it was before the House and am now even more convinced that if this program is enacted, it will be a giant step toward socialism in America.

Many of those who advocate passage of this program contend that it is a vast improvement over the situation which now exists. It is true that there are some features of the bill that may give some indication of temporary improvement in some limited fields but the overwhelming purpose and impact of the bill is, in my opinion, a step toward more Government control, more Federal handout, and a great expansion of the welfare rolls.

There appeared in the April 27 edition of the Lynchburg News, Lynchburg, Va., a very fine editorial which outlines the principal objections to this legislation. I wish to include with my remarks the text of this editorial and commend it to the reading of the Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

CREATING A WELFARE CLASS

The U.S. House of Representatives last week passed beyond the point of no return on the road to Socialism when it approved President Nixon's revolutionary "Family Assistance Act." This radical, wholly untried plan provides for a guaranteed Federal payment of \$1,600 plus \$800 in food stamps each year for a family of four—in addition to state subsidies. Before the Senate approves the bill, and it is expected to, the guaranteed payments are expected to be boosted to around \$2,500. Pressures are already being applied to increase that to \$5,000.

With one stroke, the Nixon plan adds between 13 and 15 million more people to the

10 million already on welfare! The added cost for the first year is estimated at \$5 billion, but even the supporters of the bill admit that is ridiculously low. Opponents of the plan claim it will cost an additional \$12 to \$15 billion a year—above the present welfare costs which now run about \$72 billion annually for Federal, state and local governments. That \$72 billion, of course, comes out of taxes.

Federal figures show that the number of people receiving some sort of welfare assistance increased 52 per cent and the cost of welfare programs increased 211 per cent—all in the past 10 years! With the Nixon plan, welfare costs within five years conceivably could reach \$100 billion a year.

MOST INSIDIOUS FEATURE

The horrendous cost, which must be borne by the working public, is not the most insidious feature of the bill. That feature destroys all incentive to get off welfare and, as the direct result, creates a gigantic welfare class permanently living off the wages of the working public.

Under the bill, welfare recipients can earn up to \$720 a month without losing any benefits. They would lose 50 cents in Federal subsidies for each \$1 earned above \$720 a month until the family income reaches \$3,920 a year. At that point the Federal subsidy would cease.

However, because of various formulas for qualifying for food stamps, cutoffs in state supplemental funds, and Federal, state and local taxes, a welfare recipient who takes work could wind up losing some 80 cents in welfare subsidies out of each dollar he earns. This means, frankly, that it would not pay him to work. It encourages full dependency on welfare.

However, because of various formulas for qualifying for food stamps, cutoffs in state supplemental funds, and Federal, state and local taxes, a welfare recipient who takes work could wind up losing some 80 cents in welfare subsidies out of each dollar he earns. This means, frankly, that it would not pay him to work. It encourages full dependency on welfare.

DISCOURAGES WORK

The bill does contain a provision that all able-bodied adults will be required to take jobs or job training. The original bill contained the word "suitable" work, but this was changed to "available" work. But no one expects this will really change anything, for there are too many loopholes through which able-bodied adults can avoid work.

Moreover, as Federal statistics themselves show, the work provisions would have little effect on those now on welfare rolls. Of the nearly 10 million now receiving welfare assistance, exactly half are children and thus exempted from work. Another 1-2 million are mothers—also exempted. Two million are aged—exempted; 728,000 are disabled—exempted; 80,000 are blind—exempted.

This leaves some half-million persons, or 1-19th of those now on welfare, who are not exempt. Of the 13 to 15 million additional persons added to the welfare rolls, more adults are expected in the "able-bodied" class, and thus more will be expected to take work. The cutoff in Federal subsidies, however, discourages such work.

OTHER PROGRAMS FAILED

The program has never been tested. But in 1967, New York City experimented with a project which offered far greater work incentives to some 200,000 persons. The program lasted two years, during which the heads of some 8,000 families went to work. At the end of two years, only 235 actually worked themselves off welfare rolls.

Moreover, the current Work Incentive Program (WIN) which is similar to the Nixon plan, has proved a miserable failure.

The prospects of welfare recipients work-

ing themselves off the rolls, therefore, are even less for the Nixon plan than for the other two—which means the working people of this country must expect to pay some \$100 billion a year for welfare which encourages people not to work.

Moreover, instead of reducing the monumental welfare department bureaucracy, the Nixon plan actually adds a whole new bureaucracy under the Social Security Administration. In addition, the bill legitimizes and institutionalizes welfare by making it a "right."

A total of 243 Congressmen voted for this plan to create a permanent, expanding welfare class of some 25 million at the onset. There are less than 80 million people working in this country today. Those 80 million are to be taxed to support the 25 million—plus pay for all other Government expenses and programs. The bill, in effect, makes the working people forced laborers.

Of Virginia's 10 Congressmen, Republicans Richard Poff of the Sixth District, William Wampler of the Ninth and G. William Whitehurst of the Second, voted for the bill. Republican Joel Broyhill did not vote, but was paired for the bill. The remaining six, five Democrats and one Republican, voted against it. It was significant that just about every wild-eyed, knee-jerk liberal in the House in both parties voted for it, while, with a few exceptions, conservatives of both parties voted against it.

WALTER REUTHER—THE LEGACY OF LEADERSHIP

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, Walter Reuther's death at any time would have been a tragic loss to American labor and to the country. His passing while in the prime of his leadership is an especially poignant tragedy in these times which cry out for the kind of forceful and creative frontliner that was Walter Reuther.

At 63, Reuther was still a young man—filled with the spirit and zeal of idealism, traveling the length and breadth of the country to educate, convince, persuade, and negotiate for the fulfillment of the American dream for all Americans, with the same innovation and conviction which he had brought to bear in his fight for the rights and security of American labor for more than a half-century. He leaves behind 63 years of achievement for his union, the U.A.W., and for the American labor movement. He also leaves his mark on almost all major issues of our time. As a great labor leader, he had earned the name of a great national leader as well.

He touched so many people. They touched him back. He carried journeyman cards in so many fields of endeavor. His credentials were unimpeachable among so many different groupings—hostile groups like those he fought and won out over so frequently; suspicious groups like the young and the black and the brown; inarticulate groups like the poor and the immigrant. He knew power and he understood the powerless.

At mid-century, Walter Reuther could have looked back with pride on his achievements as one of the most innovative and tireless architects of the

American labor movement. But for Walter Reuther, this was not enough. Just as he stood at the front of the sit-down strikers in the auto plants of Detroit in the 1930's, so he stood with equal conviction and vigor before the garbage strikers of Memphis in the 1960's. He could have stood on the relatively quiet shores of a mature labor movement and said, "I have done enough." But just as he was willing to face popular disfavor and personal danger when labor was at the height of its struggle for the basics of a decent life in America, so he was willing to face controversy—often to generate and then transcend it—in the fight for a decent life for all Americans.

Always at the forefront of the battle for social justice and equality for all men, often far ahead of his time, Reuther was not content to be a voice crying in the wilderness. Through the force of his personality and with his characteristic combination of evangelical zeal and hardheaded practicality, he performed one of the greatest, and as he well knew, difficult tasks of leadership—to educate, persuade, convince—to show that the goals he sought for the poor and dispossessed of the 1960's were intimately intertwined with the well-being and future security of his own union.

To battle for a responsive and humane political system, to oppose the waste of human lives at home and abroad, to stand among the first to demand what has now become a familiar cry—the reordering of our priorities—did not represent a departure from his position as a labor leader. It was rather in dedication to his membership and to the highest values and goals of the American labor movement, that he took these stands and faced the storms of controversy on the most serious and difficult issues of our time.

Reuther never sought to stand in the way of industrial technological progress and innovation: as technology is a major adjunct to a productive economy and as a productive economy is vital to the well-being of his membership, Reuther did not seek to deny to industry and labor alike the benefits of technological progress. Rather than fight progress, he sought to ameliorate its problems.

Reuther championed union participation in industrial planning to ease the dislocations of automation, and a guaranteed annual wage for workers, culminating in the achievement of the supplementary unemployment benefit plan whereby workers receive about two-thirds of regular take-home pay during layoffs. But it is also characteristic of his breadth of vision that Reuther saw the problems of modern technology not simply in terms of their effect on the security and purchasing power of the American worker, but in the context of a deadly dilemma: man must rule technology or technology will rule man.

As a leader in the fight for conservation and environmental quality, and an outspoken critic of technology as a tool of the arms race and as a force for destruction of mankind, Reuther was characteristically ahead of his time.

The legacy of the labor movement had

been the fight for justice, equality, and security for the workingman of America; but as the movement grew to maturity in the 1950's and 1960's, Reuther was deeply concerned that these values would be subordinated to skirmishes for higher wages and more benefits alone. Reuther sought a wider view.

In economic terms, he sought to encompass union demands for higher wages and benefits within the context of what was best for the economy in general, in recognition that the economic health of American labor was inseparable from the health of the whole economic system. In social and political terms, he knew that denial of civil rights to the black man and security to the Nation's poor would be paid for in an era of civil unrest and political repressions that would threaten to tear apart the fabric of our society.

From his position at the head of one of the Nation's most powerful unions, Walter Reuther waged a tireless battle on behalf of those yet to share in the benefits which had been gained by his own membership.

When he felt that his own union, while associated with the AFL-CIO, was moving back from the frontlines in the fight for justice and equality, he led UAW's withdrawal from that organization, of which he had been a major architect slightly more than a decade before. He was keenly aware that a living wage, decent working conditions, and a better quality of life for the auto workers would be but fragile achievements were the country to be plunged into general social and political strife.

Walter Reuther's life had been dedicated to working within the system. He was a man respected and admired by the establishment—indeed, he was very much a part of it—yet he gained some of his most dedicated friends from among the alienated. As a champion of the poor and dispossessed, he sought not simply to bring people into the establishment, but to bring the establishment in line with the needs of the people.

He made the system work better. He understood that it did not work at all for some, that it did not always work for others, and that it did not work the way it was supposed to unless it worked for all the people.

Walter Reuther sought justice for his fellow man all his life. Surely he is entitled to justice for himself now.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 15, 1970

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

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

How long?