

The top priority project of Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel; Harrison Loesch, assistant secretary of the interior for public land management, and Bruce has been to realign the top echelons of the bureau and bring in some new blood—supposedly younger, more flexible and more responsive to Indian needs than the old top management.

Seventeen persons have been ousted, and it is promised that three-fourths of the newcomers will be Indians.

The task of finding them, however, has dragged on far longer than Loesch and Bruce hoped. Some Indians—most of them working outside the government—already were earning too much money to shift jobs. Others, already working for the government, encountered complex Civil Service problems. Still others concluded that working for the bureau would be a sellout. So far, eight of the 17 spots have been filled. Bruce said earlier this week that he hopes to announce the rest of the roster Monday.

One of those who reportedly signed up is Lee Cook, a Red Lake Chippewa who has been serving in the Federal Economic Development Administration. One of those who reportedly declined is Will Antell, a White Earth Chippewa who is the top Indian education specialist for the state of Minnesota.

Loesch and Bruce also are not for the idea of allowing Indians if they wish, to run entirely by themselves the community services that traditionally have been provided by the bureau. This would be done by contract. Financing would come from the tribe's share of federal appropriations now being spent by the bureau in managing the tribe's affairs. The bureau would agree to resume the management of any tribe that tried running any part of its own affairs and failed.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AGENCY IS GOAL

Eventually, Loesch and Bruce would like to see the bureau turned into a technical assistance agency, standing by to help Indian tribes do what they want when they want to do it.

The two administrators have a handful of success stories to which they can point. The Ramah Navajos in New Mexico and the Rough Rock Navajos in Arizona have contracted to run their own schools. The Zunis in New Mexico will soon take over all community services—education, law enforcement, road-building, housing and economic development.

Similar proposals from about 10 other tribes—none in the Upper Midwest—are under review, according to Bruce.

How fast the idea will spread, he and Loesch can't say.

They figure that some tribes will want to stay entirely under the bureau's protective

and admittedly dependency-instilling umbrella. Some will want to experiment with running one or two services and others will want to take on everything. Contracting will not be forced on anybody, they say.

"The point is to make the opportunity available," says Loesch, a blunt-spoken former Colorado land lawyer. "There have been too many people around here who were unwilling to let the Indian make his own mistakes. That's a lot of crap. Everybody makes mistakes."

It was expected that Mr. Nixon's now-declined message to Congress would include legislative proposals intended to make contracting easier.

Contracting will affect mainly the reservation Indian.

About the best the bureau will promise for the urban Indian is to urge other departments and agencies with Indian funds to use them. The council is promising to do the same, for whatever it may be worth.

MOVEMENT IN RIGHT DIRECTION AT HAND

In sum, there seems to be some movement in what many Indians would call the right direction, a direction that will allow them to take more control over their own destiny and allow their culture to develop again alongside the white man's.

The question is whether the movement is fast enough to do any real good.

Some Indians are encouraged, at least in small degree.

Others, more militant, are not.

To those who take the longer view, the rather moderate concluding words of a declaration of Indian purpose, written in 1961, still apply:

"... The Indians ask for assistance, technical and financial, for the time needed, however long that may be, to regain in the America of the space age some measure of the adjustment they enjoyed as the original possessors of their native land."

Equally appropriate, to those who take a shorter view, are the words of activist Clyde Bellecourt of Minneapolis, executive director of the American Indian movement.

In a recent confrontation Loesch asked him why he didn't take his appeals through regular channels instead of into the streets.

"We've been trying to go through regular channels for more than 100 years," Bellecourt replied, "and look where it's got us."

[From the Minneapolis Tribune,
May 24, 1970]

BIA: THE RED MAN'S BURDEN

Indian Americans are caught in a dilemma. They suffer in many ways from the heavy hand of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. But they know that, as a small minority, they might suffer even more if the bureau were eliminated.

The dimensions of this dilemma have been reviewed in a series of articles by Frank Wright, a Tribune staff correspondent in Washington, D.C. As Wright pointed out, the bureau paternalistically dominates the everyday lives of reservation Indians, is slow in responding to the Indian drive for self-determination, and even fails many times to fulfill its obligations to protect Indian rights. (In the latest example of this, a Bureau of Reclamation irrigation project is robbing the Paiute Indians of a priceless lake in Nevada.)

Still, the bureau has helped to achieve gains for Indians in health, housing, employment, education and income, even though those gains still leave Indians far behind even the poorest of the poor among other groups in American society. Further, Indians saw the devastating effects of a short-lived policy in the 1950s to terminate BIA jurisdiction over Indian reservations.

The dilemma leaves little choice but to intensify the pressure for change within the present system, rather than to seek a new system. That means pressure to gain a stronger voice for Indians in managing their own affairs, pressure for more policymaking positions for Indians within the bureau, and pressure to relate BIA programs to urban Indians as well as reservation Indians.

The new BIA administration has taken some good steps to increase its responsiveness to Indian needs and to encourage greater Indian self-determination. The bureau continues, however, to resist pressures for a greater urban orientation, despite the fact that half or more of the Indian people probably live in the cities. The bureau cites congressional policy to support its stand, but it seems that the biggest obstacle to change is the BIA itself. Those 33 volumes of BIA regulations and procedures are a burden on the backs of Indian Americans.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment, under the order previously entered, until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 12, 1970, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PRIVACY IS A FUNDAMENTAL AMERICAN RIGHT

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, increasingly, the Members of this body are expressing their concern of the many insidious ways in which the privacy of Americans is threatened. The concern is especially justified because of the changes in our society. The operation of Government and of business is said to require

ever increasing amounts of information about the individual citizen.

Unfortunately, this information is not always kept privileged.

I am delighted that the Casper Star-Tribune, my hometown paper with the broadest circulation of any daily in Wyoming, has joined my deep concern over this issue. I ask that an editorial in the June 10, 1970, issue of the paper, be published in the RECORD as an indication of the growing awareness throughout the Nation of the Government to intrude into areas it ought not to.

Such editorials contribute to the growing public awareness which is so necessary for the protection and preservation of our rights:

[From the Casper Star-Tribune, June 10, 1970]

NAMES FOR SALE: WHAT PRIVACY?

Congressman John Wold is so specifically right in his opposition to the (former) practice of the Internal Revenue Service in selling lists of names that we cannot see how anyone could reasonably disagree with his position.

Selling names and addresses for advertising and other uses is a common practice which helps a few to the annoyance of many. It is a practice which should be outlawed. While we tolerate it, we regard it as an invasion of privacy. Those individuals and institutions which provide such listings cannot be regarded as much less than scavengers at a cent or five cents a name. A customer or prospective customer writes to a company

regarding an item, and it is only a short time hence, that he receives "pitches" from other companies which may meet some area of his interest.

When the Internal Revenue Service makes use of privileged information, available to it under compulsion of law, the hackles of every citizen should rise. After Mr. Wold asked the IRS to stop selling rolls of mailing labels containing names and addresses of some 140,000 licensed gun dealers and collectors for about a cent a name, the IRS said it had done so, but contended it could sell the lists under the Freedom of Information Act.

The IRS viewpoint has been described as a gross distortion of the act, and we are inclined to agree. In an area where there is reason to believe that private enterprise is open to suspicion, the U.S. Government should be *simon pure*?

Congressman Wold has raised the question of whether the rights of individuals have been violated. He also noted that indiscriminate circulation of such lists as those of gun dealers and collectors could provide targets for access of weapons.

There is continuing concern—as there should be—that personal information provided to governmental agencies will be misused. If there is any one thing that has made this country great, it is the philosophy that it is a nation of individuals and that they are not merely units of an overriding state.

If we are willing to go that way—toward Communism—we can do it by gradual processes which hardly will be noticed. The erosion of individual freedom is almost unperceived, and bureaucracy becomes such a behemoth that even the President and his Cabinet cannot always prevent it from twisting the arms of republican form of government.

John Wold has pinpointed this question to the field of guns—and he was right in doing that. But it is a much larger issue dealing with the American citizen, the law-abiding person, the non-criminal, who has some privilege of privacy which should be respected by private enterprise and by his government.

THE COMPUTER AGE IS DAWNING ON CAPITOL HILL

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in 1965 and 1966, I was a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress jointly chaired by former Senator A. S. Mike Monroney and Representative RAY J. MADDEN.

Our deliberations led to the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved by the Senate in 1967.

During the course of several weeks of hearings we learned again that knowledge is power—that enacting legislation requires an understanding of the alternatives. That understanding would be aided immeasurably by the use of computers, upon which business and executive departments are relying increasingly to their advantage.

Mr. President, computers would better equip us to make the decisions we must make. They would give this Nation's lawmakers the capability we must have to meet representatives of the executive

branch and the business community on equal terms.

That the computer age is dawning on Capitol Hill is the subject of an article in the May 28, 1970, issue of the National Journal, published by the Center for Political Research. The article discusses provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act which has been ordered reported by the House Rules Committee. Title IV would create a Joint Committee on Data Processing charged with the responsibility for establishing a system of automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval to meet the "urgent, critical, and continuing need" of the Congress.

The author is Mr. Andrew J. Glass, formerly of the New York Herald-Tribune and now the Journal's congressional staff correspondent. I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the RECORD.

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

CPR REPORT/CONGRESS MOVES INTO COMPUTER AGE BUT DIVIDES ON CONTROL OF NEW SYSTEMS

(By Andrew J. Glass)

The computer age is dawning on Capitol Hill.

Despite this awakening, there is resistance within the legislative branch against creating a unified computer system. Sparring has arisen between the House and Senate and within each body over who will control the computers, although no one is opposing their introduction.

Behind these disputes lies the knowledge that information is power: Any group that designs and runs a computer system in Congress also has the potential to shape the legislative process.

Enacting legislation often reflects an understanding of the alternatives. With access to computer tools, individual lawmakers would become less dependent on committees and better equipped to take the initiative.

Redressing the balance: Computers, which thrive on the kind of recurring data Congress deals in, may provide the lawmakers with a new capability to challenge policymakers in the executive branch.

Among those pressing for action it is widely felt that "third-generation" analytic computers could be an effective tool in restoring to Congress powers yielded nearly 50 years ago with the passage of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 (PL 67-13).

Until then, it was Congress and not the executive branch that annually prepared the federal budget draft.

Without the detailed information generated by the budgetary cycle, Congress lacks a key framework for decision-making.

A 1969 House Government Operations Committee report states that "the time is already here when the Bureau of the Budget could not prepare the budget without the use of a computer."

There are 4,666 computers in the federal government, 62.1 per cent of them in the Defense Department. This does not count computers tied into specific weapons systems.

Bridging the gap: Four years ago, the sole computer facility on Capitol Hill was a small unit used to calculate the Library of Congress payroll. Even today, in making fresh strides to bridge the information gap with the executive branch, Congress finds itself behind nearly two dozen state legislatures which have computerized their data.

In 1965, Congress directed the National Bureau of Standards to offer all-out techni-

cal support to federal agencies in the computer sciences (PL 89-306).

Yet a good deal of this new data is not being used by Congress, which currently lacks the means to absorb it. For example:

Walter W. Hassie, director of management information systems for the Budget Bureau, has privately offered on Capitol Hill to make available the data used to compile 200-odd special analyses which, in turn, govern key budget-making decisions. Hassie is also moving toward a year-round "rolling budget" system. At present, Congress lacks the manpower and tools to use this data—to evaluate it independently or to maintain its own "rolling budget," which requires computers continuously to monitor all changes in spending levels.

In Denver, the Air Force runs its computerized Project LITE (Legal Information Through Electronics). LITE has such data as the entire text of the U.S. Code; all published decisions of the U.S. Comptroller General and all unpublished decisions since 1955, and all international law agreements. Congress has no way of tapping into LITE.

This year, the Bureau of the Census is developing comprehensive magnetic tape files on U.S. population trends, including key statistics on race, education, income and housing. Congress lacks independent means to study this data.

Too much, too soon: Another major problem facing Congress is, in the words of the systems analysts, "information overload." As a recent Library of Congress report puts it:

"The problem usually is not too little information, but too much."

HOUSE

Having successfully resisted for four years, House Democratic leaders determined in 1969 that pressure had mounted to the point where they should produce a congressional reorganization bill.

The result of these efforts is more modest in scope than scores of previous efforts that have failed in the House. Known as the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (HR 17654), the bill is scheduled to be taken up on the House floor during the week of June 22.

Computer provisions: Title IV of the bill provides for the creation of a Joint Committee on Data Processing. This concept faces strong opposition.

Joint approach—The proposed panel would be composed of six Senators and six Representatives, divided evenly between Democrats and Republicans. The group would have wide powers to set computer policies for Congress.

Specifically, the joint committee would be charged with implementing the bill's finding that "... there is an urgent, critical and continuing need on the part of the Congress and the legislative branch generally for a modern, effective and coordinated automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval system."

The joint committee approach had been advocated (as HR 7012) by Rep. William S. Moorhead, D-Pa., who says that "Capitol Hill computer systems must be compatible—they must be able to 'talk to one another.'"

Record salary—Under the plan, the joint committee would hire a director of data processing and pay him \$40,000 a year. This would be the highest-paid staff position on Capitol Hill.

It would be some \$2,000 higher than the salaries paid to the Architect of the Capitol, the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate. And it would be only \$2,500 below the political ceiling imposed by the Members' own salary level. (A deputy director would earn \$36,000 a year.)

Gordon E. Nelson, who recently resigned as administrative assistant to Rep. B. F. Sisk, D-Calif., a principal author of the reorganization measure, said the high salary levels reflect the difficulty of luring away the best

people and keeping them. "The data processing community," he added, "has a notorious reputation for pirating people."

Unanimous committee backing—From a political standpoint, the reorganization bill's strongest virtue is its co-sponsorship by all the members of the House Rules Committee—usually an inducement to rank-and-file support.

Sisk, who piloted the proposal to the floor as chairman of a special rules subcommittee on legislative reorganization, told *National Journal*:

"This is tremendously expensive equipment. I'm thoroughly convinced in my mind that there is no other economically feasible way to proceed than to bring it under one blanket."

Alternative Approach: One Member of the House who is not at all content with the prospect of climbing under a joint committee blanket is Joe D. Waggoner Jr., D-La., chairman of a special House Administration Subcommittee on Electrical and Mechanical Office Equipment.

"Sure, we're going to fight them on it," Waggoner told *National Journal*.

Design project set—Furthermore, Waggoner revealed that he planned to sign a contract with a private firm, or group of firms, to develop specifications for a coordinated computerized information system for the House. The normal range of such contracts is several hundred thousand dollars.

Waggoner emphasized that he intended to negotiate the contract in mid-June, before the Sisk bill reaches the floor. If Waggoner keeps to his timetable, the House will have a contract to provide an automatic data processing system before its Members vote on the recommendation to develop a system jointly with the Senate.

House Clerk stalled—Waggoner's initiative has halted efforts by House Clerk W. Pat Jennings, a former Member (D-Va. 1955-1967), to develop independently a computerized mailing system and a legislative retrieval system for the House.

These steps would have followed the computerization by Jennings of the House's annual \$18.6 million payroll.

In June 1969, Jennings dazzled Members with a two-day demonstration of an information system known as Digiscribe. The system combines a cathode-ray tube, an electric typewriter and a calculating unit.

In the test run, Representatives found they could touch one of five words flashed on a television-like screen (such as a category of bills) and, within 12 seconds, the screen would light up with background information on the subject.

Consolidation effort: Since that time, the House Administration Committee has refused to approve further outlays for Jennings-initiated projects in the computer field as the panel presses its claim for jurisdiction against all would-be competitors.

"Pat and his people have been brought into the fold," Waggoner said. Last year, Waggoner chided Jennings for moving ahead without consulting with him.

Democratic bid—Waggoner maintains he is acting under a mandate dating from a January 1969 partisan resolution sponsored by Rep. John Brademas, D-Ind. The resolution was endorsed by the independently-oriented Democratic Study Group as well as by the full Democratic Caucus.

The Brademas resolution calls for "the Committee on House Administration (to) be fully supported by Democratic Members in efforts to improve the efficiency of operations in the House. . . . We urge that these efforts include, but not be limited to, the use of computers and of a centralized mail processing system."

Extra funds provided—More significant, perhaps, than the resolution is a special open-purpose appropriation of \$500,000 (HRes 710) that the House Administration Committee won last November to fund—

should it choose to use the money that way—the design of a computerized information system.

On May 27, Waggoner reported, his subcommittee completed interviews with the last of 46 prospective contractors.

At the same time, Waggoner's staff has been conducting in-depth interviews with more than 200 Members as well as dozens of key committee employees regarding their computer-related priorities.

"This has been a two-way process," Julian P. Langston, chief clerk of the House Administration Committee, told *National Journal*. "In more than a few cases, the Members were not well acquainted with the potential applications of such an information system and we were able to help them understand what can be done," Langston said. "Everyone who wanted to be interviewed was."

Interviews analyzed—The survey is expected to be completed in early June. Results will then be tabulated and analyzed by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan.

Although Waggoner declined to disclose his future plans, a source close to the subcommittee's work said that, almost certainly, the initial computerization efforts would focus on systems:

To monitor federal contract awards in each congressional district, and

To keep track of legislative activity, including the status of bills.

Political ramifications—Waggoner acknowledged, however, that he was resisting "strong pressure" to install a computerized mailing system similar to Jennings' proposal. The reason for his resistance, he said, is that Republicans would object to the advantage such a system would provide to incumbent Democrats in an election year.

Sisk-Waggoner controversy: Sisk had thought he had Waggoner's support for a joint committee on which Waggoner, presumably, would play a major role.

Joint committees assailed—When Waggoner testified before the Sisk subcommittee in November 1969, however, he said:

"There are glaring examples where (joint committees) have failed miserably to work. . . . I am convinced that if we are going to proceed, we are going to set back any final action two years or more by going to a joint committee now."

One Member present at the hearing said privately: "Sisk nearly fell off his chair when he heard that. He thought he had a deal all lined up with Joe."

Outcome in contention—It is difficult to assess Waggoner's potential strength in his coming effort to defeat the joint committee concept. One member of the Democratic hierarchy in the House who supports Sisk said: "I would have assumed if he (Waggoner) had any real cards he would have played them before we got to the floor."

But a member of the Rules Committee, Richard Bolling, D-Mo., told *National Journal*: "If we had to vote today, they (Waggoner's group) would probably win. But I hope to change that by the time the issue reaches the House because our plan makes eminently more sense."

Government Operations Role: Another uncertain element is the position of Rep. Jack Brooks, D-Tex., who, Sisk admits, "has some reservations."

Over the last decade, as chairman of a Government Activities Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, Brooks has specialized in keeping an eye on the use of computer systems in the executive branch. He claims this work has resulted in a saving of \$1.5 billion to taxpayers.

Brooks initiative—In April 1969, Brooks held hearings on "Effective and Efficient Use of Computers in Congress." They resulted in a Brooks-drafted bill (H.R. 10791) that gives the Comptroller General coordinating authority to acquire and maintain computers for congressional use.

Brooks' bill was stopped in the Rules Committee. Thereupon, Brooks suggested to Sisk that computer authority be placed in the hands of the Legislative Reference Service (LRS) of the Library of Congress in view of the fact that Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats "has manifested an extreme reluctance to assume the responsibilities."

Situation reviewed: "Essentially, you've got three horses going right now on computers in the House," a Member said. "There is Government Operations and Brooks. There is Rules and Sisk. And there is House Administration and Waggoner. Right now, (House Clerk) Pat Jennings is out of it—he's been playing ball with Waggoner. And it looks like they're trying to squeeze out Brooks as well."

The congressional analyst did not mention another "horse" that may well be in the running: The 50-member House Appropriations Committee, which must eventually fund any major computer system. The appropriations group budgetary work could also be directly affected by such a system.

Meantime, Waggoner is forging ahead, utilizing a temporary task force of outside consultants called, simply, "the working group." Its senior members are Edward J. Mahoney, director of the new data processing center at the U.S. General Accounting Office; Robert L. Chartrand, an information specialist at LRS; and Thomas E. Ladd, an aide to Jennings.

Compatibility with the Senate: Brooks is displeased with the Waggoner approach because, he maintains, it does not put sufficient stress on meshing with the Senate's "data base." As he puts it: "You can put together the needed hardware in weeks. You can design a system in a matter of months. But a data base must be developed over a period of years. And not having thought through the data base problem is like having a Cadillac in the upper reaches of the Congo up to its hub caps in mud."

Waggoner, however, bristles with anger whenever he is reminded that last July he invited Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, Mont., and his then GOP counterpart, Everett McKinley Dirksen, III. (1951-1969) to join in the staffing of "the working group."

Waggoner said he never received a reply to his invitation. (One explanation offered privately on Capitol Hill is that the protocol-conscious Mansfield chose not to reply because, in his view, the subcommittee bid should have been transmitted to him by House Majority Leader Carl Albert, Okla.)

Lack of cooperation from the Senate will be a major issue when he attacks the joint committee concept on the floor, Waggoner said.

Sisk, however, said there is "fresh evidence" that the Senate is shifting its stand. He reported he had recently received letters of encouragement from Dirksen's successor as minority leader, Sen. Hugh Scott, Pa., and Senate Majority Whip Edward M. Kennedy, Mass.—letters, Sisk said, expressing "a strong interest" in his approach.

SENATE

Following several independent tracks, the Senate is delving deeply this year into the world of computers. It remains uncertain, however, whether these efforts will yield a coordinated information system.

A major new track opened when the Senate legislative appropriations subcommittee, chaired by Sen. Joseph M. Montoya, D-N.M., last year called upon Secretary of the Senate Francis R. Valeo to examine the Senate's fiscal operations.

Management study: Valeo, whose role is equivalent to Jennings' in the House, said he later broadened the effort "into a complete organizational analysis of all offices under the Secretary of the Senate."

To conduct the study, begun last November, Valeo retained Orlando B. Potter as a \$31,317-a-year consultant. Potter had served

as a legislative aide to Sen. Clairborne Pell, D-R.I., between 1962 and 1968. Two years ago, he ran unsuccessfully for the House seat held by Carleton J. King, R-N.Y.

Although the study will not be completed until mid-June, Potter's tentative findings show that:

The Senate's 4,500-employee payroll is figured manually. The Senate is the only federal agency still paying its employees in cash. (Checks and direct deposits to bank accounts are available on a monthly basis.)

Basic housekeeping functions, such as personnel records, the fiscal accounts of committees and stationery allowances, are also calculated by hand.

Five Senate offices are currently compiling separate indexes of legislative activity. These indexes overlap and duplicate one another.

In his analysis, Potter has described 15 potential applications for computers.

System described: "What is needed," Potter told *National Journal* "is a single system retrievable at all (input) sources. This would create automatic integration of legislative action. I'm thinking in terms of a rather large-scale real-time system."

(A "real-time system" is one in which the data can enter the system simultaneously at several points of origin, called remote terminals. The data is then instantaneously transmitted and available at all other terminals.)

Potter's proposals further call for separating "operating functions," which the Senate would maintain, and the "historical functions," which would be turned over to the LRS.

This concept must still be approved by Valeo and Majority Leader Mansfield. Valeo, who had served as an aide to Mansfield before becoming Secretary of the Senate (1959-66), is keenly aware of Mansfield's low opinion of joint Senate-House committees. Mansfield's views tend to point the Senate in the direction of an independent approach toward computers.

Rules initiative: Meantime, the Senate committee that holds direct responsibility for housekeeping chores, Rules and Administration, is showing a new-found interest in computer technology.

Last month, Chairman B. Everett Jordan, D-N.C., ordered the panel's chief counsel, Hugh Q. Alexander, and his minority counterpart, Burkett Van Kirk, to undertake a joint study of computer applications for the Senate. The staff has turned to the LRS's Chartrand for technical assistance.

Computer facility: Unlike the House, the Senate leases a computer system to prepare mailing-list printouts for individual Senate offices. This installation, located in the Senate service department, is under the control of the Senate sergeant-at-arms, Robert G. Dunphy.

Until the partial conversion to magnetic tape in the summer of 1968, all Senate offices with mailing lists were storing them in the service department on metal plates. The floor was sagging dangerously under their combined weight.

The Senate's computer operation is shrouded in secrecy. Would-be visitors are politely, but firmly, turned away. No public records are available of the cost, which is absorbed in a lump-sum appropriation to Dunphy by the Montoya panel.

"They have been extremely sensitive about any knowledge getting out," an aide to Sen. Joseph D. Tydings, D-Md., told *National Journal*.

However, a series of interviews by *National Journal* with persons familiar with the system revealed that:

The computer system was installed after a group of key Senators, including Jordan, visited the automated mailing operation of Kiplinger Washington Editors, Inc.

In the first year of operation, the facility was plagued with numerous breakdowns, de-

lays and errors—to the point that Senators resisted further conversions to the system. These difficulties were reduced, if not eliminated, with the introduction of a new, larger unit in August 1969.

In a further effort to improve efficiency, Dunphy last year hired a new computer manager, James W. Estep, and two programmers.

In March 1970, 36 Senators from both parties wrote Jordan, Montoya and Dunphy complaining that "over the last several years many of us have experienced great difficulty in obtaining adequate service" from the Senate's internal printing facility. As a result of the letter, Dunphy ordered new equipment to support the computer.

About half the Senate offices are now estimated to be using the system. Senators are limited to mailings of 280,000 items a month.

The system permits Senators to classify their constituents by up to 10 different "professional" codes—such as occupation, political affiliation and viewpoint on the issues—as well as three separate geographic codes.

Unused potential: A Senator who declined to be identified for publication but who is conversant with the computer said: "We are sitting with a brain downstairs. They are now feeling out the edges of other kinds of retrieval but it has to be secret. The attitude is we're going to get this mailing thing right before we do anything else."

Meantime, a group of young activists, who are for the most part employed in the offices of Northern Democrats, meets informally on an irregular basis to exchange information about computer developments in the Senate and to map plans for further initiatives. This group was instrumental in framing the joint letter of complaint on the Senate service department.

GOP computer ally: Fresh support for advancing on the computer front is coming from Edward L. Beach, secretary and staff director of the Senate Republican Policy Committee.

Beach, a former nuclear submarine commander, circumnavigated the earth under the seas aboard the *USS Triton* in 1960. He has a strong grasp of computer technology.

A Democratic Senate source said privately: "The beauty of it is that New (Beach) plugs into all the power-brokers on the other side of the aisle. If he gets behind this, you'll really see some action around here."

SUPPORTING AGENCIES

Ten computer systems are now installed or on order in the legislative branch.

Agencies under the control of Congress—the Library of Congress, the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO) and the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO)—are making wide use of automated systems.

Library of Congress: The library has grown from a budget of \$2,971,200 and 959 employees in 1939 to \$46,310,000 and 2,942 employees in the current fiscal year.

Automation spending—Since 1966, the library has spent \$5,295,000 on its automation program. If current requests are approved in full, spending for automation would total \$7,855,000 through June 30, 1971.

According to L. Quincy Mumford, the Librarian of Congress, "at the current rate of growth, the servicing of the library's collections will, before many years pass, become cumbersome beyond the point acceptable to users unless we proceed now with the automation program."

Bibliography—Since 1964, the library has been developing a central bibliographical system (CBS) that has increasingly emphasized the use of computers.

CBS, essentially a document retrieval system, features a computerized machine-readable language (MARC). By this means, bibliographical data is distributed to 75 other computer-equipped libraries throughout the world. CBS also calls for gradually computer-

izing such functions as copyright control, book ordering and a massive subject-heading file.

Card system—The library's card division is automating the annual distribution of some 100 million catalogue cards (with five million titles) to 25,000 libraries.

When the project is completed this fall, the library will be able to produce a daily magnetic tape containing all card data on MARC. This will eliminate the need to store cards and end delays in the filing of outside orders.

At the same time, earlier catalogue entries are being converted to the automated system under a private grant from the Council for Library Resources, a Washington-based arm of the Ford Foundation.

According to John G. Lorenz, deputy librarian of congress, "in many respects (we are) leading the way in library automation not only in this country but in the world."

Legislative Reference Service—Late in 1967, LRS began using computers to prepare the *Digest of Public General Bills, and Resolutions*, a semi-weekly reference work that contains a capsule summary of each public bill introduced.

LRS also employs what it calls an administrative terminal system (ATS) to send and recall computer data. Thirty terminals, essentially electric typewriters, hooked into the computer, process data used to compile the digest and related information sought by committees and individual Members.

Terminals in Congress—In addition, two House committees—Banking and Currency and Judiciary—keep their bill schedules (calendars) on the Library's computer through terminals located in the committee rooms. Ten more House committees are currently seeking to be hooked into the system.

Planned capability—As Lester S. Jayson, director of LRS explains it: "Hopefully, as the system develops, we will have random retrieval. By that I mean if you ask a question like: 'What bills are pending with regard to veterans' affairs?' the computer could be queried accordingly and then there would be printout of summaries of all bills on that subject. We can do it now only by recalling specific bills."

The system described by Jason is expected to be operating by December 1970.

Government Printing Office: The printing and binding of its own publications will cost Congress \$30,300,000 in the current fiscal year. This sum has been appropriated to the GPO, an arm of the legislative branch that also handles, on a reimbursable basis, the far more extensive printing needs of the White House, the executive departments, independent agencies and the federal judiciary.

Automation thrusts—A \$125,000 request pending in Congress would pay for the design of a computer system to handle inventory and sales to the public at the GPO's central Washington, D.C. facility.

In addition, the GPO is seeking seed money to build a fully automated satellite distribution center west of the Mississippi River—a project that the House Appropriations Committee frowns upon.

In the view of Carper W. Buckley, superintendent of documents at GPO, top priority should be placed on conversion to "modern automated electronic data processing methods in order to perform a task of the magnitude with which we are faced. No operation of comparable scope, in or out of government, is still attempting to perform such an operation manually."

Electronic printing—GPO is making limited use of electronic photocomposition in its Washington printing plant. The eventual plan is to feed the GPO's two "Inotron" machines directly with the LRS' *Bill Digest* tapes.

General Accounting Office: The GAO, a watchdog agency charged with keeping other federal agencies honest and efficient, has been

dealing with computer technology since the early 1950s. (The first computer produced commercially was acquired by the Census Bureau in 1951 to assist in processing returns.) Yet the GAO is only now in the process of installing a computer system to support its own work.

GAO defense—Comptroller General Staats, who runs the agency, defends GAO's ultra-cautious approach toward acquiring its own computers. "It is obvious," he told Brooks' subcommittee last year, "that the effort to supply a management information system presents problems. We have been almost two years in the process of trying to develop one for our own internal requirements."

Staats sees the GAO's role with computers as covering three broad areas:

Aiding in the internal management of GAO itself;

As a tool in GAO audits of other federal agencies;

To be analyzed as to their uses by federal agencies.

Decisions to be made—This last interest has a special bearing on congressional initiatives to install computers. As Staats views it: "(This) is a question of lease versus purchase; the question of whether or not there is adequate planning for the design of the system; the question of how the equipment is maintained, and whether it is maintained more economically in-house or by contract."

BACKGROUND

Since the mid-1960s, there has been an ever-increasing number of articles and statements in the *Congressional Record* regarding the difficulties encountered by Congress in gathering, storing and retrieving information.

Often, these analyses have been accompanied by specific proposals to acquire computer "hardware" and "software."

Computer hardware includes all the physical components utilized in the system, including such units as processors, printers, terminals and magnetic tape loaders. Computer software includes all the "programs"—sets of instructions—needed to make the hardware function properly.)

These studies have usually been aimed at the adoption of a variety of specialized uses.

Proposed legislation: The first bill calling for the creation of a computer facility to serve Congress was introduced by Rep. Robert McClory, R-Ill., when the 90th Congress opened in January 1967. This bill (H.R. 21) was aimed at giving the LRS power to "make use of automatic data processing techniques and equipment in the performance of its functions."

Senate action—A similar provision was inserted in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967 (S. 355) by Sen. Scott. This measure, which passed the Senate in 1968, also called for the creation of a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, which would be responsible for "continuing study of automatic data processing and information retrieval systems for Congress."

Another section of the bill dealt with the formation of a "standardized information and data processing system for budgetary and fiscal data for use by all federal agencies." The data pool was to be built through the joint efforts of the Director of the Budget Bureau, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller General.

House resistance—The proposals in S. 355 resulted in large part from staff work and hearings conducted by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, established in 1965 and chaired jointly by former Sen. A. S. (Mike) Monroney, D-Okla. (1951-69), and Rep. Ray J. Madden, D-Ind., a senior member of the House Rules Committee.

The House Democratic leadership, joined by most committee chairmen, showed no enthusiasm for S. 355, partly because the bill would distribute considerable new powers to younger Members.

The joint committee and its wide ranging proposals for legislative reform died at the end of the 90th Congress after the House Rules Committee refused to clear S. 355 for floor action.

Private sector pressures: Beginning in the mid-1960s, private groups have begun to play a significant role in examining the information policies of Congress and in seeking to acquaint the lawmakers with computerized systems.

Among the key developments:

The American Enterprise Institute commissioned 12 research papers focusing on all facets of legislative functions, including information systems. They were published in 1966 as *Congress: The First Branch of Government*.

The National Broadcasting Co. (NBC) sponsored a "management study of the U.S. Congress" prepared in 1965 by Arthur D. Little Inc., a Cambridge, Mass., consulting firm. A team of specialists interviewed about 20 Members. Their recommendations served as the basis of an NBC-TV news program entitled "Congress Needs Help" and were later published under that title in book form.

The Brookings Institution held a seminar at the start of the 90th Congress (1967) for about 20 Members. The group held a series of informal talks on the need for improved means of support for legislative work.

The Washington Operations Council, supported by the Institute for Management Sciences, convened in 1968-69 a series of evening meetings designed at forming closer ties between the lawmakers and systems analysis specialists.

Senate seminar—The American Federation of Information Processing Societies, a software trade group, and the Association for Computing Machinery Inc., a hardware association, joined May 20 to sponsor a day-long computer orientation session in the Senate Caucus Room. The seminar conflicted with the workload pressures arising from the Cambodian crisis, perhaps a reason why fewer than two dozen congressional staffers attended.

One speaker, Joel D. Aron, of International Business Machines' federal systems center, stressed the effect recent computer hardware developments could have on the legislative branch.

"First-generation computers were merely operational," Aron said. "Second and third generation information systems are just beginning to enter the decision-making area. But it looks like the power they give you is a lot more significant. It allows to take an analytic approach to problems when you've just been guessing in the past."

Consultants' ideas—In the last three years, software and hardware firms have prepared a series of speculative proposals—designing computer systems that would serve the entire Congress.

At the same time, pilot management studies of individual congressional offices have been undertaken by private consultants. Several recommendations envisioned the installation of computer terminals in offices tied by telephone lines to a remote "data bank."

Lately, the stress on Capitol Hill has shifted to software programming and the necessity to build and maintain a strong information storage system that could continually be "updated."

"It's just as well," Orlando Potter, the Senate consultant, said. "The hardware companies sent salesmen up here who just scared the hell out of Congress and really set us back."

FUTURE

In his introduction to *The Sapless Branch*, a study of Congress by former Sen. Joseph S. Clark, D-Pa. (1957-69), British historian Sir Dennis Brogan writes:

"Until Congress reforms its own procedures and changes its state of mind, it will continue to suffer increasing public discredit or

public indifference—and this would be a disastrous trend for the United States."

The quiet revolution: In recent years, an ever-increasing number of lawmakers have come to believe that information technology could play a critical role in meeting the challenge posed by Sir Dennis.

Despite this quiet revolution in thinking, Congress as an institution has yet to experience anywhere near the full potential of computer-based information technology.

Nonetheless, several factors could accelerate the acceptance of computer facilities:

Built-in tensions between authorizing and appropriating committees, both eager to control program decision-making;

Publicity incentives and other rewards for committee and subcommittee chairmen who identify themselves with computer technology and offer such services to other Members;

Fears that Congress has yielded too much initiative and authority to the President, which have been revived by the Cambodian crisis.

As John S. Saloma III, a former president of the Ripon Society and a political science professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has observed:

"(In the past), Congress has often had to 'second guess' the Executive without the information to back its hunches. Now, as technology generalizes the availability of information, Congress can tap into Executive-based information systems, establish quality controls and develop more limited information systems for its own specific requirements."

In this way, Congress could, perhaps by mid-decade, possess powerful new tools to review, evaluate, analyze and, eventually, set its own priorities.

JOBS FOR COMPUTERS

In recent years, independent studies and computer-oriented lawmakers have proposed more and more ways that computers could be used to meet the needs of the legislative branch. The following is a summary of suggested applications:

LEGISLATIVE DATA

Status and content of bills.
Schedules and activity summary.
Index of congressional documents.
Automated voting and post-vote analysis.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA

Payrolls and inventory.
Personnel records.
Lobbyist's files.
Campaign spending reports.

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS' DATA

Personal legislative history.
Mailing lists.
Constitutional correspondence files.
Congressional district profiles.

OTHER DATA

Files currently in executive branch.
Budgetary and appropriations process.
Federal contract awards.
Topical research and statistics.
(SOURCE.—CPR Research Services.)

KEY ACTORS IN COMPUTER PLANNING

These lawmakers are playing key roles in bringing computers to Congress:

B. F. (Bernie) Sisk, 60, D-Calif., succeeded in moving a congressional reform bill to the House floor after others were unable to do so.

Texas-born, Sisk left his wife and two children behind in 1937 to seek work in California. They joined him there later. In 1955, Fresno and Merced counties in central California sent Sisk to the House and have kept him in office since.

Last year, Sisk, joined the House Agriculture Committee, thus becoming the only House Member to serve both on the Rules panel and a major policy-making committee.

Rep. Joe D. Waggoner Jr., 52, D-La., is

regarded widely by his colleagues as one of the best politicians on Capitol Hill. He has advanced his most recent cause (control of House computers) through an easygoing and friendly approach with fellow House Members.

Waggoner came to the House from the Fourth District of Louisiana through a special election in 1961. Before running for Congress, he operated a wholesale petroleum products agency in Bossier Parish (county), La.

Sen. Joseph M. Montoya, 55, D-N Mex., chairs a seven-member appropriations subcommittee that funds much of the Senate's operating needs without going through other committees. Such tight control gives him an extra measure of power in the Senate's internal affairs.

Montoya has been in politics for all his adult life. He was 21 when elected to the New

Mexico House of Representatives; later he served four terms as lieutenant governor.

He was elected to the U.S. House in 1957 and came to the Senate in 1964, where he also watches after New Mexico's needs as a member of the Public Works Committee.

Sen. B. Everett Jordan, 73, D-N.C., produces fewer bills from his Rules and Administration Committee than does the chairman of any other standing Senate committee.

But Jordan is also in charge of such mundane matters as allocating private offices ("hideaways") to Senators, which gives him a good deal of leverage with his colleagues. Now he is moving into computers.

Jordan, a Senator since 1958, came into the limelight in 1963-65 when his panel handled the investigation into the conduct of Robert G. (Bobby) Baker, former secretary to the Senate majority. He has extensive textile holdings in North Carolina.

full understanding of a necessarily complex subject.

SCOREKEEPING REPORT—BILL BY BILL

Supporting table No. 1 in the report is the key table showing, bill by bill, what Congress is doing to change both the budget authority and the outlay—expenditure—sides of the President's budget. It shows actions in terms of increases or decreases from the budget estimates.

Scorekeeping for budget authority, such as appropriations, can be fairly precise. However, precise translation of actions on appropriations into the effect of such actions on outlays is not possible. The best that can be provided are approximations of the effects of these actions on the outlay or expenditure budget. I am inserting supporting table No. 1 in the RECORD.

By referring to the various subtotal lines on the table, the cumulative change from the budget estimates can be readily determined.

This table is in several parts.

APPROPRIATION BILLS

The first part of the table shows the effects of actions taken—to June 8—at this session on appropriation bills.

The report indicates that the net effect of House actions in appropriation bills to June 8 have resulted in decreasing 1971 appropriation requests for budget authority by about \$682 million, and increasing estimated outlays over the President's budget estimates by about \$101 million. Outlays show an increase, because the outlay figure includes the effect in fiscal 1971 of the Labor-HEW-OEO appropriation bill for fiscal 1970 passed at this session—the budget for fiscal 1971 submitted in February did not reflect final congressional action on this appropriation bill, but did reflect final congressional action on all other appropriation bills for fiscal 1970, except, of course, the pending second general supplemental bill.

BACKDOOR BUDGET AUTHORITY

The second part of this table shows changes in the budget made in the form of new budget authority through the so-called backdoor appropriations process. To June 8, the House has voted \$224 million in budget authority over the President's budget requests. Since only contract authority is involved, no change is shown for outlays. The figures shown in parentheses are for actions taken during the last session on bills still pending before the Congress.

LEGISLATIVE BILLS MANDATING SPENDING

The third part of this table reflects estimates for budget increases or decreases which result from congressional action on legislation containing mandatory spending authorizations such as pay or pension increases for which spending does not wait until an appropriation is made as is the case for most legislation authorizing new or expanded programs.

The net effect of House actions to June 8 for such legislative items is a decrease in 1971 budget authority of \$89 million and a decrease in 1971 budget outlays of about \$6 million—largely as a result of a later effective date than proposed in the budget for the family as-

COMPUTERS IN STATE LEGISLATURES¹

| | Law search | Bill status | Bill history | Bill drafting | Index | Bill digest | Fiscal impact | Appropriations | Total |
|-------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|-------|-------------|---------------|----------------|-------|
| Connecticut | X | X | | | | | | | 2 |
| Florida | | X | X | | X | X | | | 4 |
| Hawaii | X | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Illinois | X | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Indiana | | X | X | | | X | X | | 4 |
| Iowa | X | X | X | | X | | | | 4 |
| Maryland | X | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Massachusetts | X | X | | | | | | | 2 |
| Missouri | X | X | | X | X | | | | 4 |
| Nebraska | X | | | | | | | | 1 |
| New Hampshire | X | | | | | | | | 1 |
| New Jersey | X | | | | | | | | 1 |
| New York | X | | | | | | | | 1 |
| North Carolina | | X | | X | X | | | | 4 |
| Ohio | X | X | | | | | | X | 3 |
| Pennsylvania | | X | X | X | | X | | | 4 |
| Tennessee | | X | | | | | | | 1 |
| Texas | X | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Washington | X | X | | | | | | | 2 |
| West Virginia | X | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Wisconsin | X | | | X | | | | | 2 |
| Total (21 States) | 16 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | |

¹State legislatures have moved more quickly than Congress in implementing the use of computers to support their operations. The above is a summary of computer applications in 21 State legislatures that use data processing.

Source: Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

THE 1971 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, last week, I commented briefly on the periodic "budget scorekeeping report" prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. A new report—cumulative to June 8, 1970—has now been issued and mailed to all Members. This report shows how various actions of the Congress affect the President's budget estimates. It also reveals how inactions by the Congress on various Presidential proposals may also affect the President's budget.

In briefest summary, the report discloses that, as of June 8, the following actions affecting the fiscal 1971 budget have been taken:

First. The President's budget estimates of \$220 billion in new budget authority—Have been decreased by House actions by \$548 million;

Have been increased by Senate actions by \$1,203 million; and

Have been increased by congressional enactments to date by \$383 million.

Second. The President's budget esti-

mates of about \$205 billion in net budget outlays—expenditures—

Have been increased by House actions a net of about \$95 million;

Have been increased by Senate actions a net of about \$945 million; and

Have been increased by congressional enactments to date by about \$420 million.

This report is the only generally available source showing how congressional actions on each appropriation bill and each legislative bill directly affect the finances of the Federal Government. The report brings together all facets of the Federal budget; that is, appropriations, spending authorizations in basic legislation other than appropriation bills, the status of revenue proposals, the estimated cost of proposed legislation, and it shows what the actions or inactions of the Congress on these many proposals do to the budget outlook for the Federal Government.

This report is entirely factual and objective. It is based upon the best information the committee staff has been able to obtain from various sources. Its main thrust is to show how much the Congress is increasing or decreasing the President's budget by its actions or inactions on the various parts of the budget.

The scorekeeping report is about 25 pages of largely statistical data related to the budget and requires some study for a

sistance program legislation. This does not reflect enacted or pending Federal or postal pay increases which were proposed by the President as increases to his own February budget and therefore not accounted for as congressional increases in the budget.

A similar tabulation, giving the details of congressional actions affecting fiscal 1970 estimates, is included at the bottom of this table.

OVERALL CONGRESSIONAL EFFECT

Translating these actions as of June 8 on the fiscal 1971 budget, it will be seen that all bills—appropriation and legislative—enacted as of this time—which increase or decrease the President's budget—have added about \$383 million in new budget obligational authority and about \$420 million in budget outlays to the budget totals.

ACTION ON REVENUE SIDE OF BUDGET

The surplus or deficit in a budget is the difference between outlays and receipts. Thus, to determine what Congress has done to the deficit so far one must point to the increase in estimated outlays as a congressional increase in the deficit, unless that increase is offset by an increase in taxes also voted by the Congress. The report also keeps track of revenue proposals and congressional action thereon—table 3 of the report.

There have been some revenue increases voted by the Congress amounting to about \$146 million more than the

budget anticipated. But most of the President's new revenue proposals have not been acted upon.

SURPLUS-DEFICIT SITUATION

The increase in the projected 1971 deficit chargeable to the Congress to date is the difference between the \$420 million increase in outlays offset by a \$146 million increase in revenues, or about \$274 million.

In his statement of May 19, 1970, the President revised his February budget estimates for fiscal 1971 to reflect a projected deficit for the year of about \$1.3 billion—a change of \$2.6 billion from his February projection of a \$1.3 billion surplus. This latest projection included some actual and anticipated congressional actions. These surplus and deficit estimates are on the unified budget concept. They do not reflect changes in the national debt.

For Federal funds—funds not earmarked for social security and such purposes—the deficit for fiscal 1971 is now projected at more than \$10 billion. This more nearly reflects the true increase in the Federal debt expected for fiscal 1971.

The February budget included about \$5.4 billion for proposals which offset the projected deficit. These were the new revenue proposals, postal rate increases, legislative proposals resulting in negative budget outlays and the President's projected program terminations, restructuring and reductions—most of which require legislative action to

achieve them. Had the budget not reflected estimates for these things the deficit, on a unified budget basis, would presumably have been projected at \$4.1 billion instead of a surplus of \$1.3 billion.

On the basis of the May 19 reestimates announced by the President, proposals which offset the projected deficit had increased from \$5.4 billion to \$8.9 billion, including the proposed speedup in estate and gift tax collections, the leaded gasoline tax and some additional postal revenue increases not in the February budget estimates. Eliminating these offsetting proposals from the May 19 budget estimates would increase the projected deficit for 1971 on the unified budget to \$10.5 billion from the President's stated \$1.3 billion.

Going through the same type of calculations for just the Federal funds part of the budget, the May 19 projected deficit for these funds was \$10 billion. Adding the various offsets which are applicable only to Federal funds would increase this deficit in Federal funds to about \$18.4 billion.

Carrying the matter a little further and adding the \$3.2 billion loss in projected budget revenue recently estimated by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, these possible deficits for 1971 could be as high as \$13.7 billion on the unified budget basis and \$21.6 for the Federal funds portion of the budget.

The table referred to follows:

SUPPORTING TABLE NO. 1.—EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS DURING THE CURRENT SESSION ON INDIVIDUAL BILLS AFFECTING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES) (AS OF JUNE 8, 1970)

[In thousands of dollars]

| Items acted upon | Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget) | | | Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget) | | |
|--|--|---------------|----------------|--|---------------|----------------|
| | House (1) | Senate (2) | Enacted (3) | House (4) | Senate (5) | Enacted (6) |
| Fiscal year 1971: | | | | | | |
| Appropriation bills (changes from the 1971 budget): | | | | | | |
| Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, 1970 (H.R. 15931, Public Law 91-204)..... | | | | +248,000 | +248,000 | +248,000 |
| Education (H.R. 16916)..... | +319,590 | +700,597 | | +215,000 | +367,000 | |
| Legislative branch (H.R. 16915)..... | -9,394 | | | -8,750 | | |
| Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Offices (H.R. 16900)..... | -73,053 | | | -65,000 | | |
| Second supplemental, 1970 (H.R. 17399)..... | | | | -19,700 | +12,200 | |
| Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development (H.R. 17548)..... | +173,389 | | | -114,650 | | |
| State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies (H.R. 17575)..... | -136,949 | | | -50,000 | | |
| Interior and related agencies (H.R. 17619)..... | -731 | | | -3,350 | | |
| Transportation and related agencies (H.R. 17755)..... | -36,235 | | | -34,700 | | |
| Foreign assistance and related agencies (H.R. 17867)..... | -655,578 | | | -150,000 | | |
| District of Columbia (H.R. 17868)..... | -150 | | | -150 | | |
| Agriculture and related agencies (H.R. 17923)..... | +125,587 | | | +94,900 | | |
| Military construction (H.R. 17970)..... | +137,763 | | | +11,000 | | |
| Subtotal, appropriation bills..... | -682,461 | +700,597 | | +100,600 | +602,800 | +248,000 |
| Legislative bills with "backdoor" spending authorizations (changes from the 1971 budget): | | | | | | |
| Navajo Road (S. 404)..... | | (+5,000) | | | | |
| Land and water conservation (S. 2315)..... | +30,000 | (+30,000) | | | | |
| Unemployment trust fund (H.R. 14705)..... | +194,000 | +194,000 | +194,000 | | | |
| Outdoor advertising controls (S. 1442)..... | | (+15,000) | | | | |
| Federal-aid highways (H.R. 14741)..... | (+26,000) | | | | | |
| NSLI trust fund for veterans home loans (H.R. 9476)..... | | | | (+1,000,000) | | |
| Subtotal, "backdoor"..... | +224,000 | +194,000 | +194,000 | | | |
| Legislative bills with mandatory spending authorizations (changes from the 1971 budget): | | | | | | |
| Additional district judges (Public Law 91-272)..... | -2,370 | +1,473 | -727 | -2,370 | +1,473 | -727 |
| Court leave for Federal employees (H.R. 12979)..... | (N.A.) | | | (N.A.) | | |
| Uniform relocation assistance (S. 1)..... | | (N.A.) | | | (N.A.) | |
| Employee health benefits (H.R. 16968)..... | +140,000 | | | +140,000 | | |
| Defense: overseas mailing privileges (H.R. 8434)..... | (+8,900) | | | (+8,900) | | |
| Military lawyers retention (H.R. 4296)..... | (+7,000) | | | (+7,000) | | |
| Family separation allowance—residence (H.R. 110)..... | (+17,000) | | | (+17,000) | | |
| Family separation allowance—POW (H.R. 9486)..... | (N.A.) | | | (N.A.) | | |
| Air evacuation subsistence (H.R. 9654)..... | (+50) | | | (+50) | | |
| Dependents' health care (H.R. 8413)..... | (+255) | | | (+255) | | |
| Reserve retirement—Berlin-Vietnam (H.R. 3813)..... | (N.A.) | | | (N.A.) | | |
| Reserve retirement—aviation midshipmen (H.R. 11265)..... | (N.A.) | | | (N.A.) | | |

Footnotes at end of table.

SUPPORTING TABLE NO. 1.—EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS DURING THE CURRENT SESSION ON INDIVIDUAL BILLS AFFECTING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES) (AS OF JUNE 8, 1970)

[In thousands of dollars]

| Items acted upon | Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget) | | | Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget) | | |
|---|--|------------|------------|--|-----------|----------|
| | House | Senate | Enacted | House | Senate | Enacted |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Fiscal year 1971—Continued | | | | | | |
| Legislative bills with mandatory spending authorizations (changes from the 1971 budget)—Continued | | | | | | |
| Public Health Service retirement (Public Law 91-253) | +259 | +259 | +259 | +259 | +259 | +259 |
| Family assistance (H.R. 16311) | -450,000 | | | -350,000 | | |
| Federal lands for parks (reduces offsetting receipts) (S. 1708) | | (N.A.) | | | (N.A.) | |
| Foreign Service retirement (Public Law 91-201) | (N.A.) | (N.A.) | (N.A.) | (N.A.) | (N.A.) | (N.A.) |
| Veterans' hospital care for 70-year-olds (H.R. 693) | (+7,000) | (+7,000) | (+) | (+7,000) | (+7,000) | (+) |
| Veterans non-service-connected benefits (H.R. 372) | (+8,538) | | | (+8,538) | | |
| Veterans education assistance (Public Law 91-219) ¹ | +185,500 | +185,500 | +185,500 | +169,000 | +169,000 | +169,000 |
| Veterans additional \$5,000 insurance (S. 1479) | +45,000 | (+45,000) | (+) | +45,000 | (+45,000) | (+) |
| Veterans compensation increase (S. 3348) | | +114,370 | | | +114,370 | |
| Redefine "child"—(dependency compensation) (Public Law 91-262) | | +6,900 | +3,552 | | +6,900 | +3,552 |
| Railroad retirement (H.R. 15733) | -7,700 | | | -7,700 | | |
| Subtotal, mandatory | -89,056 | +308,502 | +188,584 | -5,556 | +292,002 | +172,084 |
| Subtotal, legislative bills | +134,944 | +502,502 | +382,584 | -5,556 | +292,002 | +172,084 |
| Total, fiscal year 1971 ² | -547,517 | +1,203,099 | +382,584 | +95,044 | +894,802 | +420,084 |
| Fiscal year 1970: | | | | | | |
| Appropriation bills (changes from the revised 1970 budget): | | | | | | |
| Foreign Assistance (Public Law 91-194) | -150 | -150 | -150 | -100 | -100 | -100 |
| Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies (H.R. 15931, Public Law 91-204) | +567,000 | +567,000 | +567,000 | +335,000 | +335,000 | +335,000 |
| Second Supplemental, 1970 (H.R. 17399) | -153,957 | +126,408 | | -121,300 | +85,000 | |
| Subtotal, appropriation bills | +412,893 | +440,442 | +566,850 | +213,600 | +249,900 | +334,900 |
| Legislative bills with spending authorizations (changes from the revised 1970 budget): | | | | | | |
| Food for needy children (Public Law 91-207) | | | | +30,000 | +30,000 | +30,000 |
| Veterans education assistance (Public Law 91-219) | +107,400 | +107,400 | +107,400 | +94,000 | +94,000 | +94,000 |
| Airports and airways development (Public Law 91-258) | | | +840,000 | | | (N.A.) |
| Subtotal, legislative bills | +107,400 | +107,400 | +947,400 | +124,000 | +124,000 | +124,000 |
| Total, fiscal year 1970 | +520,293 | +547,842 | +1,514,250 | +337,600 | +373,900 | +458,900 |

¹ Reflects conference or final action for comparability.
² \$425,000,000 budget authority (\$212,000,000 outlays) for impacted area School aid, carried in budget as "proposed legislation," is regarded as budget appropriation request for scorekeeping purposes although no formal amendment has been transmitted.
³ "Backdoor" refers to budget authority and outlays provided in basic legislation not requiring further appropriation action.
⁴ Congressional increase of \$185,500,000 subsequently included in budget amendment (H. Doc. 91-312).

⁵ Excludes actions taken in previous session, shown in parentheses above.
† Subject to or in conference.
‡ Committee action.
§ Pending signature.
N.A.—Not available.

CHANCELLOR HARRY H. RANSOM RESIGNATION: A GREAT LOSS TO TEXAS EDUCATION

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS
 IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
 Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last week, Dr. Harry H. Ransom announced his resignation as chancellor of the University of Texas system. During his career as an educator and administrator, Dr. Ransom has made many valuable contributions to higher education. His creative and imaginative leadership will be greatly missed.

Dr. Ransom began his career at the University of Texas as an instructor of English in 1935. He was promoted to assistant professor in 1938, associate professor in 1946, and full professor in 1947. His leadership ability was recognized early by the university and he was appointed assistant dean of the graduate school in 1951 and associate dean in 1953. In 1954, Dr. Ransom became dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and served in this position until 1957.

In 1957, Dr. Ransom was elevated to the position of provost of the university and later promoted to vice president and finally president in 1960. In 1961, it was

decided that Dr. Ransom should lead the entire University of Texas system; he was appointed chancellor. Under his leadership, the University of Texas and its affiliated institutions experienced unprecedented growth and development. Today the University of Texas enjoys the reputation of being one of this Nation's best and most dynamic institutions of higher education.

Dr. Ransom has not limited himself strictly to the administration of the University of Texas system. In addition to his many official duties, Dr. Ransom has found time to be active in community affairs and to write several books and numerous scholarly articles.

As a University of Texas alumnus, I regret deeply Dr. Ransom's resignation. His career has been a source of inspiration to all of those who are concerned about the education of our young people. I earnestly hope that he will continue to be active in the field of education for many years to come.

Mr. President, an editorial which appeared in the Tuesday, June 2, 1970, issue of the Dallas Times Herald entitled "Educator of the First Class" calls Dr. Ransom "one of Texas higher education's great men." I agree with that appraisal. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

EDUCATOR OF THE FIRST CLASS

Typical, probably, is the reaction of one University of Texas alumnus to the news of Harry Hunt Ransom's resignation as chancellor of the massive UT system.

"This ruins my day," said the ex.

That is the way all friends of the state university might well feel, even though Ransom will not step down until next January, and even though he will still carry the title "chancellor emeritus."

Ransom, a courtly and persuasive onetime English professor, is one of Texas higher education's great men. And he just may be the best thing that ever happened to The University of Texas.

Under the Ransom regime, the main university at Austin came to be recognized as one of the nation's top universities. Once, UT was just fair-to-middling. Ransom helped make it great. He hired leading scholars and worked to attract the brightest students. Almost legendary is his prowess at acquiring literary collections and memorabilia (Erle Stanley Gardner's study, for example) which he added to the UT library. The library today is probably as good as that of any other state university in the country.

Ransom also helped strengthen the entire UT system, which added, just this past year, new campuses at Dallas and Midland-Odessa.

To be sure, all the credit for UT's newfound status does not go to Ransom alone. Nor would he, modest man that he is, try to claim it.

And yet it is Harry Ransom who, in the last decade, has given UT its most decisive shove toward greatness, who has made it

all that its founders envisioned it: "A university of the first class."

He is a great educator and a great builder. No university could ask for more.

RESOLUTION: CAMPUS DISORDERS

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the students of C. F. Brewer High School in my congressional district have sent me a copy of a resolution, unanimously approved by the Student Council and individually signed by approximately 90 percent of the students of that school.

This resolution grew out of a discussion in an English class taught by Mrs. Mildred Woodrum. The discussion had centered around the recent incident at Kent State University and other incidents at other American colleges. The students asserted their desire to express their feelings on the subject of campus disorders. Three hundred and fifty of the school's student body of 550 had signed it within the first hour, and I am advised that a preponderant majority of the student body embraced the sentiments expressed in the resolution with great enthusiasm.

Since it obviously reflects the feelings of a very considerable number of young Americans, I am including it in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION: CAMPUS DISORDER

Whereas we, the students of Brewer High School, believe in our country, the United States of America, and the democratic principles upon which it was founded; and

Whereas we uphold the right of students to lawful dissent we believe that campus riots violate America's democratic values; and

Whereas we are tired of having our precious rights outrageously abused and taken for granted; and

Whereas we staunchly support our law enforcement officers on the local, state, and national levels; and

Whereas we believe that firm guidelines should be established so that law enforcement officers can uphold the laws without fear of reproach or persecution; whereas previously, laws have been loosely interpreted and law enforcement officers' hands have been tied (for example, one has the right to "peaceable assembly," but what constitutes a "peaceable assembly"); and

Whereas we believe in lawful and peaceful assembly as outlined in the constitution, but when public property is criminally and willfully destroyed, the severest penalties should be assessed immediately:

Therefore, be it resolved that the students of C. F. Brewer High School on this twelfth day of May, 1970, do not condone the irrational and sickening behavior of any student deliberately destroying public property, forcefully occupying campus buildings, or terrorizing fellow students. Any young man abusing his college draft deferment as an excuse to create violence and disorder on or off the campus should have his draft classification revoked immediately. Any student utilizing state or federal loans to finance his education who participates in unlawful disorder on or off the campus should have his loan immediately declared past due. All students who are enrolled in the colleges and universities of the State of Texas and the nation who are guilty of unlawful disorder

should be permanently barred from the privilege of studying in a state educational institution. Governing bodies, legal and educational, must provide the leadership and assistance necessary to terminate campus disorders so that students attending these colleges may obtain the education they are seeking.

We hereby assert our devout faith that the citizens of our nation will support to the utmost this resolution by contacting local, state, and national leaders, requesting immediate action.

TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS C. TURNER

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, today a great and good friend of mine for the past quarter of a century, the Federal Highway Administrator, Francis C. Turner, begins his 42d year as a dedicated, motivated, and highly qualified professional public servant.

Today, coincidentally, he appeared before the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works to testify on the continuation of the Federal-Aid Highway Act. As usual his presentation was factual, forceful, and illuminating.

Few public servants in the history of the United States can boast of such a long and distinguished career as Frank, nor can many, past or present, boast of so many outstanding contributions to the welfare and well-being of our citizens. A little known fact about Frank Turner is that he was involved with the Alaskan Highway when it was planned and constructed by the United States. He then took over the maintenance of the highway after its completion. Later he was to oversee the U.S. participation in the development of the Inter-American Highway. Pending legislation before the Committee on Public Works would authorize the construction of the last 250 miles of this great highway in Central America, referred to as the Darien Gap. Should this last connecting link be constructed, a resident of Fairbanks, Alaska, could drive from his hometown to the southern tip of the Argentine along highways in which Frank Turner has had and has an abiding interest.

Frank Turner is a graduate of Texas A&M College and a native of Texas. He recently received an honorary degree from his alma mater. He joined the Bureau of Public Roads in 1929 and served in various capacities with this Bureau, including Chief Engineer and Assistant Federal Highway Administrator.

Last year his contributions to the worldwide development of highways was recognized when he was named by the International Road Federation their Man of the Year, a wise choice.

To Frank, on behalf of the members of the Committee on Public Works, as well as for myself, I offer a warm "well done" for the past, and our sincerest hopes for the continuation of a brilliant career until Frank decides it is time to go and do all those things a person contemplates doing upon retiring.

A WELCOME TO THE DELEGATES OF THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE MEETING IN NORFOLK, VA.

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend a welcome to the delegates meeting in Norfolk, Va., for the 48th National Convention of the Izaak Walton League of America.

This outstanding conservation-oriented organization will be meeting July 7 to 10 in my district. The theme of the convention will be "Man and His Environment: The Question of Human Numbers."

Of some interest to the league is legislation I have introduced or cosponsored dealing with environmental problems. The scope of the bills is shown by the fact that they cover five different areas: Administration, legislation, enforcement, education, and research. The most all-inclusive bill is H.R. 15969, the Pollution Abatement Act of 1970. It creates a National Environment Control Commission which would consolidate pollution programs presently widely scattered throughout the Federal Government, and provide an organized, businesslike approach to combating pollution.

H.R. 14701 gives the Federal Government immediate injunctive relief in any situation where danger of water pollution exists. The various departments of Government need the enforcement tool this bill provides. The bill was introduced in direct response to the recent James River sewage situation created in Richmond, Va.

House Resolution 715 would create a Standing Committee on the Environment in the House of Representatives. All pollution bills would go to this legislative committee, except tax credit bills.

H.R. 15288 is an educational bill directing the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide funds for training and education in pollution abatement.

H.R. 16847 establishes the National College of Ecological and Environmental Studies. The bill would affect educational and research efforts in the area of environmental pollution.

Also of interest to the Izaak Walton League are bills I have introduced or cosponsored in the field of animal protection legislation. The five bills close loopholes in existing laws that make the maltreatment of animals financially beneficial, create controls in areas where none exist, provide for research and study on an international level of species becoming rare, and cover a wide variety of animals and their environment.

I especially want to bring the league's attention to H.R. 13957, the animal protection bill. It would empower the Secretary of Agriculture to set standards of adequate humane care and housing for every kind of animal in laboratories, dealer premises, the pet trade, zoos, and circuses in transit. The bill would remove

the exemption in the present Laboratory Animal Welfare Act for animals under research or experimentation. However, it would not interfere with an experiment as such. The bill would also close the loophole to include dealers in primates, exempt under the present law, who do not sell dogs or cats. There is great suffering and loss of life in the massive monkey imports now being made for the laboratory, pet and zoo trades. This area is badly in need of regulation.

The bill will also help close loopholes through which stolen dogs and cats enter the research or pet trade. It sets minimum standards for roadside zoos wherever interstate commerce is involved. It brings all varieties of warm blooded animals under the protection of the experienced veterinary inspectors of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Animal Health Division. The animal protection bill aims at a single goal: To increase the humane coverage of the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act so that more animals can benefit from its tested effectiveness in stopping abuse and neglect. The bill is now pending before the House Committee on Agriculture.

Norfolk, and the entire Commonwealth of Virginia, is honored that the Izaak Walton League of America has given us the opportunity to show our hospitality.

YOUTH SPEAKS

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the consent of the House, I quote herewith a most poignant editorial taken from the June 4 issue of the *Amherst New Era-Progress*, published by J. Bernard McDearmon and edited by Keene C. Brown:

YOUTH SPEAKS

Recently the teachers of the senior class of several high schools were requested to ask their students to list on an unsigned paper the things they wish their parents would do as well as those things they wish their parents would refrain from doing. The answers which came in were not entirely what was expected, but we feel they reflected that our youngsters are not really as bad as one might believe from all the notoriety they have received of late.

Among the answers which appeared most frequently were the following:

- Be stricter.
- Be more dedicated to church work and go to church as a family.
- Be fun loving.
- Treat my friends like they were welcome.
- Try to understand me and my friends.
- Don't treat me like a child, but depend on me more.
- Tell me right from wrong, but don't be too harsh about it.
- Don't fuss at me before other people.
- Don't curse; don't drink, don't smoke.
- Answer simple questions without giving a lecture.
- Ask my opinion instead of demanding.
- Be trustworthy.
- Be more thoughtful of one another. Love one another. Love me.

This list is what the youngsters polled said they wanted, and it does reflect upon the

ingrained good judgment of young people despite their fashions and despite the behavior of the more vocal rebels. We could elaborate on each, giving our own interpretation of what the youngsters meant and why they would want what they say, but the interpretation of each reader will be more meaningful than ours. It is a very healthy set of requests, and we feel that the whole group is well worth thoughtful consideration.

TRIBUTE TO LANGHORNE WASHBURN

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, there is probably no public servant who brings to his office greater energy and ability or who can point to a more impressive record of achievement in a short time than Langhorne Washburn, Director of the U.S. Travel Service. A great many Idahoans are numbered among his thousands of friends and admirers across the country. Lang Washburn recently honored the State of Idaho by making the keynote address at a travel seminar sponsored jointly by Senator LEN B. JORDAN and me at Sun Valley, Idaho on June 1, 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an article by John Carmody about Lang Washburn in a recent issue of the *Washington Post Potomac* magazine, which I include as a part of my remarks:

LANG WASHBURN

Mr. ROONEY. I feel strongly, since the first day I saw you, that it is a shame to see a fine young man so adept at raising money for the opposition political party get involved in an operation such as this. I told you this before, did I not?

Mr. WASHBURN. You did and I asked you to try to talk me out of it.—From the May 9, 1969, hearings of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Lang Washburn is a likeable, well-tailored chap who looks and talks like a walk-on from *Ten North Frederick*.

"I'm just the withered bough of a noble tree," he told us, while leafing through the pictures of his old PBV and PBM in the Solomons and off Okinawa, which were waiting to go up on the walls of his office at the Commerce Department.

Actually, at 51, Lang Washburn isn't at all withered and, in fact, he comes from two noble trees the Washburns of Maine and the Langhornes of Virginia. But then Lang Washburn is pretty modest about his job as director of the U.S. Travel Service, too.

"Mel Laird asked me what the hell I took this job for," he said, "but I don't know I thought it was time to do it (government service) after talking about it for so long."

Actually, according to friends, Washburn could have had almost anything at USIA or State if he'd wanted it, which is the kind of clout you have when you have personally raised \$5.2 million for Richard M. Nixon in the last few years and have worked in such unprepossessing but exhausting jobs as schedule director for the national Nixon Bandwagons in the 1956 and 1960 campaigns. (He was also in charge of the six barrage balloons that preceded Dwight D. Eisenhower around the United States in 1952. This was his first real taste of big-time Republican politics and he's self-deprecatory about that, too.)

Lang Washburn is full of a kind of advertising man excitement when he starts talking about USTS. This is not surprising, since he has been in public relations on and off ever since World War II when he joined his friend Stanley Hiller Jr. in his California-based helicopter company.

What is a little surprising, however, is that Lang Washburn can get so enthusiastic, futurewise, about an agency that has such a long (10-year) history of being Rep. John J. Rooney's favorite football. The Brooklyn Democrat is one of those men in town who automatically rates a "powerful" when you type his name and for the life of him, Rooney's never been able to figure out why USTS was created by the Kennedy Administration in the first place. Oh, he knows it was to make a small dent in the balance of payments, but he still apparently thinks it's silly spending even USTS's paltry \$4.5 million a year to lure foreigners to this country when the American travel agencies, shipping companies, airlines, buslines, hotel chains—you name it—are spending a great deal more themselves to do the same darn thing.

Every springtime since 1961, USTS directors have trudged manfully up to Capitol Hill to listen to Rep. Rooney rag them over such substantive issues as to whether USTS can prove it ever attracted one visitor to our shores (it can't) and over such inconsequential issues as the man in the Rome office with the "Edwardian beard" who rubbed Rooney the wrong way (he was fired) or the \$20 a month rent bill for potted palms in the Tokyo office (they're gone).

Although USTS still maintains seven overseas offices (all in second floor locations, believe it or not, to offset the appearance of competition with anybody in the travel business), over the last couple of years there has been what seems to be a slight shift of emphasis for USTS towards making the foreign visitor feel a lot more comfortable—even welcome—when he finally does get to the U.S. Hence, those nice low-key TV and radio and billboard spots that conclude "One Japanese (or French or German) visitor's most unforgettable American memory might easily be you."

And hence the appearance in the last year of \$13 plaques on the wall behind the front desks of some 107 U.S. hotels (in 50 cities) proclaiming that the establishment can furnish translations for four different languages—a modest effort that USTS hopes will grow and grow and grow.

And with the help of the Travelodge Corp., foreign visitors now can call a number free in Kansas City, Kan., (800-255-3035) to get hotel, travel and sightseeing information from people who speak German, French, Spanish and Japanese.

This is not to suggest that USTS is out of the business of luring foreign visitors here. About half its staff of 78 is located overseas and about half its \$4.5 million budget goes into sales and advertising overseas including Canada. (The last figure is a little misleading. Thanks to the Advertising Council, USTS actually is quite penurious in its own advertising but receives, according to ad industry estimates, some \$15 million in free space in this country alone each year).

A major campaign to lure Canadians to stay longer (hundreds of thousands come across the borders in the East to shop but little else) and a new drive to lure Mexican tourists are slated.

Besides the seven overseas branches, USTS now has an office in the Paris embassy which serves as a headquarters to lure big international conventions to the U.S., a lucrative money flow, which presently is running 6-to-1 the European way.

This last idea has been kicking around the Travel Service for years, but staffers credit Lang Washburn for finally getting it under way.

It has the Washburn ring to it. His friend Rep. Bob Wilson of California calls him

"promotion-minded" and Lang Washburn does indeed have a whole raftful of ideas—including one for promoting himself to Assistant Commerce Secretary for Tourism to "further dignify this thing"—some of them better than others.

Much of Washburn's enthusiasm rides on S. 1289, a bill that originated in the Commerce Committee and that has already passed the Senate. The bill would amend the 1961 International Travel Act to raise the yearly authorization for USTS to \$15 million through Fiscal 1973 and would create a National Tourism Resources Review Commission that could help set guidelines for USTS through 1980, with a little help from the President. (A Rooney staffer, however, says S. 1289 resembles previous legislation brought up by Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) and has the same chance as the Javits legislation in the House: "None.")

One of his first projects after he took over USTS was to raise \$405,000 from five big U.S. airlines, Avis, the Marriott, Hilton and Sheraton hotel chains, Greyhound bus and a little here and there from such federally funded agencies as the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Import-Export Bank. He used the money to build what *New York's* Peter Blake calls "a little inflated earth globe that, for sheer banality, is matched only by the Soviet Pavilion" at the U.S. exhibit at Osaka's Expo 70. Washburn designed it.

The description amuses Washburn (a little) but he is truly proud of the fact that his method of fundraising from the private sector seems to hit Rep. Rooney just where he lives and that the two men are getting along well.

Washburn says he took the job as director of USTS at the behest of his friend and fellow GOP fund raiser Maurice Stans, the Commerce Secretary. Washburn says he is "fiercely enthusiastic" about the prospects for USTS and is willing to do "anything I can in my humble way" to keep USTS pointing toward its goal—which these days seems to be to stay afloat at least until 1976, when the U.S. celebrates its bicentennial and should offer, if someone can just decide what and how, a great deal of natural tourist attraction to the rest of the world, a la Expo 70.

Washburn in the meantime is trying to get improved customs service for foreign tourists at U.S. entry ports and increase the number of cities for the translation service.

He is a constant traveler these days as he tackles old Republican contacts to help finance USTS projects or expedite Washburn-style ideas to boost tourism in Europe. (A recent example: getting the Up with People to send the kids to Europe armed with their own new song—"Come Take a Spin Around America"—to help boost travel to the U.S. "They're exciting, heartwarming," says Washburn.)

This doesn't leave Washburn any time at all for one of his favorite recreations, wood chopping, which has been pretty curtailed because there's not much room at his 150-year-old Georgetown house to chop anyway.

He and his wife, Judy (daughter of California millionaire Paul Davies), keep a Yankee racing sloop they sailed down from Nantucket over at Annapolis. He still gets a chance to fly a plane once in a while.

Washburn was born in Livermore Falls, Maine, of a family that over the course of American history has supplied seven Washburns to Congress (a great-great-great ancestor started the Republican Party in Maine).

He attended Hotchkiss School and spent a year at the University of Virginia before becoming a Navy pilot in World War II. He was wounded near war's end off Okinawa when a Kamikaze plane crashed his PBM squadron's mother ship. After the war he joined Hiller in the helicopter business on the West Coast.

One of his favorite pictures hangs on an office wall—of him and Stanley clinging to the rotor mount on the world's first pilotless copter as it swings high over March Field with nothing between the two young men and runway number one except a razor thin aluminum beam and 5,000 feet of California sunshine.

He left Hiller in 1955 for public relations in New York. He invented an automated device that could monitor sales of merchandise off supermarket shelves, which interested A. C. Nielsen Co., the TV rating people, enough to buy him out and make him a vice president. ("Like most great inventors, I have the misfortune of being alive.")

In the 1960s Gen. Lucius Clay and Ray Bliss, the Eastern Establishment's top GOP money people, talked Washburn into periodic forays as a fund-raiser for the party. In 1965 he moved here to become finance director of the Republican National Committee, concentrating on the congressional campaigns, until taking the USTS job.

Over the years, the Travel Service has never received either a very good press or very much money, despite the obvious fact that tourism is the nation's second biggest dollar export (next to automobiles) and despite the even more striking fact that most governments around the world don't hesitate to spend millions to lure tourists. Washburn hopes to turn all this around.

Of his relationship with tough Rep. Rooney, he says: "I have a very high regard for the Congressman. He's a terrific over-looker—he takes the big view. And he told me that once I got past him and the committee he'd be my stoutest defender. But I was quite an asker.

"I'm trying to get our authorization ceiling raised to \$6.5 million this year, of course, with the \$15 million in mind eventually.

"There are real targets of opportunity in this business of travel and I aim to go for them. Like I always used to say at the National Committee (and here Lang Washburn puts on the self-deprecatory air again, as if he were really a little miscast as a bigtime money man): 'Success is assured unless energy fails.'" He looks at you to see if you laugh.

"After all," says C. Langhorne Washburn, the consummate Republican, "this is probably the only federal agency going that actually makes a profit for the government."

MY DREAM FOR MY COUNTRY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, in reading a recent issue of the *Oakland, Calif., Post*, I came across a prize-winning poem by Edward Scott, a member of the fourth grade of Cole Elementary School of Oakland.

Mr. Speaker, Edward Scott's poem demonstrates the deep feeling of even our younger students about the continuation of the war in Indochina.

I would like to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues can share Edward's very moving words.

MY DREAM FOR MY COUNTRY

(By Edward Scott)

Isn't it a shame,
Someone should try and stop it,
Someone should try and stop the war,
People end up dying—trying.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11102

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in urging passage of the conference report on H.R. 11102, the Hospital and Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1970, which has just been reported.

There is an urgent need to improve our health delivery system to meet the demands of an ever-increasing population. In far too many areas of this country, there are not sufficient medical facilities to serve the population. And in those areas where sufficient facilities exist, many of the structures are antiquated or in disrepair and need replacement.

The Hill-Burton program, which this bill extends for 3 years, has been one of the most successful pieces of public health legislation.

Thousands of new hospital beds and special-care facilities have been provided throughout the less populated areas of the country under this program.

Nor has this program been limited to the public sector. Many private, non-profit groups have benefited from the low-cost, Government-backed loans.

The provision to retain the 3-year expansion, as opposed to the 5-year extension proposed by the Senate, is a good one. This permits Congress the opportunity to review the functioning of this program at better intervals.

With the rapidly changing technology in the hospital and medical fields, frequent review of the Federal Government activity in this area is necessary.

In addition, the entire medical delivery system of this country is presently being examined in detail by persons in and out of the medical field. It is too early to determine what changes such a reevaluation of how medical services should be provided to those in need will bring.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out a particular feature that was not included in the original House bill. The conferees adopted the Senate amendment that provides for a report to the Congress by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the health consequences of using marihuana. In addition, it seeks recommendations for legislative and administrative action. The measure would also make this report an annual occurrence.

With so many of our young people becoming involved with marihuana, such reports are essential. There is at present a lack of unbiased, factual, and complete data on the effects of this hallucinogen.

On balance, the measure has significant merit both in the continuance of previous programs and the adoption of new ones. I strongly urge my colleagues to accept the conference report.

SUPPORT NIXON'S VIETNAM PROGRAM

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, one of the most convincing and down-to-earth expressions of support for the American effort to destroy enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia appeared in the May 28, 1970, issue of the Evening Sentinel, a prominent daily newspaper in Carlisle, Pa.

This persuasive piece took the form of a letter to the editor, and it is particularly meaningful because it was written by a man who has had firsthand experience on the battlefield in Vietnam and in other encounters. Because this letter deals with our presence in Cambodia in a logical and unemotional manner, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

SUPPORTS NIXON'S VIETNAM PROGRAM

To The Editor Of The Sentinel:

My thoughts are simple. I wish to applaud and support President Nixon in his drive to destroy the enemy bases in Cambodia. I believe President Nixon when he says he wants to get the American troops out of Vietnam quickly and with minimum losses. He must do this. He will have absolutely no political future if he does not accomplish our withdrawal as fast as possible. However, as our leader he surely remembers the situation at the time Prime Minister Chamberlain made his statement, "Peace in our time." To withdraw from Vietnam too quickly and throw that country to the Communist wolves would only make them stronger to tackle their next victim.

I know he is right in destroying the sanctuaries in Cambodia. Time and again when I was in Vietnam my unit would meet and inflict awful casualties on certain North Vietnamese and Viet Cong units. After each battle, remnants of these units would infiltrate through the jungle back to Cambodia. There they would be remanned and rearmed and in about 60 days we would have another battle with these same units. To destroy the sanctuaries will not only hasten the withdrawal of our forces, but will give Vietnam a chance to survive as a nation after our forces have departed.

I can understand how people who may be personally involved can be easily swayed to ignore the lessons of history and presume that, since we have the capability to run from the fight, it is easier to let our friends survive as best they can. To "withdraw now" sounds very simple when it is put that way by persons who wish to achieve some short-range personal or long-range political gain. However, I am convinced that if the sanctuaries remained, just about the time our troops would be in the final phase of pulling out, the North Vietnamese would launch a large scale offensive and inflict a massive defeat on our forces. With what has gone on to date, such a defeat would not only destroy Vietnam, but would probably destroy our nation too.

I fought Germans in World War II, I was on the DMZ in Korea for one year, and I fought for a year in Vietnam. I have lost many fine friends and have taken several enemy shell fragments personally in my 32 years of service in the Army. I am now retired because of a disability from one of these wounds. More pertinent, all four of the eligible male members of my immediate family are now in service. With these things

as background, you can see that I have a sincere desire to see casualties stopped.

Yet, I am positive that the President is right in not sustaining a defeat to our nation while he withdraws our men from Vietnam. I cannot help but think that the President has finally hit the enemy in a vital spot when our troops destroy the Cambodian sanctuaries. This seems even more obvious when a person views the extreme reaction of those political leaders who might lose an election or suffer a loss for their long-range cause if the President's plan succeeds. It seems to me that their cries become ever louder if only to drown out the obvious success of the destruction of the Cambodian bases.

That is about all I have to say, except that for the first time in my life I am going to become politically active to work to help those who support our troops in Vietnam. I will support completely those who help our fighting men, and work just as hard to defeat at the polls those politicians who, for personal gain, would cause us more casualties and for our nation to lose its honor. I wish that you would do the same.

WILLIAM D. BROBECK,
Colonel, Infantry, Retired.

NOTE.—Former Commander: Co. A, 134th, Infantry, France, 1944; 3rd Battalion, 34th Infantry, Korea, 1954; 3rd Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, Vietnam, 1955-66.

TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS C. TURNER

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, I am most happy to pay my deepest respects to one of the real greats among our public servants of the executive branch, the Federal Highway Administrator, Francis C. Turner. The occasion which brings forth my remarks is that today Frank begins his 42d year of service to the Nation. Few men in Government today, or in the past, can match the contributions to our society that Frank Turner can.

An old and valued friend, I have admired Frank Turner as a man, as a professional in his field, and as one who makes his position and opinions known without equivocation or a lack of candor. All of us in the Congress have found these traits lacking in so many bureaucrats who have appeared before us through the years. Some I have come to describe as elliptical witnesses—in the meaning described in Webster's dictionary as "of or relating to studied obscurity." Not so with Frank Turner.

I know that, while I am speaking only for myself, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who know Frank endorse my opinion.

We take our highways so much for granted that we tend to overlook their tremendous contribution to social and economic development. The fact is the United States would not be the nation it is today without our vast highway transportation system, for which Frank Turner is in many respects largely responsible.

There is no way in which the people

of this country can adequately express our debt to Frank Turner for his 41 years of dedicated and talented service in highway development. May his services continue to be available to the Nation for many years to come.

INDOCHINA WAR DEATHS DROP
54 PERCENT

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's determined, realistic policy for ending the war in Vietnam and removing U.S. troops is meeting marked success.

As evidence of this success, I insert in the RECORD at this point an article from the Washington Daily News, stating that U.S. combat deaths in Indochina this year are down 54 percent from the comparable time period last year.

The three reasons given for this decline: reduction of 115,000 U.S. troops, progress of the Vietnamization program, and lower enemy action, all testify to the success of the President's policies. I commend this article published June 9, 1970, to my colleagues' attention:

INDOCHINA WAR DEATHS DROP 54 PERCENT
(By Mike Miller)

U.S. combat deaths in Indochina are down by 54 per cent thru the first five months of 1970 from the toll for the comparable period of last year.

Defense Department figures showed today that 2,397 Americans were killed in combat this year thru May 30, including more than 200 who died last month in U.S. operations in Cambodia.

During the same five-month period last year, 5,240 Americans died in combat—2,843 more than this year.

This year's U.S. wounded-in-action total is also down 54 per cent—from 36,800 thru the first five months of 1969 to 16,773 this year.

Non-combat deaths also are down—from 903 for the same period of 1969 to 800 so far in 1970. These are deaths resulting from such causes as aircraft crashes not related to combat.

The Cambodian operations did swell the U.S. death toll in May to 693, highest monthly total this year. However, during the first five months of last year the lowest monthly death toll was 795 in January; the highest monthly toll was 1,316 in March.

The Nixon Administration has stressed reduction of U.S. casualties as one of its top goals in Southeast Asia during the Vietnamization program. The lower casualty toll this year continues a trend which began with declining combat deaths during the last several months of 1969.

Pentagon officers cite these reasons for the lower casualties this year:

Reduction of the U.S. force in South Vietnam by 115,000 men. With fewer men in the combat zone, it figures that there should be fewer casualties. There are now 425,450 U.S. servicemen in Vietnam, the lowest total in more than three years.

Progress of the Vietnamization program in which South Vietnamese forces are taking on more combat, with U.S. troops moving toward assuming a logistics and combat support role.

A lower level of enemy action this year than during the same period of 1969.

South Vietnamese and enemy casualties also are down from 1969, reflecting the lower level of combat. However, South Vietnamese and communist losses have not declined as sharply as U.S. combat deaths.

Official statistics on South Vietnamese and enemy casualties were available at the Pentagon only for the period thru April.

For the first four months of 1970, South Vietnamese combat deaths totalled 6,399 compared to 7,632 for the same period last year, a drop of 16 per cent. Enemy deaths, as listed by the Defense Department, fell from 59,385 to 41,413, a 30 per cent drop.

In the entire war so far, 42,425 U.S. military men have been killed in combat. Another 8,023 have died from noncombat causes. There are 978 Americans missing and 456 known captured by the enemy.

South Vietnamese combat deaths in the conflict since the beginning of 1961 total 108,043. Enemy deaths during the same period totalled 646,658, the Defense Department said.

A STRONG U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, addressed the 73d annual dinner meeting of the May Club of Newport News, Va. Mr. Hood has long been one of the most active advocates of a strong U.S. merchant marine.

In his remarks he noted the long-awaited signs which lead to optimism regarding the prospects for rebuilding our merchant fleet. However, the need for continued efforts in this regard is appropriately included in his remarks which I would like to share with my colleagues.

The address follows:

SPEECH BY EDWIN M. HOOD

Shipbuilding and shipyard activities are our "bread and butter." We therefore look for signs that the immediate and long-term future will be better than the past. We look always for evidence that a stability of operations will bless our shipyards. And, finally, we seek continuing assurance that the results of our labors will make a meaningful contribution to the national well-being.

Much has already been said about the prospects for shipbuilding in American yards during the decade of the 1970's. They are indeed bright. They exist in terms of naval vessels, merchant ships, deep-draft tankers, and a variety of other specialized vessels and floating equipment which are needed to balance and improve our nation's sea power capabilities.

This need has been repeatedly demonstrated: by the large number of overaged ships in our naval and shipping fleets . . . by the steady expansion of trade and commerce throughout the world . . . by the decline of export and import cargoes carried aboard American flag ships . . . by Russia's emergence as a naval and maritime power of threatening proportions . . . and by the potentials for the development of the many treasures beneath the surface of the seas and on the floors of the oceans.

The present Administration in Washington, unlike its predecessors of recent history, has embarked on a commitment to provide the ships that are necessary to guarantee that the United States will long remain a first-rate sea power with a naval fleet second to none

and a modern maritime fleet capable of carrying 30 percent of U.S. exports and imports by volume. The comparable figure at present is hovering near 6 percent. Fortunately, this commitment enjoys strong bi-partisan support, and, against the backdrop of measurable need, it comes not a moment too soon.

During the next 10 years, market opportunities for American shipyards could total as much as \$34 billion for a 67 percent increase over the results of the 1960 decade. There are those who believe this prediction is very much on the conservative side. But, in any event, the 1970's will be more active than the 1960's for all of us.

To make certain that our Navy is continually effective, it has been estimated that annual Federal appropriations in excess of \$3.5 billion will be required for the construction of new ships. In most of the 1960 decade, the average has been closer to \$2 billion. Appropriations for these purposes have, however, increased by more than \$1 billion in the past two fiscal years, and for the current year, the Congress presently has under consideration a budget request slightly in excess of \$3 billion for naval ship construction and conversion. These high levels of funding are interpreted as evidence of a positive determination within the Administration to continue emphasis on modernization of the Navy fleet.

By reason of its past endeavors, Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company can be expected to share in this tremendous potential along with the balance of the industry.

A new program to rehabilitate the high seas American merchant marine, sponsored by the Nixon Administration, is also in the offing. It has already passed the first milestone on Capitol Hill, and could well be enacted into law within the next 60 to 90 days. Under this program, 300 merchant ships for foreign trade operation would be built in American yards. This program is valued in excess of \$6 billion. The Federal Government would underwrite \$2.2 billion and the balance would be financed by private sources.

By its participation in the design phase of this very promising program, it is evident that Newport News expects to be among those shipyards building these 300 ships.

Another \$2.4 billion in tanker construction is forecast in the 1970's for a possible sixfold increase over the record of tanker output by U.S. yards in the 1960's. Much of this tonnage will be required to transport oil from the North Slope of Alaska to East and West Coast refineries. Simultaneously, the U.S. private tank ship fleet will require replacement tonnage of about four million deadweight between now and 1980. Since all of these tankers will be operating in U.S. domestic waters, they must be built in American yards. That is the law of the land.

By the award of a contract in early April to design "giant icebreaking oil tankers" for Arctic service, one can reasonably conclude that Newport News, along with various other shipyards, plans to participate in this segment of the coming shipbuilding market.

It is important to bear in mind that these are forecasts based on critical needs. But, they involve the expenditure of substantial sums of money. Prospects are one thing; realities sometimes differ. Nonetheless, the sensitivity of existing needs—and their relationship to national security—suggest that at the close of the 1970 decade, realities will closely equal forecasts.

Meanwhile, certain facts of life must be recognized.

Construction of 300 merchant ships could produce, as previously mentioned, revenues of more than \$6 billion for the U.S. shipbuilding industry, exceeding the combined billings for all commercial ship construction by American yards during the past two decades. The private investment of an addi-

tional \$500 million in shipyard facilities and equipment over 10 years could thereby be stimulated. Employment of an additional 15,000 skilled shipyard craftsmen could be required. An annual 30 percent increase in steel consumption for ship construction could be anticipated. Manufacturers and suppliers of ship components and equipment could likewise expect an upsurge in sales to shipyards.

These figures are only minimum. Taking into account the impact of very probable orders for naval ship and tanker construction, more capital investments in facilities, more employment for workers of all skills, and more consumption of domestic products and services could be generated. An expansion of total national capacity to build ships could very well be necessary. Fresh opportunities for management proficiency, improved productivity, operational and manpower stability, technological advancement, and better earnings truly loom on the horizon.

But, contrary to the popular notion, deficiencies in our sea power resources will not be corrected overnight—relatively speaking. Let me illustrate this point in the context of the proposed Nixon maritime program.

Assuming passage of the enabling legislation by mid-Summer of 1970, shipbuilding contracts in units of 10, 20 or 30 ships each, as are envisioned by the Nixon proposals, probably will not materialize for another 12 months—until the Spring of 1971 at the soonest. Shipyard production will not accelerate until early 1972, and deliveries of new ships will not commence for another 12 months at the earliest. In other words, even with today's emphasis on urgency, the long-sought, long-needed and long-awaited rejuvenation of the American merchant marine would not be felt initially—will not really begin—until 1973.

Another note of caution would seem to be in order: This plan for restoration of the United States as a first-rate maritime power will succeed or fail on the extent to which shipowners' requirements can be consolidated to permit repetitive construction of near-identical ships, employing modular concepts, interchangeable design features and standardized components. The extent to which funding is made available by the Administration, the Congress and the private sector will likewise be a crucial factor.

It has become increasingly obvious that the demands on the Federal Treasury become more intense each year. The sale of national priorities which governs Federal funding can change and fluctuate almost annually. For a number of years, the exigencies of the military conflict in Southeast Asia plus social and health measures have commanded top priority. Within the past twelve months, environmental problems have been elevated on the scale. There is little budgetary leeway, and there will be little in the future.

Shipbuilding under governmental auspices—whether it be for the Navy, the merchant marine or the commercial dry cargo fleet—is therefore in competition with all other public programs and projects. The contest is inevitable. It is not so much a contest between low priority and high priority items, but a competition among programs and projects in the high priority category.

The relative standing of items in this latter group is rarely static. But, the truism that the United States is virtually an island domain is unchangeable. Moreover, we are a "have not" nation in terms of many critical materials. Our industrial prominence could not long be sustained without basic minerals that must be imported in bulk quantities. Our defense establishment could not long endure if the flow of these strategic materials were to be interrupted or eliminated. Surrounded by water, then, we need ships, under our own control, not only to carry our goods

to world markets, but to bring to our shores certain basic essentials for sustenance, safety and survival.

The building of these ships within our own boundaries has been regarded as important to the "public good" since Colonial days. This fundamental belief on the part of our Founding Fathers has been affirmed time and again through the years. Only last year, national security officials upheld the proposition that an adequate, efficient and productive shipbuilding capacity, under our own jurisdiction, is essential to the national interest. This reaffirmation no doubt led to the commitment of the Nixon Administration to guarantee that the United States will always possess a sufficiency of sea power through ships built in American yards.

Under these circumstances, it is not illogical to anticipate that, despite the pressures of other national issues, Federal funding for ship construction purposes will, in the years ahead, qualify for higher standing on the scale of national priorities than during the past two decades. Support for this point of view comes, in addition to the position of the Administration, from leaders in the Congress and from a substantial majority of the members of the Congress on both sides of the political aisle. Of course, there have been, and always will be, voices of dissent, but with the dawning of the "age of aquarius," the importance of shipbuilding apparently enjoys a high degree of harmony and understanding among those in high places responsible for policy decisions and actions.

Most shipyard operators as far back as the early 1960's reasoned that a national shipbuilding effort to refurbish the U.S. Navy and the American Merchant Marine, such as is now predicted, was inevitable. This confidence that the United States would eventually reassert the importance of sea power to national well-being and take the necessary steps to modernize both fleets has generated unprecedented peacetime expenditures for upgrading and expansion projects in American yards.

Whether the industry's actions can be attributed to confidence, foresight or willingness to take calculated risks, it enters the 1970 decade well-equipped to handle the impressive shipbuilding prospects which now loom on the horizon.

Thereby, you and I can look ahead to a brighter future. But, it will be a future that will call on foremen, managers, supervisors, and craftsmen alike for greater effort and greater productivity. Our industry and its personnel have literally been challenged to show that they can produce the ships which are so urgently needed in the national interest at reasonable prices and on reasonable delivery schedules. Meeting this challenge will not be easy, and you and your counterparts in other shipyards throughout the nation will have a significant role in shaping the outcome.

THAT THE BALTIC STATES MAY AGAIN KNOW FREEDOM

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, June 15, marks the sad anniversary of the loss of independence by the Baltic peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Along with my fellow colleagues I join in expressing the hope that the Baltic States may again know the freedom that the Soviets destroyed when they invaded

those peace-loving countries on June 15, 1940.

The 89th Congress passed a concurrent resolution calling on the President to—

Direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations . . . to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. . . .

I would hope that the administration will continue to focus attention on the plight of all of the peoples in the captive nations.

I insert House Concurrent Resolution 416 in the RECORD:

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlements of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people:

Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

Passed the House of Representatives June 21, 1965.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

AFTER 26 YEARS AT SWEDESBURG

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cite the Reverend Francis P. Sokol who has completed a remarkable career in service to God and his parishioners. Father Sokol, who was 75 on June 1, 1970, was appointed pastor emeritus of the Sacred Heart Church, Swedesburg, Pa., after 26 years as pastor there and 45 years after his ordination to the priesthood.

Honored recently by his parishioners on the anniversary of his ordination, Father Sokol is retiring because of the mandatory age limit of 75 set by the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. He became pastor of Sacred Heart Church in 1944, succeeding the late Reverend Martin K. Maciejewski.

Father Sokol's service at the Swedesburg church has found its rewards in the devotion and esteem in which his parishioners hold him and in an era of church achievement. Built during Father Sokol's tenure were a new school, a new rectory, and a new Sisters' convent.

Born in Poland on June 1, 1895, Father Sokol immigrated to the United States in 1912. He attended several schools before entering Saints Cyril and Methodius Seminary at Orchard Lake, Mich.

Father Sokol was ordained on February 15, 1925, in Detroit by the Most Reverend Michael Gallagher. It was the start of an illustrious career of service which included appointments in eastern Pennsylvania.

Appointments in the local diocese were: assistant pastor of St. Hedwig's Church, Philadelphia; St. Mary's of Conshohocken; and St. Josaphat, Manayunk in Philadelphia; chaplain of Motherhouse of Bernadine Sisters in Reading, and in the Provincial Home and the Academy of the Sisters of Nazareth at Torresdale in Philadelphia.

Father Sokol attended the Consistory of Cardinals in 1959 and was present at a public audience with His Late Holiness Pope John XXIII. He made the trip to the Vatican with a group of clergymen and laymen which accompanied the late John Cardinal O'Hara, of Philadelphia, and Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, for ceremonies elevating them to the College of Cardinals. Father Sokol also traveled to Poland where he had two private audiences with Stephen Cardinal Wyszynski, Primate of Poland.

In addition to his parish duties, Father Sokol took part in community work. He was chaplain for the Swedesburg Fire Company, one of the outstanding volunteer fire companies in Upper Merion Township.

The contributions of individuals such as Father Sokol to our Nation—contributions both spiritual and temporal—should be acknowledged especially in these trying times for our people. He has shown, by word and deed, how one person can contribute to the well-being of his fellow men and the community itself. By working through the American system, he has built and improved upon this system.

I offer my warmest congratulations to Father Sokol and my best wishes to his successor, the Reverend Leon E. Jaworowski, the new pastor of Sacred Heart Church.

In noting Father Sokol's work, the Upper Merion Supervisors issued a proclamation in his honor. I think the last words of this proclamation can best exemplify Father Sokol's career—

What a man does for himself dies with him; what a man does for his community lives on . . .

PLANES FOR ISRAEL

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to personally reaffirm my position and my own strong personal feelings that the United States should take immediate and affirmative action in acquiescing in the request of the State of Israel's desire to purchase 125 additional jet aircraft. The balance of power in the Middle East is fast shifting not only to the disadvantage of Israel but also to the disadvantage of the United States.

In my own correspondence with the White House concerning this matter I was advised that the matter was being taken under consideration. While I do not intend to be a "Monday morning quarterback," I feel that the sale of these planes is vitally important and the time has come when this request can no longer be ignored on the basis of being continually reviewed.

Three years to the month following the Israeli victory in the so-called six-day war in 1967, the supply of military aircraft of the Arab bloc has quadrupled and the number of missiles, tanks, and guns—supplied by the Soviet Union—has increased to astounding proportions. This situation has been allowed to progress to the point where even our own military specialists are doubtful that even with the requested additional aircraft the Arab threat can be thwarted if the Soviet continues to pour military arms and supplies into the Arab nations.

The mistaken policy of our State Department in attempting to appease the Soviets by refusing to sell these needed aircraft—on a cash basis—has resulted in bolstering the sagging confidence of the Arabs and particularly the United Arab Republic.

It is common knowledge that the Soviet Union has long planned for its access route to oil to be through domination of the Arab nations in the Middle East. Only the tiny nation of Israel stands between the free world and total Soviet domination of this area, a giant step in the Soviet journey toward world domination and the conquest of communism.

Following the 1967 conflict, the Soviet Union started in earnest to move technicians, pilots, and advisers into the United Arab Republic, a move which served a twofold purpose: First, it gave the Egyptians the impression that the Soviets were coming to their rescue after their humiliating defeat by the Israelis, and second, it gave the Soviet its strongest foothold to date in the Middle East—a move I venture to say that the Arab nations will one day woefully regret.

The Soviet Union is not only eyeing the rich oil resources of the Arab nations. The Soviet sees, too, the coveted Suez Canal.

It is for these assets that the Soviets continue to move their air defense system closer and closer to the west bank of the canal, in an effort to force Israel to

retreat from this line of defense or risk losing more of its precious aircraft.

The Soviets are pulling a monumental bluff on the world. It is not their goal to bring about a face-to-face confrontation with the United States. Indeed, no. But every move closer to the banks of the Suez Canal is a gain for the Soviets that goes completely unchallenged except for the planes of Israel, and the fact that any gain at all that is made is another loss of prestige for the United States—at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, how long can we afford to let this challenge go unanswered?

Unless we pick up the gauntlet and let the Soviets know—not in words but in the immediate sale to Israel of these needed aircraft—that we intend to keep our commitment to maintain a strategic arms balance in the Middle East, this conflict will continue to grow and the United States will once again face hostility throughout the world for its failure to keep its promises to the only friend it has in the Middle East.

At the same time, we must make a greater effort to halt the growing independence of the Arab nations on the economic and military support of the Soviet Union. This is a matter of the greatest urgency. There is little doubt that the Arab nations cannot see the increasing encroachment by the Soviets into their governments and into their political, economic, and cultural systems.

By maintaining the arms balance in supplying these planes to Israel, as a first step, the United States will have a better chance of maintaining some rapport with the Arab nations, thereby, hopefully, working toward a commitment from all sides for a permanent and lasting peace in the Middle East. But this cannot be accomplished as long as the Soviets continue to arm and support the Arab nations in the proportion of the present ratio of 4 to 1 in military aircraft.

I have again joined with my colleagues in writing to the President to personally urge the sale of these planes to Israel, and I hope that our President will approve the sale as quickly as feasible and show our willingness to the Soviets and to the world that the United States will not tolerate this situation whereby the very survival of this courageous nation is at stake.

BILL TO OBTAIN PARKLANDS

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 4, 1970, inaccurately reported the number of acres held by the Navy near Rehoboth Beach, Del. I am therefore inserting a correct version of my statement:

STATEMENT BY THE HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would convey five parcels of land at Cape Henlopen, Del., from the Army and the Navy to the State of Delaware.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this proposal may be of more than ordinary interest to you and the other distinguished Members of Congress, their families, and their staffs, for it concerns an area where many of you vacation: Rehoboth Beach, Del. I believe it is safe to say that many of you and thousands of others in this metropolitan area will have a personal stake in the course and outcome of this bill.

The parcels of land in question are all either enclaves within or barriers between parkland already operated by the State of Delaware. To the north of the 820-acre military land is the 540-acre Cape Henlopen State Park. In the south is another State park, known as Gordon's Pond.

All of this land—worth about \$100,000 per acre—is located on the Atlantic Ocean, where it enjoys the benefits of beautiful beaches and imposing sand dunes. The land is undeveloped commercially, and the State is determined to maintain it in its natural state.

Four of the parcels are owned by the Department of the Navy. Reserve forces are trained on one 15-acre plot; some little-used equipment sheds are located on two other plots totaling three-quarters of an acre; and on the remaining 614 acres of Navy land some important oceanographic work is conducted. The Army owns a 190-acre plot used for recreation and some Reserve training.

Quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, we in Delaware have long wanted these lands for the use of outdoor recreation and for the benefit of all our citizens. Our resolve and desire were recently strengthened by recent actions by the Department of the Army.

It was on the Army land during Earth Week last April that an operation began; an operation that caused consternation and shock among the citizens of Delaware. I should note here that located on the Army land is—or was—one of nature's wonders, which we in Delaware call the "Big Dune." It is—or was—the largest sand dune between Sandy Hook, N.J., and Cape Hatteras, N.C. The Big Dune was over 70 feet high and had been the subject of scholarly articles in both Scientific American and National Geographic magazines. I say was, because during Earth Week the Army began an operation covering 13 acres of the Big Dune's area. As I understand it, the purpose of the operation was to create a parking space for five to 10 trailers. To create this parking place, the 13 acres were leveled, reducing their height to 40 feet.

This destruction was undertaken without consultation with Delaware officials or with the citizens who live in the area. Quite understandably, all of us were upset. Since then, Senators JOHN J. WILLIAMS and J. CALLEB BOGGS, and I have been discussing this matter with the Department of Defense. We told them that we were interested in the land, and asked that, if possible, they justify military retention of any parts of it.

In response to our inquiries, officials at the Department of Defense said verbally that they might be responsive to conveying the 15-acre plot, the two plots totalling three-quarters of an acre, and a corridor through the 614-acre plot. We have received no confirmation of that offer.

The Army, however, maintains its need to retain the 190-acre plot. They say the land is necessary for recreation and training, even though only 14,000 persons used it for recreation last year. On the other hand, more than 1 million persons used the State-operated recreational beaches last year.

As I indicated earlier, many—perhaps even most—of the 1 million vacationers last year were from the Washington area. I am sure you are all familiar with this portion of Delaware. If you personally have not visited the area, members of your staff almost certainly have. The fine beaches provide a momentary respite from the daily drive of work here in Washington.

In light of these and other facts, my col-

leagues and I cannot agree that the Army needs this land. If, in fact, the Army requires land for training, the Governor of Delaware has agreed to find them other, more suitable sites.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would simply convey all of the lands in question to the State of Delaware. We realize that there may be a perfectly valid justification for the Navy to retain its part of the land, and we are willing to consider such justifications and accommodate them through the legislative process.

CONGRESSMAN PETTIS TALKS ABOUT AVIATION

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of our colleagues an interesting and informative feature article in the June issue of *Air Line Pilot* magazine. Entitled "A View From the Hill," it is a first-person story by one of my distinguished fellow Californians, JERRY PETTIS.

As a former commercial airline pilot and airline administrator himself, he presents a candid and lucid account of the problems facing the Nation's air carrier industry and transportation system—and how they relate to our continuing space program.

So that all Members might have the benefit of this fine article, I wish to include it in the *RECORD* at this point:

A VIEW FROM THE HILL

(By Congressman JERRY L. PETTIS (R-Calif.) as told to Lou Davis)

(NOTE.—How do the airlines pilot, air carrier industry and transportation system look to a former airline pilot, business executive and now Congressman? Representative Jerry L. Pettis is all of these and he offers some timely comments from his Capitol Hill perch.)

It has been a long time since I sat in the left and right seat of an airliner. But the fine perspective that position gave me has never left me. It has helped me in every endeavor. And I think that every man who sits up front on the flight deck has a vantage point for viewing the affairs of the world and of man, that other men will never know or value.

As I look downstream, seeing the things that we're doing in the field of space exploration—earth orbiting satellites, space shuttles, etc.—I think we find ourselves involved in trying to shape a transportation system that even the airline pilot never dreamed of seeing in the decade of the 70s. Being recently privileged to sit on the House Science and Astronautics Committee offered an exciting prospect of things to come that should thrill the most pessimistic of men.

As I think back to my days at United when I started to fly the line, I would have called anyone insane or "nutty" who ever hinted of the things we consider practical and routine today. I mean the bad as well as the good: the problems of the jet age as well as the advantages; the promise of supersonic travel as well as the threat of degrading man's environment with noise and air pollution.

Right now, in the space program, we are contemplating flying manned vehicles that will give us space shuttle service within a

few years. And, from there, we will just begin to broaden our horizons to anywhere on earth and into space. The planet's the limit—almost any planet within our galaxy.

Sitting here, comfortably and casually in the space age, I also remember how the airline pilot has had to fight for the technology that he knew was available, for the equipment that was efficient, safe and practical, and for facilities that were needed to make air travel safer. I cannot help but contrast those days and those problems with the way it is in the space program today. The astronauts are an integral part of the team, their voices are heard and accepted. I cannot help but marvel at the total effort, the vast army of technicians, scientists, engineers and astronauts manning the space program that brought the three Apollo XIII astronauts back to earth. This was the acme of teamwork.

In aviation and airline operations, the pilot has not always been welcome in the planning, in the accident investigation operation. More often than not—before ALPA demonstrated its value—decisions were too often made by company executives, ground-bound marketeers, economists and engineers. Highest values have been placed upon economics, competition between companies, etc.

Now, I don't decry competition. I'm just saying that all too often the feelings and pleas of the professionally trained air crew have been subordinated to other considerations.

I think the Apollo XIII accident has renewed public interest in getting from here to there safely by air. Passengers don't identify their reactions directly to the moon space flights. But I do believe they say to themselves, when they fly, say from here to Los Angeles: "I, too, am defying gravity. I too wonder how safe that flight will be. And, if something goes wrong, is the total system as efficient as that which brought Apollo XIII back to earth?"

Judging from the public chatter these days, he or she might very well wonder if everything that can be done is being done to make that flight completely safe; many wonder if there has been a compromise somewhere along the line, one ever so small; and might well ask if the people in charge—whether they be company management, air crew in command, the FAA or others—are settling for a statistical level of safety that, with a little more effort or teamwork, could be reduced.

Just recently, coming back from Florida, our jet transport broke out of the overcast at about 1,500 feet on the approach to Dulles airport. There off the left wing was a small airplane. I don't know if our pilot knew he was there or if the pilot of the other plane knew we were there. The fact that we do not have a system to identify traffic in a more accurate and positive way is one of the common problems worrying me today.

I'm not on the committee concerned with this matter, but let me tell you: Whether you're a private pilot or an airline pilot or a passenger in an airliner or a private plane, you've got to know that this is a critical problem and we'd better solve it.

We have the technology now, the technical ability to solve the problem. Gosh! If we can provide a crew escape system on top of a space command module that will eject astronauts to safety if something goes awry during the rocketing blastoff, there is no reason why we cannot keep an airliner away from another aircraft. All we have to do is harness the same brains and talent that took us to the moon and has sent unmanned craft on tours of the planets.

When John F. Kennedy said a decade ago that we'd land a man on the moon and bring him back safely to earth before 1970, I said: "That's political malarkey." I was wrong and he was right. The important thing is that

we did it. There were jillions of problems. There were countless blank walls. But, when we applied the brainpower of American science in the various fields—metallurgy, space physics, fuels, biology, environmental control, aerodynamics, etc.—whatever the problems were, they were licked.

Why not do the same thing with the nation's airways system? Why not get a first-class team, including pilots, and see that the chances for mid-air collisions are almost nonexistent by 1980. We need goals and the resources to meet them, as was the case with NASA's mission.

We must get to work using satellites for air and surface navigation over the North Atlantic and the Pacific—and right away! They will make it possible to pinpoint aircraft positions within 50 feet.

We must provide the best planes that advanced technology can produce, the best electronics and all-weather navigation systems to achieve air travel's full potential with safety and reliability.

Some of our government agencies, trade groups and operators may not agree with me on this. Here too, sometimes I think too many fellows sitting in bureaus ought to get out on the firing line, get closer to realistic and creative people and find out what they're really saying and what they are capable of doing. Instead the tendency is to judge from a Washington desk-top and take the conventional way out by leaning on the old bromide, saying: "Well, you know things move slowly around here. It takes a long time to get budgets approved, you know."

OK! Granted that is often so. But my point is, they don't have to take time.

When I came to Congress in 1966 I was told that certain things could not be done—could never be done. They told me a committee or a commission could never be abolished after it had been established. I've been able to abolish the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. It took an act of Congress and a lot of my time but it was long overdue. As a result of that success, Congress is going to take a long look at a lot of other commissions and committees that have outlived their usefulness. Maybe we'll get rid of a lot of expense and deadwood in the process.

We need the same approach to our air transportation system. I'm not damning the FAA. I'm just saying that the longer people and organizations are established in Washington, the easier it is to become comfortable in going along with the system. When they tell me it can't be done or that it's going to take a lot of time or it's inadequate, what they are really saying is: "Look at all the things we would have to do to make it work."

Maybe critics do have a point. Satellites may not have passed the experimental stage, may not be perfect. But, we've proved the concept to be good. Let's get with it and develop it. Let's get to NASA and say: "Hey you guys who are experts with these birds, what do we have to do to make satellites functional and reliable for this purpose; How long will it take and what will it cost?" Should we wait until they are perfected, we'll not get them.

Some people come back and say the airways problem is different from NASA's mission. Airways exist now! They are antiquated and inadequate. They're in place and operating just as are railroad tracks. Planes must continue to use them, even while they're being modified. We can't shut down long enough to install a brand new system. All that is true. But this argument, strong as it is, doesn't hold water. We build railroads and highways without stopping trains and auto traffic—we can do the same with airways.

What we need are can-do fellows who have not known the words "it can't be done."

The only reason we placed men on the moon in 10 years and brought them back was

because we contracted the business to private concerns who said: "Yes, it can be done." NASA's role was to serve as the Board of Directors of the project.

I believe the FAA should go this route. It should seek help of scientists and industry in contracting the work. We need to break away from the bonds of the long-established system composed of World War II equipment.

Now that the airports/airways legislation is becoming law, it's a start in the right direction. It's a far cry from what we're ultimately going to have, but it's a start. Thankfully, it looks like we are finally breaking away from our cocoon of lethargy and bureaucratic restraints.

Now I'd like to see us undertake one gigantic evaluation of the total transportation system. Let us truly measure the pluses and the minuses, get away from the habit of patching a leaky roof. Once we know what we're dealing with and what our realistic goals are, then we should proceed with implementation on the long haul.

We must make sure that the needs of society are satisfied. We must have an idea as to how many people there are and how many there will be that need service. We have demographic studies for the whole world; let's use them as part of the projection process.

And now, you may ask, if I were a pilot today, still flying the line, what would be of prime concern to me?

One thing that bothers me as I talk with my old buddies, is that they do not have the same verve for their jobs today as they did when I was a pilot. I know that we are much older, but I've made allowances for that. There's something else, I believe, that causes it. That has to do with retirement.

Sixty years of age is no time or age at which man was meant to be put to pasture. Particularly, where intellectual and mental capabilities are concerned. Pilots are at their best at this period. Some of the greatest novels, some of the most creative works have been done after the age of 60. We must do something about this. We must provide the men who fly the airliners with a challenge that is commensurate with their talent and resourcefulness—at a time when they should have the best years of their lives ahead of them.

Some of the sharpest men in Congress today are over 60.

If a man is 60, if he is physically able to go out and play a hard set of tennis or 36 holes of golf, it's not fair to boot him out of the cockpit. We have a reservoir of some of the brightest minds in the nation and we're saying we have no use for them. Society must not be denied the value and the benefits of their talents.

The public generally admires an airline pilot. He represents stability, confidence with the right mix of foresight, insight and fearlessness. He is a good citizen. I hear it everywhere I go—all the time. I ride the airlines more now than I used to when I was a pilot. There is high respect for the pilot's ability to solve problems, for his dexterity, his physical health and his mental capabilities and attitude. I include all the crew members in this statement—including those wonderful girls in the cabin who make flying so pleasant under sometimes trying conditions.

There are few positions of responsibility in this country where as much value in human lives and in corporate investment rests with the performance of two to three men. Having been an airline pilot, an airline executive, an owner of a business, an educational finance officer and, now, a public servant in Congress, I know of no other profession that carries so much responsibility as is assigned to the airline pilot and flight crew.

The country needs you. We all need you.

REA ESSAY WINNERS IN NEBRASKA

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, annually a statewide essay contest is sponsored by the Nebraska Rural Electric Association on "What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community." It is my privilege today to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the winning essays of six of the State winners who reside in my congressional district. Next week, these winners, along with others from Nebraska, will travel to Washington to see their Government in operation as part of their prize for submitting winning essays.

The essays follow:

INFORMATION

My name: Mary Harding, age: 15, grade: sophomore, school: Crete High School.

Name of parents: Mr. and Mrs. Thomas E. Harding, Pleasant Dale, Nebraska.

Contestant sponsored by the Seward County Rural Public Power District, Seward, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Electric Association.

ELECTRICITY MEANS EXTRA LIVING

The city, with all of its traffic engineers and bustling around, has always had the reputation of a place of modern conveniences and progressive utilities. However, living in the city many people are led to believe that the farm is an 18th century institution. About a year ago, our family moved to the farm, and I began to have a different viewpoint of country living, but also, I really began to appreciate the services of the electric company.

People who live in the country are working people, and when they do get spare time, they like to be in pleasant surroundings to really enjoy themselves. Electricity gives them extra living space, extra living time, and it transforms work into hobby.

The drudgery of past farm eras has diminished greatly, thanks to electricity. And because life has been made a little less work and a little more live, the farmer has been able to take advantage of one of this country's greatest assets—the fresh, clean countryside.

After a day of hard work, there is more time to relax and do things one enjoys. The day no longer ends at dark and neither do the activities. At the flick of a switch, celebrities from all over the world; soft, sweet music from the nation's finest bands; and the laughter and tragedies of the greatest playwrights are brought to the farmers' own livingrooms. The world is not allowed to pass the farmer by.

And the housewife of the country no longer is limited in her spare time, thanks to electricity. Washing, ironing, cooking, sewing, and cleaning time are cut drastically and quality is improved greatly allowing the convenience of city living amid the beauty of a country location.

Water, once a heavy burden in the routine of a farm, no longer presents a problem. The animal tanks are filled by lifting the lever to an electric pump, and in winter the water remains water because there is an electric tank heater in the tank. In the house, ample water, both hot and cold, is there for the kitchen, utility room, and bath. Remember that last steaming bath? Remember the buckets of water you didn't have to carry to the stove to heat and then to the tub—also remember the backache you didn't get from lifting all that water.

At night, the last check around the yard is much safer because of the big yard lamp. Carefully planned lighting on the patio can extend the house to the outdoors to take advantage of cooling breezes on warm summer nights—even bring the dinner to the patio free of bugs now that there are special bulbs for that purpose.

Electricity has liberated the farmer as a slave of the weather. The wilting heat of the summer and the freezing cold of the winter no longer make life miserable. An electric cooling and heating system has given the family of the farm control over their climate and has even regulated the amount of moisture in their home.

Now that we have moved to the country, I have realized the really important role electricity plays in twentieth century farm life. Electricity gives extra power to work and extra beauty to play. Electricity keeps the farmer informed and brings them entertainment. The necessities of everyday life have been changed from drudgery to simple, pleasant routine due to electricity. Electricity adds space and time to farm life—electricity means extra living.

INFORMATION

My Name: Susanna Von Essen, age: 16, grade: Sophomore, school: Pender High School.

Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Herman H. Von Essen, Emerson, Nebraska 68733.

Contestant sponsored by the Northeast Nebraska Rural Public Power District, Emerson, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

As the farmer throws back a mound of quilts and gets out of bed, he shivers,—the house is icy cold. Dressing quickly, he lights a kerosene lantern and hurries out, pails in hand, to milk the cows. Meanwhile, his wife must pump water and light a fire in the wood burning stove in order to prepare breakfast. Sound farfetched? Well, this is merely a description of life in rural America in the "good old days" before Willie Wirehand came to do the farmer's chores the electric way. Such modern innovations as electric blankets, electric heat, dusk-to-dawn automatic lights, milking machines, pressure water systems, and electric ranges are now available to every farm in our area, thanks to rural electrification.

Electricity is the keystone of modern farm machinery and methods. It has enabled a farmer to increase both the productivity of his acres, and the size of his operation. Livestock farming, particularly, has been changed in many ways. Today's farmer need only stand by and watch while a push-button feeding system does his work for him. He is no longer dependent upon the wind for pumping water. If his water system is electrically controlled, his livestock will always have an abundant supply. Electrically heated barns can greatly reduce losses of newborn animals. Rural electrification has also introduced into our area, some entirely new aspects of livestock farming, such as dairying.

Grain farming, too, has been aided by rural electrification. When there is a lack of moisture, the farmer is able to irrigate his crops, using power supplied by his rural public power district. At harvest time, he can rest assured that his grain will not spoil if he has an electric drying bin.

Willie Wirehand is also the farm wife's best friend. Through rural electrification she is able to enjoy the same modern conveniences as her city counterpart. The drudgery of washday has been eliminated by the automatic washer, dryer, and electric iron. Food preparation has been simplified by the electric range, refrigerator, and home freezer,

plus a myriad of other appliances. Even cleaning house has been made much easier.

Of course, there have been other changes in the home, from which the entire family has benefited. Electric heat, air conditioners, dehumidifiers, and pressure water systems have made life more comfortable for everyone. The television, radio, and the record player, provide opportunities for entertainment and education.

Rural electrification benefits the community as well as the farm home. Several towns purchase their electric power directly from the rural public power district, thereby eliminating the need for maintaining their own power plant. The electrification system, and the demand for new appliances and equipment, and for repair service, provides employment for a number of persons. In addition, the time saved by a farmer and his family through the use of electricity allows them to participate more fully in community affairs.

Rural electrification has brought electricity to the farmer, and today, it is one of his most valuable tools. It has given many comforts to his family, and helped the area it serves. Rural electrification can say with pride "Willie Wierhand does your chores the electric way."

INFORMATION

My name: Jim Say, age: 16, grade: Sophomore, school: Norfolk Senior High School.

Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. John Say, R. R. #2, Norfolk, Neb. 68701.

Contestant sponsored by the Elkhorn Rural Public Power District, Battle Creek, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION TO OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

A morning during the year of 1970, in a remote Rocky Mountain region of the United States reveals a farmer awakening early to prepare for working in his field the entire day. His wife will begin cleaning the house, a chore taking at least one week, since relatives are coming to visit. This couple does not have electricity on their farm.

Electricity has made farming rely more on planning, in place of sweating. On an average farm it can be put to over 400 different uses. Mostly due to electricity a farmer can produce six times as much today as one could 150 years ago. Larger farms are now possible, in the last half century the average size of farms has increased by 30%.

Almost every facet of farming and ranching now depends on electrical tools. One example is the dairy industry, where sanitation is important. Cows can be milked by electrical machinery over three times as fast as the best human milker could, even including the time taken to clean the equipment. With electricity to pump fresh water and to bring feed, milk production has increased by 20%.

Other ranchers have also reported greater profits after using electricity. A farmer in southern Nebraska, using modern equipment, spent only one hour daily caring for his hogs. Over 10% of all poultry brooding in Nebraska also requires use of electricity.

The rural housewife has likewise benefited greatly from electrical installation in the home. Electric lighting provides sufficient illumination without unnecessary heat. Appliances such as irons, ovens, refrigerators, and freezers have become indispensable, while such conveniences as vacuum cleaners, mixers, washers, and driers have saved even more work. Some appliances have eliminated over 90% of the labor needed previously.

The chief advantage of electricity are convenience, efficiency, and low cost. Over 98% of the farms in Nebraska have electricity, illustrating the availability of electrification in rural areas. Electricity has no combustion by-products as those of fuels, offering cleaner and safer living conditions. This

properly has encouraged manufacturers to turn to electricity to lessen air pollution. Nominal cost is shown by the expense of electric heating used by a typical rural family during a severe winter, which was less than \$200 monthly. Soybean growers are receiving more profits by processing their crops by themselves with electric machinery. Chicken feed can be ground at a cost of only five cents a ton.

The modern farmer will face the future with a growing dependence on electricity. To meet the resulting greater demand researchers are developing new agricultural machines utilizing electricity. One of these recently produced implements is an experimental tractor called the EXT, powered by six lead-acid rechargeable batteries. Capable of plowing, the estimated price of this type of machine is as little as \$1,000. With machines of this nature the farm and community of the future will probably depend entirely on electricity as a source of energy.

INFORMATION

My Name: Mary Cech, age: 16, grade: junior, school: Clarkson High School.

Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. James S. Cech, R. R. No. 1, Clarkson, Nebraska.

Contestant sponsored by the Cornhusker Public Power District, Columbus, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

I'll admit it, I was born a non-believer, but can you really blame me? Almost any youth of today first found himself in a family already conveniently "set" with electricity. Certainly, I depended on it for many comforts, but as for the belief that it is a necessary, even vital part of today's rural life was another thing, and one that I seldom cared to think of.

And then the "lights went out" for a short time due to an electrical storm. Much to my dismay those grave necessities such as the electric toothbrush, hair-dryer, and hair curler ceased to function. Panic!!

For supper all to be had was cold baloney and potato chips, and then I singed my hair while playing a game of cards (the only means of entertainment) by candlelight. That did it!! I complained of all my hardships to my dad.

He told me all my sufferings were absurd, because electricity was used for far more important things than convenience equipment. I must have not looked very convinced, for, a day or two after the storm, he took me to my uncle's, the dairy farmer. I saw all the electrical equipment he needed, ranging from the milkers to huge coolers. Dad got tricky and had me milk one threatening old jersey by hand. After milking one quart, I was exhausted and truly realized the need for electric machines here.

Dad told me I hadn't seen it all yet, and gritting my teeth, we proceeded to a neighboring farm with seemingly miles of cattle. I saw the intricate electric feeders and watering systems in function. Electricity certainly made this place hum also.

I was almost cured. Almost, because I made the mistake of telling my dad that I guessed electricity was important for feeders and milkers but it didn't pertain to crop farmers very much.

Well, away we went again, to various irrigation and auger systems and several drying bins. I was informed that without this equipment, the crop farmer could never expect a maximum yield for a minimum amount of labor.

I was convinced. I now know electricity is not just a convenience measure. Thanks to my dad, I found that electricity has become a vital necessity to every farmer, large or small, crop or livestock.

And even I, one of those "carefree" teenagers, have become a believer! A believer in rural electrification.

INFORMATION

My name: Clyde W. Marr, age: 16, grade: Junior, school: Rosalie Public Schools.

Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Warren A. Marr, Rosalie, Nebraska.

Contestant sponsored by the Burt County Public Power District, Tekamah, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

Our rural electrification system, which is dedicated to service, has made possible the modern way of life for twenty million Americans, ten percent of our nation's population. Ninety percent of the rural electric customers are located on farms and non-farm residences. The rest are schools, churches, rural industries and businesses.

Rural electrification helps our home and community in three ways: It provides light, power and heating-cooling temperature control.

I live on the farm, so I know firsthand what electricity means in providing light. My grandmother relates how, when my father was a child, farm families had to depend upon kerosene lamps for light. When chores were delayed, when sows farrowed at night, or sick animals required attention, they had to rely upon kerosene lanterns for light. Grandma tended her babies at night, prepared early breakfasts and late suppers by dim, smelly, unsafe lamplight.

Today, our homes are electrically lighted—completely, dependably, safely—thanks to rural electrification service. Farmstead yardlights even provide outdoor illumination throughout the night for added safety and convenience. At night, the twinkling of myriad, friendly dusk-to-dawn security lights in our community is a beautiful, reassuring sight that symbolizes the brightness and protection that electricity provides for our community.

Rural electrification provides power for doing chores and performing many heavy tasks. My father tells us about his boyhood days when farm families had to depend upon horsepower, windpower, or gasoline-driven motor power for such chores as grinding, elevating, mixing, and conveying feeds, pumping water, doing family washing and countless other tasks requiring power. Today, we flip a switch or press a button, and there is instant, ample power for doing heavy chores—from grinding and mixing feeds to operating water systems, power tools and milking machines, doing family laundry, or turning Mother's food mixer. Rural electrification is indeed a moving force in our lives!

Rural electrification also provides temperature control. Many farm homes are heated by quiet, clean, economic electricity, controlled to warm one room or the entire house. Other homes not equipped with central electric heat have supplementary electric heating units to provide extra heat for nursery, bathroom or basement. Electricity also provides quick, dependable temporary heat for farrowing pens, brooder houses or lambing quarters. Electric heat also makes possible such conveniences as water heaters, electric stoves, clothes dryers, ironers, toasters and numerous other household appliances.

In addition to heating, electricity also provides cooling that makes possible refrigeration, home freezers and rural locker plants. Central cooling systems temperature-control the entire house. Smaller room-size air conditioners provide warm-weather comfort for many families, and electric fans are found in almost every home.

Rural Electrification is indeed a magic wand that, extended throughout our community over high lines, provides light, power, and

heating-cooling temperature control; thus transforming our farms and homes dependably, conveniently, inexpensively. I cannot envision my home or my community without this precious commodity—rural electrification.

INFORMATION

My name: Cindy Schoeder, age: 16, grade: sophomore, school: David City High School. Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Wilbur Schoeder, R.R. #1, David City, Nebraska 68632.

Contestant sponsored by the Butler County Rural Public Power District, David City, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

Those were the good old days?

Time and time again I have heard from my grandparents how things were in the "good old days." Unfortunately for them, electricity was not available for all and was used by only the minority of the people. As a result they were without many of the luxuries enjoyed by most of us today.

Little did I know that a spring day in 1966 would bring me a taste of those "good old days." Although the exact date was March 22, it seemed very little like spring. The temperature had dropped and the weatherman had forecast snow. Snow isn't unusual in early spring, so the day began as any other day. However, late in the afternoon the sky became overcast, wet snow began coming down and the wind increased tremendously to 60 and 75 miles an hour.

As we were finishing dinner dishes that Tuesday night, we had a power failure, due to the storm, and our home was left in darkness. That meant studying by candlelight and no television. It would be a dull night. Due to these circumstances beyond our control, our whole family went to bed early for a change. The "whole family" in addition to myself included my parents, a brother, an older sister who was home from college for "spring vacation" and my grandmother from out-of-state who was visiting at the time.

Next morning when we awoke, conditions hadn't improved as we had hoped but were even worse. The house was very cold, our hurried breakfast was prepared on a camp stove and we were without the usual running water. After collecting a few necessities, we moved to our little basement for the rest of the day as it was warmer there. Instead of the one day we had anticipated, we lived in the basement three days.

While the REA crewmen were repairing damage to lines and light poles over the entire county, time passed slowly for us. We had plenty of hours to reflect on the many conveniences we enjoy as a result of electricity. Even grandmother agreed that modern life is much more enjoyable than that of days gone by.

This recollection of the 1966 blizzard reminds me of the comforts and conveniences electricity brings to my home and my community.

Little did people realize thirty-five years ago the changes that the Rural Electrification Administration, better known as the REA, would bring about. Their lives changed as they also enjoyed the modern facilities previously used only by city residents. Work on the farm was eased for both the farmer and his wife by the use of electricity.

The electrical system brought about improvements in health, nutrition, education and communication for the farm family. These things not only made living easier but also made it more economical.

As the REA celebrates its thirty-fifth anniversary, consumers are experiencing its many benefits. Electricity is one of the biggest bargains in the family budget, and creates more free time for good times. It is

difficult to put a value of dollars and cents on electricity for home and community, but it makes a good life better, thanks to the REA.

"BIG ED JOHNSON"

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the State of Colorado and the Nation was saddened by the death of the Honorable Edwin C. Johnson, three-time Governor of the State of Colorado and who had 18 years' service in the U.S. Senate.

Governor Johnson had a unique ability to analyze and foresee many of the problems that were presented. While he was U.S. Senator, he spoke out against the United States sending American GI's into Indochina. I think it is fitting and proper that we should again reread that speech that was made on April 19, 1954, which is as follows:

THE WAR IN INDOCHINA

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A week ago I spoke emphatically, but briefly, against the United States sending American GI's into the mud and muck of Indochina. I suggested then that in a few days I would present further arguments to support my position. My reason then and my reason for speaking now was and is to alert the American people with respect to the dangers faced by their sons and their economy.

This present crusade to send troops to Indochina, with its uncalculated cost for an uncalculated result, is the most foolhardy venture in all American history. It is my guess that it would mean, at the very minimum, 500,000 American casualties and a very minimum of \$100 billion of borrowed money.

Five hundred thousand American casualties is a staggering contribution to ask American mothers to make for an uncalculated risk. That fact alone should sober our responsible leaders. But \$100 billion of additional borrowed money means for America a 25-cent dollar instead of our present 50-cent dollar and an economy so weak that it can no longer give leadership to a distraught world or resist communism at home and abroad.

Such a war could last 10 years, or it could touch off and spawn a world war which would have to be fought for 100 years without victory. It could drive the brown and Malay races into the arms of the Communists in a solid front against the white race in a death struggle, which eventually would destroy all civilization. These are some of the uncalculated risks of the proposal to fight in Indochina. Let them be calculated before we move civilization one small step closer to the yawning abyss of world disaster. To drift, drift, drift, drift closer and ever closer to this flaming candle, like some silly, enchanted moth, is almost too fantastic for human minds to contemplate.

If the American people realized the nearness of war in Indochina, they would rise up as one man and stop it. America is practically unanimous against sending soldiers or sailors or bombers to this war in the jungles.

In November of 1952, I heard E. P. Hoyt, publisher of the Denver Post, in an eloquent address to the Denver Rotary Club, say that five words decided the election. According to Mr. Hoyt, when Candidate Eisenhower said in the campaign, "I will go to Korea," the Democrats' goose was cooked. The political

house built by five words could be destroyed, in the twinkling of an eye, by these five words: "Troops will go to Indochina."

The other day a Senator whose sound judgment I respect greatly questioned whether military intervention by the United States in Indochina would not give Red China the excuse it wants also to intervene. There are no reasons to doubt that very result. When we began sending billions of dollars of war supplies to the French, China began sending millions of dollars in war supplies to the native rebels, not as gifts but in exchange for the raw materials which China needs so desperately. Of course, our troops will be more than matched in numbers by their troops. Such an American-Chinese war would be fought not in a place of our choosing, but in China's backyard, and 7,000 miles from the shores of America. Most certainly the advantages are with the Communists; the disadvantages with us. I can almost hear the chess-playing experts in the Kremlin snickering over our act of desperation as a wonderful strategic victory should we commit American soldiers to this jungle war in support of white man's colonialism.

A few hours ago the President said in Kentucky that regardless of how this war started, it was now the free world versus communism. I wish it were that simple, and that there were no other fundamental contingencies. It seems to me we must be realistic, however, and take into account the original causes of the rebellion in Indochina, as well as the full impact and results which would follow our intervention in this uprising of the native population against French rule.

Edward R. Murrow says that Senator McCARTHY thinks every critic is a Communist. In world affairs, our diplomats seem also to be making that basic McCarthy error.

During the past year I have sought to arrive at some positive conclusion about the Indochina issues, and, in all honesty, I am unable to support the belief that the present conflict between the French-supported Vietnam and the rebel Viet Minh is, in truth, a war of the forces of freedom, on the one hand, and the forces of communism on the other hand. Soviet communism, with its contempt for the rights of the individual, is a despicable tyranny. But it is not the only tyranny. Unbridled imperialism, the law of the jungle that says the strong shall devour the weak, the "haves" shall exploit the "have nots," is no less despotic, no less contemptible, is no less the uncompromising enemy of our American principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, than is Soviet communism.

So often causes are confused by labels, and labels with dogmas, and dogmas with principles, until it becomes difficult to find, much less to evaluate, the fundamental issues. These elements are distorted even more, by careless thinking until an uniformed people become a confused people, and, in the end, a dismayed people whose own ignorance has allowed it to be shabbily used.

Forces are at work to get this Nation committed to war in Asia. Some of these forces we know to be our enemies, some of them we recognize as our real friends. Unfortunately, there seems to be no articulate force in America determined to keep us out of war. But because it is not articulate, do not think for a moment that this force is not present. Congress must give it a voice that will be heard, and that will be heard in time to prevent American principles from being abandoned and the United States from being committed to the support of an imperialistic colonial war.

Our press and radio during the past few weeks have pulled no punches, have left nothing to the imagination, for the most part, in describing France's Indochina enemies, the Viet Minh, as "the Communist forces." This war has been going on for

nearly 8 years. As recently as 5 years ago the Viet Minh were not labeled, even by the less responsible press, as Communists. As recently as 5 months ago they were not so identified, even by the French. In fact, even 90 days ago dispatches from Saigon discreetly and consistently called them the Communist-led Viet Minh, but never the Communist forces, or the Communist Viet Minh. At what point, and to what degree, has this war, which every record shows to have been a war for freedom and independence, a war against imperialism, at what point did it suddenly become a war of Communist aggression?

The genesis of reasoning lies in distinguishing fact from fancy, truth from untruth. In examining the whole far-eastern question I have tried painstakingly to substantiate each belief as fact before relating it in terms of its by-product, before evaluating it in terms of a conclusion that may be drawn from it.

It is a fact that more than two-thirds of the world's population goes to bed hungry every night. It is also a fact that most of that two-thirds lives in Asia. It is no less a fact that communism breeds on poverty and want. But to conclude, unreservedly, that all Asia is a breeding ground for communism is to commit a folly of reasoning which, from the start, places us on false premises.

It is also a fact that man does not live by bread alone, that spiritual forces are more potent in most southeast Asiatic communities than political forces, and that these ancient peoples, of strong spiritual convictions and mature cultures, have shown a marked reluctance for accepting any new political ideas. All these facts have been significant deterrents to attempts to propagate Mr. Marx's materialism.

Yet it is also true that Asia has had a belly full of war, and, like a good part of our western world, it is seeking, almost desperately, for something to hold onto, something that will spare it the destruction and misery it has known too well and too long. If that something can offer the faintest promise of hope for overcoming the manifold hardships of war it will win converts.

Asia is in revolution—revolution against colonialism. The promulgation of what we in America believe are the inalienable rights of every man, and the right to walk as equals with dignity in the world community is sweeping Asia. The spirit which animated the American Revolution and the French Revolution of the eighteenth century, and Bolivar's great cause in South America in the nineteenth century, has taken firm root in Asia in this century. Nationalism, which began with the restive forces of Sun Yet Sen in China, and the establishment of a constitutional monarchy in Japan has swollen to flood tide in Asia since World War II. The successful independence movement of Gandhi in India, the successful revolt of Indonesia, and the independence of Burma, Pakistan, and the Philippines, are but manifestations of the revolution against colonialism in Asia. To these let us add the present war in Indochina, which, in fact, had its start almost 30 years ago.

The astonishing victories of the Japanese Army in China, southeast Asia, and the Islands of the Pacific, taught Asiatics for the first time that the Western Powers were not invincible, for there is no denying that Japan's sweep was impressive, if not decisive. Because of their cultural and religious tenets, most Asiatics are peace-loving people, not easily stirred to violence, and they are indefatigably patient. The inspiration of Japan's success, coupled with the arms provided by Japan's surrender, literally all over Asia, supplied the two essentials for these nationalist movements to spring into action with renewed vigor. It was largely on the crest of this popular tide that Mao Tse Tung

rode to final victory over the Kuomintang and its colonialist allies. Russia was not a factor in Mao's success; in fact, it did nothing for him until after Chiang's defeat.

Colonialism must go in Asia. Washington, tagged successfully by our enemies as the great defender of colonialism and imperialism, must awaken to the realities of the current revolution in Asia against these evils.

Nationalism, inspired originally by America, is being thwarted by America, with the aggregate effect of driving independence movements to Moscow and the forfeit of America's traditional role as freedom's refuge. In terser language, we help the cause of world communism by failure to stand solidly for the cause of world democracy. In fact, in the minds of a great many Asiatics and Europeans, and members of the Arab States as well, America does not quite know what it is for, and only faintly what it is against.

In our appraisal of the political situation on the continent of Asia, we may have been susceptible to a fundamental error. The geometric theorem which declares things equal to the same thing are equal to each other, when followed in the very inexact science of politics, demonstrates clearly the rule of logic which states that the more logically one proceeds from an illogical premise, the more illogical one becomes.

We are a freedom-inspired Nation, devoted to the tenets of democracy, but Communist China makes the same claim. Shrewdly China points out that we are the defenders of the white man's policy of exploitation, and as a result of our actions the natives believe this false propaganda.

When it comes to sending our troops and treasure half way around the world to fight in defense of colonialism, we cannot take comfort from the fact that an Asiatic does not know any more about us than we do about him. The penalty is more than loss of troops and treasure, infinitely more.

China, culturally, is the dominant force in Asia. More than perhaps any other race, the Chinese are the businessmen of Asia, are willing to be the entrepreneurs, assume financial risks, and be the shopkeepers—in fact, in many communities outside China they are the entire middle class.

The Chinese are, indeed, rugged individualists, with a rapacity for a fast buck that is almost instinctive. As a people who have grown up with an intimate knowledge of poverty, they believe poverty to be the worst of all evils; that wealth can overcome all ills. Thus, acquisitiveness, amounting at times to avarice, is a somewhat universal Chinese characteristic, and hardly one which lends itself to communistic regimentation. Among their more endearing qualities are wit, a high sense of cultural values, philosophical humor, and a zest for good eating when they can afford it—a somewhat natural manifestation of a people that knows famine too well.

Indochina is not nearly so simple. Massive China, with a population of 400 million souls, has two principal dialects, and two main religious currents, and is geographically intact, if not integrated, with well-defined borders and no dominant minority element. Indochina has a population of 30 million people, is one-twentieth of China in size, has a geographic entity of 3 political states, more than a dozen languages and dialects, half a dozen different religions, and many distinct racial groups. It is a country of great topographical contrasts, from hot tropical rice paddies to mountainous savage jungle, through much of which no man has passed. In the strange amalgam of its contrasting population is the distinct stratum of some 3 million Chinese who live as a class apart, well interlarded into the economic life, but socially aloof.

As a producer of rice, rubber, tea, coal, coffee, pepper, teakwood, and jute for export, it is potentially a great world trader, having much of the world's needs, both east

and west. True, there is poverty, abject poverty, in the crowded river deltas of the Mekong and the Red River, but potentially the country could support many times its population if it had a better economy and improved transportation. Its public health and educational levels are dismally low—no tribute to its past hundred years of colonial existence. It has been charged, in fact, that France spent three times as much importing opium into the country than was spent on schools—a charge not yet refuted.

We gain nothing at this juncture by finding fault with our French allies. Yet let it be said again, and no one knows it better than the true French patriot, Indochina has been the worst administered colonial area in all Asia.

Vietnam, chief of the three Indochina states, includes the provinces of Cochinchina in the south, Annam in the center along the east coast, and Tonkin in the north. Of these, the Annamese are by far the most numerous. They come from an old migration which had its start in western China, but which has been established in its present locale since 1190 B.C. Immediately interior of the low eastern coastal areas, with their intensified rice culture and running virtually the length of the subcontinent, is a high mountain cordillera, inhabited by aboriginal tribes, most of whom, by the nature of their surroundings, live an entirely independent existence under their own tribal authority. The jungle tribes of Indochina recognize no law but their own; and that applies alike to France, Vietnam, or Viet Minh. For the most part, these people live quite oblivious to the war going on in the coastal areas. So long as they are assured that the masses from the coast will not come into their jungle, all is well. The jungle is so dense in places that a machinegun burst from its few, narrow, trails will not penetrate 30 yards, all of which makes it extremely difficult to fight a war of mobility and mass fire power. Whoever commands the trails commands the jungle, which is to say whoever has the tribes on his side commands the terrain.

Tonkin, the northernmost of Vietnam's three provinces, comprises both mountains and rich river delta. It has good deposits of fine anthracite coal, copper, manganese, iron, and tungsten. About 40 miles north is the border of China, and just inside another forty-odd miles, the ancient trading city of Nanning, through which passes all the supplies destined for the Nationalist forces of Ho Chi Minh—paid for in the rice and coal of Viet Minh Indochina, about seven-eighths of the total area, seized from the French.

In Indochina the French have given divide-and-rule full expression. There is also the ancient kingdom of the Khmers, Cambodia, lying in the southwest corner of the peninsula; and Laos, entirely landlocked, nestled in the mountains just north of it. Cambodia, its people mostly of Thai origin, is a closely integrated community; proud, rich in all the necessities of life, with a glorious cultural heritage of art, music, and literature. Its magnificent sixth century temple at Angkor was one of the seven wonders of the ancient world. These people are mostly Buddhists, a state religion, whose loyal subjects are both devout and disciplined in its powerful hierarchy. There is also an Isarak tribal minority whose mystic faith strongly resembles the Brahmans. The religious devotion of the people of Indochina is no insignificant factor as a barrier to communism, personifying, as it does, spiritual man in his greatest piety, with cardinal tenets of peace and international fellowship.

Thus far, Laos has not been well developed by the French. In fact, it is probably the only nation on the globe which has not 1 mile of railroad. While its teak, gold, and tin resources have been exploited without means of getting them out profitably, Laos

still lies in the realm of exploration for future pioneers. The Laotians are also Buddhists, and predominantly of Thai origin. Despite the avalanche of nervous communiques that came out of Indochina last spring about an invasion of Laos by the Communist Viet Minh, its people demonstrated neither anxiety nor concern. In fact, there is considerable opinion to the effect that the invasion was in the minds of the colonialists, then seeking, and getting, a substantial loan from the United States, on the strength of the alleged threat to the "sovereignty of poor Laos."

Several months ago a courageous and aroused group in the French Chamber of Deputies, not Communists either, demanded that their government come to peaceful terms with the Viet Minh in Indochina. Due to a certain amount of luck, the French Government has staved off a vote of confidence on this question, knowing, perhaps, that only the greatest miracle could prevent its parliamentary collapse if a vote were demanded. Within the past 10 days we have been treated to the spectacle of seeing the French Premier and the French Ministers slapped and abused in the streets of Paris by Frenchmen, and not Communist Frenchmen, because of the seemingly determined attitude of the present government to sustain a war that every Frenchman, and all France's allies save one—the administration in Washington—knows it cannot win. France needs and seeks desperately a way in which she can retire with some honor, without being confronted with complete disintegration of her overseas possessions. In a nutshell, that is what disturbs the remaining Frenchmen who cling to the Victorian dream of a farflung French Empire.

Yet what are we doing about it? Are we finding France a way "to get off the hook?" Are we helping them to save face and withdraw with honor? Or are we giving them false encouragement in the form of greater and greater and greater military commitments? Last week the Secretary of State sent an appeal to the nations of the Pacific, and then went on a barnstorming tour of France and England, in a grandiose scheme to rally forces to a course of collective action in Indochina. What was the result? All of us know it too well. Not only did the Philippines, India, and Japan vote it down unreservedly, but England and France herself sent the Secretary of State home in such terms as to leave no doubt that they wanted no part in his plan.

Why would they not rally with us in a war to stop Communist aggression? Simply because they know that the war in Indochina is not a war of Communist aggression. They know that the forces opposing France's colonial rule in Indochina are just. They know that if these forces are getting help from Communist China, it is because the true friends of freedom in the West have forsaken them. They know, too, that if Communist China is selling equipment to the Viet Minh, the Viet Minh are being made to pay dearly in rice, coal, and minerals for every bit of aid they are getting. They know, also, because we have never attempted to hide it, that the United States has committed more than a billion dollars worth of equipment, and now seems ready to commit even more, to help France—all of which from their point of view might well justify China in helping her southern Asiatic neighbor with traffic in arms and munitions.

Suppose, for example, Mexico were conquered and held by an Asiatic power. Suppose the people of Mexico rose up and struck down their oppressor. Then suppose an even stronger Asiatic power intervened, to support the status quo. What would our position be? What would we do? Would not we feel obligated in the name of freedom to give our Mexican neighbor revolutionists all aid and comfort? And if the other Asiatic power embarked troops in Mexico, would not we also

feel justified in sending our forces to drive them out?

Whether every one of the 24 million people of Viet Nam is a Communist or whether not one of them is, is not the question. If all of them are Communists, what is to be accomplished by sending 10 American divisions there, to make them live as we want them to? The only way to combat an idea is with a better idea. What better idea is being advanced by our sending tanks and bombers to slaughter the people of Indochina? What is to be gained by having thousands of our young men take their places beside the young men of France and Viet Nam in graves along the jungle trail? Have we so completely lost our perspective, have we so completely abandoned the principles of freedom, have we so willingly denied the legitimacy of our own birthright, that we demand this war? What kind of people have we become?

If we want to make Communists of all the people of Asia, if we want to recruit Communists wholesale throughout the world, if we want to bleed ourselves of all vigor and principle, and if we are ready to send the Statue of Liberty, with Freedom's Torch, to a new home on Red Square in Moscow, then, by all means, let us join the jungle war against the revolutionists fighting colonialism in Indochina.

But if we mean to recover what this stupid course of action has lost, if we mean to restore America to the place it has held for nearly 180 years in the minds and hearts of men, let us demand peace with honor, now, for France in Indochina before it is too late. The negotiations beginning today in Geneva give us one last chance. May we have the wisdom to make the most of it.

THE MEANING OF OUR FLAG: FLAG DAY, 1970

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the flag for which our heroes fought, for which they died, is the symbol of all we are as a Nation, of all we hope to be as a people. It is the emblem of equal rights; it means free speech, self-government, and the dignity of the individual. It means that this continent has been dedicated to freedom.

It means free public education—light for every mind, knowledge for every child, with the schoolhouse the fortress of our liberty. It means that it is the duty of every citizen to bear his share of the public burden—to take part in the affairs of his town, his State, and his country. It means that the ballot box is the ark of our constitutional covenant.

It means peaceful change through lawful means. It means that every citizen of the Republic, native or naturalized, must be protected at home in every State, abroad in every land, on every sea, and in the skies of the world.

It means that all distinctions based on birth or lineage have been expunged from our laws; that our Government stands as a referee between labor and capital, between the weak and the strong, between the individual and the corporation, and between want and wealth, the guarantor of justice to each and to all.

It means that there shall be an available legal remedy for every wrong. It means that we welcome to our shores the exiles of the world.

Let us then look to the flag, in these days of internal and world crises, not as a mark of divisiveness, but as a symbol of unity of purpose and our past and present determination to remain strong and free.

VETERANS BENEFITS IN ELECTION YEAR

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the season of the year is upon us when the elections are not far away and when statements begin to appear claiming political credit for all sorts of things. We all understand that a little poetic license is the order of things for elections claims and promises, but there is some necessity for maintaining a semblance of accuracy in these claims.

Currently, there is a torrent of publicity being scattered about the country decrying a recent article in Life magazine as being inaccurate and misleading. In the same breath it is admitted that the hospital in question is suffering from old facilities, a shortage of space, staff deficiencies, lack of adequate funds, and overcrowding of patients. It may be that I am not as perceptive as I should be, but these are the general impressions conveyed by the Life magazine article.

I saw recently a copy of the May 25 issue of the Republican Congressional Committee's newsletter entitled "A Push From the Top" on veteran benefits. A further reading of the article would infer that the "push from the top" came from the administration and was aimed at improving things. The article went on to take credit for practically everything that has happened, including GI bill educational increases, increases in hospital appropriations that came only after the most diligent persuasion, the outreach program which the administration has refused to fund was mentioned, and several other bills. The most interesting thing about most of these legislative enactments and programs which were mentioned is that rather than receiving a "push from the top" in gaining enactment of these bills, we really received a "shove to the rear," since the administration opposed them, and has opposed practically everything that has been considered and enacted into law.

Since statements of this type are in vogue, the record would not be complete without a recent statement by Lawrence F. O'Brien, Democratic national chairman, entitled "The Administration's Failure To Meet the Needs of Veterans." Serious researchers can start with the Republican Congressional Committee's newsletter of May 25, which appears on page 16996 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 25, and compare these claims with the analysis by Mr. O'Brien which I am including. The study of these two

documents should provide an excellent starting place for the serious student who is searching for evidence that the Nixon administration has actually done anything of consequence to help veterans.

Mr. O'Brien's analysis follows:

THE ADMINISTRATION'S FAILURE TO MEET THE NEEDS OF VETERANS

(Statement by Lawrence F. O'Brien, Democratic National Chairman)

The Nixon Administration is guilty of serious neglect of the veterans of Vietnam.

It has failed, through inaction and deliberate cutbacks, to meet the urgent needs of the Veterans' Administration.

For this, President Nixon must answer to the millions of American veterans and their families—and indeed to all Americans.

As we observe Memorial Day this weekend, it is appropriate that we take a look at the record—a 16-month record which is nothing short of appalling.

I agree with President Nixon that our men in Vietnam are "10 feet tall" and that they deserve our full support. But what happens when they return home? They are greeted with neglect and disinterest from their government.

The indictment of the current Administration on veterans affairs is a long one:

The Nixon Administration has resisted efforts to increase funding for GI education and training.

The Nixon Administration has blocked efforts to increase the VA claims processing staff.

The Nixon Administration has vetoed efforts to update and construct urgently needed hospital space.

The Nixon Administration has turned a deaf ear to cries for vitally necessary increases in VA professional staffing.

The Nixon Administration has cut back federal aid to state-run veterans' facilities.

The Nixon Administration has side-tracked money for medical education and research.

The Nixon Administration's negative attitude extends to a host of actions which would guarantee liveable compensation to veterans and dependents.

We are asked by the Administration to judge it by its deeds. As we review its failures in the area of veterans' benefits, concern for the veteran can only dismay every American and make a mockery of the Administration's claims of concern for our servicemen.

There are nearly one million new Vietnam era veterans each year, in addition to the 16 million World War II veterans and the two million World War I veterans who are in need of medical and other assistance from their government.

The Veterans' Administration *must* be adequately funded if it is to meet its obligations under an ever-mounting workload.

The Congress has recognized these needs. But the Nixon Administration continues to take a negative, footdragging attitude toward the largely bipartisan congressional efforts to guarantee adequate assistance to veterans and their dependents.

Item: Less than a year ago the House passed an increase in educational benefits for returning Vietnam servicemen. But the Nixon Administration asked Congress to wait—to "defer consideration." In doing so, is President Nixon asking Vietnam veterans to bear the brunt of his efforts to curb inflation? If so, his sense of justice is grossly misplaced.

Item: Of some 4,000 VA personnel who were cut back due to Nixon Administration budget decisions a year ago, 378 were slated for assignment to claims processing—a cutback that came at a time when VA regional offices had a backlog of almost 600,000 pending actions and inquiries—a backlog that is growing daily, with no relief in sight.

Item: In a decision which was completely inconsistent with the American commitment to our war veterans, the Nixon Administration ordered a budget cutback of \$41 million in the VA hospital construction and modernization program. Of that amount, some \$17 million would have gone for badly needed air conditioning at four VA hospitals. What kind of hope does that decision offer the patients who presently are subjected to deplorable conditions of overcrowding?

Item: The Nixon Administration cut \$31.5 million from the original 1970 VA request which would have provided 3,500 additional doctors, nurses, medical technicians and other hospital personnel. With wounded veterans of Vietnam returning in ever-increasing numbers, the VA finds itself unable to use \$20 million of newly-installed, advanced life-saving equipment because of lack of trained personnel. Desperate attempts have been made to *partially* correct this crisis by the transfer of personnel from already understaffed operations within the VA hospital system, further compounding the problem.

Item: Most hospitals across the country have a ratio of 2.5 to 3 staff personnel for each patient, while the overcrowded VA hospital staff ratio is 1.5 per patient. Faced with this unfavorable balance, the VA has one work-saving, money-saving alternative—aid to states to help modernize and construct medical facilities in state soldiers' homes. The Nixon Administration decided to *cut* \$4 million from the original VA budget slated to go to the states on a matching fund basis.

Item: The Administration has *opposed* legislation which would eliminate the "pauper's oath" for a veteran 75 years of age or older for admission to a VA hospital; *opposed* legislation which would eliminate the six-month time limit for elderly veterans who are receiving nursing care; *recommended* that the Congress *defer action* on cost-of-living increases for widows and orphans of veterans who were killed in action or who died of service-connected causes; *recommended* that Congress *reject* proposals to utilize veteran-owned insurance funds to build homes for returning Vietnam veterans who cannot find mortgage capital.

As further evidence of his insensitivity in this entire area of veterans' benefits, Mr. Nixon asked Congress to *defer action* on legislation to increase coverage for servicemen in Vietnam from \$10,000 to \$15,000. Hundreds of American men die in Vietnam each month, leaving too little money for the support of their families in an inflated economy.

Beyond this, the President asked Congress to *defer action* on adding dismemberment coverage to GI insurance policies, ignoring thousands of GIs who have lost an eye or a limb in Vietnam.

Through the diligent efforts of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House, the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate, and the appropriations committees of both houses, some of the funds arbitrarily cut by the Nixon Administration have been restored. This partial restoration was accomplished over strong Administration objections and only after intensive pressure was applied on the Administration through a series of in-depth congressional hearings.

This litany of neglect of our veterans is shocking, and I suspect it will be a revelation to many Americans. Once again we find in this area of national concern and responsibility an insensitivity on the part of the Nixon Administration that is beyond comprehension.

Yes, Mr. President, your fellow Americans agree that our men in Vietnam "stand 10 feet tall" and deserve our full support—but you cannot continue to forget about them as soon as they return home from the battlefields.

It is an American tradition that we not

neglect our veterans, and only through our deeds can we meet our responsibilities to them.

I urge the President and his Administration to act immediately and vigorously and to show leadership in correcting the neglect of the past 16 months. I am sure in doing this the President will have the support of the Democratic Congress and all Americans.

FORCED UNIONISM?

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, since the bill to provide for alleged reform in the Post Office Department is scheduled to come before the House of Representatives on next Tuesday, June 16, I am glad to have the opportunity to insert in the RECORD the following excellent article on the subject which was published in the most recent issue of Human Events:

FORCED UNIONISM IN THE POST OFFICE?

Postmaster General Winton M. Blount has blundered badly in his determination to push his postal reform measure through the Congress. As a price for his piece of legislation, Blount has surrendered—indeed, sold out, some would say—to organized labor's outrageous demand that the bill make possible a union shop contract between the government and the unions. Under such a plan, every worker would be forced to join a union within 30 days or lose his job. The bill would also eliminate the current practice of requiring postal unions to pay for the book-keeping of collecting dues by instituting a check-off system to be conducted and paid for by the government (i.e., the taxpayer).

There is no excuse for Blount's cave-in. Compulsory unionism is wrong morally, philosophically and politically. It defies understanding that a Republican Cabinet officer would even contemplate forcing 750,000 postal employees—250,000 who by their own free choice have refrained from belonging to any labor organization—to join a union. Yet Blount is not only contemplating the idea—he is doggedly determined to make Congress accept it.

As a result of his persistence, both the House bill (HR 17070) and the Senate bill (S 3842), each awaiting final action in its respective chamber, contain provisions that could force compulsory unionism upon postal employees. Yet it is difficult to envision a more ill-conceived capitulation on Blount's part. There are literally scores of solid objections to the union shop, objections which we thought Mr. Blount was clearly aware of when he opposed forced unionism as head of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. To refresh Mr. Blount's memory, we will list a few of them:

Compulsory unionism is abhorred by those who value freedom, for it is a totalitarian concept to compel someone to belong to a private organization in order to hold a job.

While private firms are permitted to negotiate union shop contracts in states without right-to-work laws, the concept of compulsory unionism has never been applied to federal employment. Three Presidents have opposed compulsory unionism for government workers. Labor Secretary George Shultz opposed the idea last November. Former Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg, a union lawyer, once told a group of laborers: "I know you will agree with me that the union shop and the closed shop are inappropriate to the federal government."

Section 1(a) of Executive Order 11491 gives each government employe the right not to join a labor union. Indeed, until Winton Blount, no Administration had ever pushed for a proposal that would compel someone to pay tribute to a union in order to work for the U.S. government.

The Republican party has historically fought compulsory unionism. When in 1965 and 1966 the Democrats tried to kill "right-to-work"—the section of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits the states to pass laws forbidding compulsory unionism—the late Sen. Everett Dirksen led the battle that ended the repeal move.

The 1968 Republican party platform pledges "to protect federal employes in the exercise of their right freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal to form, join or assist any employe organization or to refrain from any such activities."

Compulsory unionism, if approved by Congress, would set a dangerous precedent which would quickly spread to all the rest of the federal service, right down to the government employes at the local level. AFL-CIO President George Meany has admitted he wants a union shop proviso for "all civilian workers of the federal government." The AFL-CIO *News* has said: "What's good enough for Uncle Sam ought to be good enough for every state, county and city." With the union shop provision, the AFL-CIO would not only be able to augment its already awesome powers over the economy, but it would also be able to generate millions of new dollars for union treasuries—dollars which have historically been used to knock Republican candidates out of office.

In the teeth of all this, however, Blount continues to press for his "reform" plan. The postmaster general argues, but unconvincingly, that the controversial union shop provision does not automatically compel postal employes to join a union. The unions, he asserts, can, for the first time, bargain for the union shop, but the nine-man postal corporation doesn't necessarily have to agree to the demand.

But this argument is disingenuous. Businessman Blount should be well aware that historically the unions have made the union shop their top priority demand in negotiations. Moreover, there are few cases in which businesses have not readily agreed to that demand in recent years. Furthermore, it is difficult to conceive of a postal corporation, midwived by the Blount-Meany team, refusing to give in to such a request, particularly since the legislation, with its provision for dues and the like, clearly contemplates the union shop's coming into existence.

To set the record straight: under current regulations there is absolutely no way for union officials and federal management to bring into existence a union shop or agency shop that is applicable to federal employes; under the Blount-Meany plan it is a virtual certainty that the concept of compulsory unionism will be applied to postal employes first, other government workers at a later time.

When Blount is pressed, he will argue that even if the union shop provision goes into effect, at least federal employes in states where right-to-work laws prevail will not have to join unions. But even this is incorrect. Union spokesmen, in fact, insist that state laws forbidding compulsory unionism are not applicable to employes on federally owned property, and this dispute is now in the courts. Sen. Paul Fannin (R-Ariz.), perhaps the most knowledgeable lawmaker on the right-to-work laws, says there are at least some state right-to-work laws which would not protect federal workers.

All in all, then, the postal reform plan seems a bad bet. Yet union officials are already threatening to renew their illegal mail strike on June 14 unless their additional 8

per cent pay raise—part of the reform package—is approved by Congress.

The strike threat, according to Sen. Fannin, who has promised to lead a filibuster against the plan's compulsory unionism provision, is seen as part of a power play by Meany. Fannin says that Meany is getting set to blame Congress for the strike because of its failure to pass the reform bill. The Arizona charges that the AFL-CIO boss will attempt to inflame public opinion to force Congress to endorse the Blount-Meany package in order to keep the mail moving.

"In effect," says Fannin, "we are faced with the prospect of an illegal strike to force Congress to yield to demands for a 'union shop' authorization. If we yield we will have told potential federal employes that if they want to work for their own government, they will first have to pay dues to a private organization. My friend and colleague, New Hampshire Sen. Norris Cotton, said recently that if Postmaster Blount's idea of postal reform is adopted, 'control of our postal service is bound to pass from the hands of Congress into the hands of the AFL-CIO.'"

"Let's put this problem another way. Should we enact legislation here that would authorize the firing of federal employes who refuse to pay dues to a union which promotes illegal strikes?"

The answer should be obvious, but the postmaster general—with apparent support from the White House—remains determined to drive this unfortunate piece of legislation through Congress.

NATIONAL GUARD

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have been joined by 30 of my colleagues in introducing legislation designed to insure that the National Guard is adequately trained and equipped to meet the rising tide of civil disturbances—be they in our cities or on our campuses.

The most recent Army civil disturbance plan—"Garden Plot"—notes that "the normal reflex action of the well-trained combat soldier to sniper fire is to respond with an overwhelming mass of firepower." But it goes on to warn that "In a civil disturbance situation, this tactic endangers innocent people more than snipers."

The truth of this statement—as it applies to the far less well trained National Guard—was made tragically clear on the Kent State campus on May 4 when four students were slain and 10 more wounded—many of whom were not even taking part in the demonstration.

Whatever the exact circumstances of the Kent State slayings, it is clear that the National Guard was ill-equipped, in every sense of the word, to handle the situation. Clearly, our campuses are not Cambodia.

The only thing that could possibly be more tragic than the events at Kent State would be for Congress not to respond positively by making sure that the guardsmen are well trained and equipped before they are sent onto our campuses or into our cities to quell disturbances in the future.

To date, the National Guard's primary duty has been to be ready to respond to its Federal mission, that is, to provide organized units of trained personnel with sufficient and suitable equipment to augment the active Army and Air Force in time of war or national emergency. To achieve the necessary state of preparedness, guardsmen receive 5 to 6 months of active duty training, and then return to civilian life with a 5½-year commitment to meet 1 weekend per month as well as for 2 weeks "summer camp" each year.

Since National Guardsmen are civilians 90 percent of the time—for the most part, serving in managerial, professional or technical positions—they are, understandably, not as well trained and disciplined as are Regular Army units. This is why the Army assumes that another several months training would be required after a callup before the National Guard units could be committed to a battle.

But when local police forces are incapable of controlling disturbances in their State, the National Guard is called upon to act immediately—either as the State militia or, when federalized, as Federal troops. Thus, the National Guard has been federalized to protect students integrating Southern schools and called to duty to meet the riots of 1967 and 1968, as well as to control civil disorders on campuses.

This would be a tall order for the best-trained units, let alone for a group of civilian soldiers. Unfortunately, the National Guard is far less well-trained to meet these situations than to act as combat support troops. This is because the National Guard Bureau considers its duty to meet emergency breakdowns in State law and order as secondary to its combat support role. Thus, both the 6 months of active duty and the summer camp are devoted entirely to the National Guard's primary mission of support of the regular Army in conventional combat situations.

At the moment, the National Guard undergoes relatively little training—as a unit—in simulated riot conditions. In 1967, for example, civil disturbance training was optional. After the 1967 riots, the Kerner Commission recommended increased and upgraded riot training for the Guard. The Pentagon responded by formulating requirements for 33 hours of civil disturbance training, but since 1968 they have required only 16 hours of "refresher training" and 8 additional hours for new recruits. Since the National Guard is instructed by the Continental Army commander to carry out this training between January and May, the National Guard cannot devote any of its prime training time—during the 2-week summer camp—to teaching the Guard how to cope with riots.

In addition, the arms carried by the Guard—rifles and bayonets—are arms of war and are poor and improper tools for dispersing demonstrators without inflicting serious harm. The actual use of the rifle in riot control operations is generally inappropriate. It is a lethal weapon with ammunition designed to kill at

great distances. Rifle bullets ricochet. They may kill or maim innocent people blocks away from the actual target. Far too often the Guard lacks adequate supplies of tear gas and for the most part, the National Guard lacks adequate protective clothing—such as plastic face masks, armored vests, and better helmets—and communications equipment.

In sum, the shortage of training and the lack of appropriate equipment leave the National Guard inadequately prepared to handle the most sensitive situation imaginable for an armed force face-to-face confrontation with their fellow countrymen. The times are changing and we must move with them. The threat to our republic from internal disruptions—as well as the threat to innocent persons during such disorders—is increasing and we must make sure that the National Guard is adequately prepared to meet these changing conditions. For if it fails to do the job, we will find ourselves with more serious disruptions and alienation of our own people and we will have to look elsewhere for a force capable of keeping the domestic peace.

To guarantee that the National Guard is prepared to meet the constantly changing domestic conditions, my bill would create the "Commission on the Capability of the National Guard to Control Civil Disturbances."

The commission members would be the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and three persons from the private sector who would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The legislation would also create the "States Advisory Council on Civil Disturbances," which would be composed of the National Guard adjutant generals and the chief law enforcement officials in each State, with the major objective of attaining coordinated State-National Guard plans in each State to more effectively cope with civil disorders.

The basic task of the commission would be to establish minimum training, doctrine, and equipment standards for the National Guard with respect to its use in civil disorders. The bill, however, does prescribe three specific standards. First, National Guardsmen would be required to devote at least 1 week of their 6-month active duty training solely to civil disturbance training. Second, each commissioned and noncommissioned officer would be required to participate in an officer training school patterned after the highly effective civil disturbance orientation course of the Army. And, third, no command to load and lock weapons may be issued before a National Guard unit is deployed at a disturbance unless there is immediate peril to life.

In addition, the commission would be required to perform annual inspection of all National Guard units to make sure that the standards are being implemented and adhered to; to perform comprehensive reviews and critiques of the operations of Guard units when used in civil disturbance control duty; and to

report at least annually to Congress its findings on the capability of the Guard to perform its civil disturbance functions.

Any National Guard unit which was not in conformity with the standards prescribed by the commission would not be entitled to Federal funds.

Mr. Speaker, Kent State was a national tragedy and we must take speedy measures to guarantee that similar incidents do not occur again. The Constitution provides that the "United States shall guarantee every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against—domestic violence." The Congress has assumed its responsibility in the past by providing for training and by paying 90 percent of the operating costs, virtually all the costs of the equipment and nearly half the cost of the physical installations and facilities of the Guard.

As the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, L. MENDEL RIVERS, pointed out 3 years ago:

If these State militia forces do not have adequate equipment and they have not been adequately trained, it is incumbent upon us, because we have assumed this responsibility, to provide the equipment and training.

The objective of my bill is to make sure that the National Guard is adequately trained and equipped to handle civil disturbances—that it is capable of performing the delicate and demanding task of preserving domestic peace.

Mr. Speaker, following is a list of those who have joined in introduction of this measure of utmost national importance:

DANIEL E. BUTTON, Republican, of New York.

HUGH L. CAREY, Democrat, of New York.

SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, Democrat, of New York.

JOHN C. CULVER, Democrat, of Iowa.

EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Democrat, of Connecticut.

DON EDWARDS, Democrat, of California.

MARVIN L. ESCH, Republican, of Michigan.

DANTE B. FASCELL, Democrat, of Florida.

DONALD M. FRASER, Democrat, of Minnesota.

JAMES G. FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon.

SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican, of New York.

RICHARD T. HANNA, Democrat, of California.

MICHAEL HARRINGTON, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

FLOYD V. HICKS, Democrat, of Washington.

JOSEPH E. KARTH, Democrat, of Minnesota.

EDWARD I. KOCH, Democrat, of New York.

ROBERT L. LEGGETT, Democrat, of California.

SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Democrat, of Hawaii.

ABNER J. MIKVA, Democrat, of Illinois.
JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California.

RICHARD L. OTTINGER, Democrat, of New York.

BERTRAM L. PODELL, Democrat, of New York.

TOM RAILSBACK, Republican, of Illinois.

THOMAS M. REES, Democrat, of California.

DONALD W. RIEGLE, Jr., Republican, of Michigan.

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat, of New York.

WILLIAM F. RYAN, Democrat, of New York.

FERNAND ST GERMAIN, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

CHARLES W. SANDMAN, Jr., Republican, of New Jersey.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT A BIG SUCCESS

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the central Utah project is the key to development of Utah's resources for the next 100 years. It provides for the beneficial use of most of Utah's remaining undeveloped share of the Colorado River.

It has been my privilege for many years to fight to get this project funded at a realistic, economic level. I was delighted, therefore, to read an article in the May 1970 issue of Reclamation Era indicating the favorable progress of this project, as well as the entire Colorado River storage project. The article follows:

PAYOFF SOARS IN BASIN PROJECT

The Colorado River Storage Project has achieved outstanding progress since it began operation in 1963.

Assets of the project had reached a total of \$837.2 million as of June 30, 1969. Gross revenues during fiscal 1969 amounted to \$21.9 million.

In view of these figures, the project's future production holds high promise for people in many fields of endeavor.

Large populations of seven States are directly or indirectly benefitted by the CRSP. The seven favorably affected are Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

This multipurpose project delivers electric power for homes and industries, and water for both metropolitan and farm uses. The construction includes facilities for extensive lake recreation, and enhancement of fish and wildlife.

Last year four powerplants at CRSP dams generated sufficient power during periods of heavy customer use to meet the equivalent full-day needs of more than 800,000 homes. Actual revenues from power sales in fiscal 1969 totaled a significant \$19.8 million—income from 4 billion kilowatt-hours of generation.

The powerplants are at four dams, Glen Canyon, Ariz.; Flaming Gorge, Utah; Blue Mesa, Colo.; and Fontenelle, Wyo.

Seventy-five percent of the power produced on the project took place at Glen Canyon

Dam where eight large turbines operate. This facility generated 3 billion kilowatt-hours.

Other power was from Flaming Gorge with 684 million kwh; Blue Mesa with 258 million kwh; and Montanella with 67 million kwh.

Arizona was the highest user of CRSP power at 37.7 percent. Utah used 26 percent. New Mexico used 13.6 percent. Colorado used 12.9 percent. Nevada used 4.5 percent. California used 3.3 percent, and Wyoming used 2 percent.

TWO NEW PLANTS

The population in this area is growing faster than the national average, so to help meet the demands for power, such facilities will increase during the next few years, and new plants to be added will include Morrow Point and Crystal Dam in Colorado, and 3 dams on the Central Utah Project.

About 74,000 acres of land are now being served with water from CRSP facilities, and crops from this land are valued at about \$5½ million for the year.

CRSP lakes, some of them attracting visitors from throughout the Nation, are used more each year for recreation. There were 3.4 million visits last year (1969). The increase was 5 percent over the year before at the 12 CRSP reservoirs, with the largest gains showing at Lake Powell behind Glen Canyon Dam, and Blue Mesa Reservoir.

At Lake Powell an access highway was completed in 1968 to the Bullfrog Basin recreation site. Bullfrog is located along the upper part of the reservoir and is about 100 miles closer to Salt Lake City, Utah, than the Wahweap site in Arizona. Basic recreation facilities are nearly completed at Bullfrog Basin.

RECREATION FACILITIES

Construction is continuing on basic recreation facilities at the Elk Creek and the Iola area at Blue Mesa Reservoir. Camping and Picnicking facilities were added along with a better access road and parking area.

Year 1969 was only the third full year of use at Blue Mesa, but with the added facilities about 134,000 more visitor days were recorded than in 1969.

Flaming Gorge Reservoir was again the most popular and heavily used recreation area of the CRSP. It sustained nearly 1.2 million visitor-days which is far above the early estimates made for the area at its present stage of development.

Fishing is reported good in all project reservoirs and it has been exceptional at Flaming Gorge and Navajo Reservoirs.

A successful fish stocking program has been carried on by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and by the various State fish and game agencies. Release of clear cold water from the reservoirs has also created an extraordinary stream fishery below most of the dams.

F & W ENLARGEMENT

Fish and wildlife programs will result in major new benefits in this region. Two fish hatcheries had been substantially completed with funds of the CRSP Act.

Jones Hole National Fish Hatchery is located below Flaming Gorge Dam. It is still under construction, but the administrative buildings, residences, and the hatchery facilities were in operation last year. The first rainbow trout eggs were received at the hatchery.

Hotchkiss National Fish Hatchery is located near Hotchkiss, Colo. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife approved this facility for operation.

A National Wildlife Refuge and three waterfowl management areas are being developed in connection with the Colorado River Storage Project.

Development of the Seedskadee National Wildlife Refuge has begun along the Green River below Fontenelle Reservoir and will continue over the next several years. A land

acquisition program is underway in this area to purchase some 7,400 acres to be used in conjunction with other publicly owned land.

WATERFOWL MANAGEMENT

Browns Park Waterfowl Management Area is located below Flaming Gorge Reservoir in Utah. A residence, shop, and bunkhouse have recently been completed. About 30 acres of land have been planted to millet, strawberry clover, and winter wheat to provide feed for the migrant and permanent bird populations.

This Browns Park area has been stocked with some geese, ducks, and pheasants to increase local populations of these birds.

Miller Mesa Waterfowl Area on the west shore of Navajo Reservoir just south of the Colorado-New Mexico border is about complete. A small reservoir and dikes are completed and full. About 170 acres of agricultural land have been planted to barley, oats, wheat, and alfalfa.

Some work began during fiscal 1970, with nonreimbursable funds obtained through the CRSP Act, on Desert Lake Waterfowl Management Area. It is located in eastern Utah near Huntington North Reservoir. Purchase of about 280 acres of land is planned in addition to that already being developed by the Utah Division of Fish and Game. Preliminary plans are in final form for the development of this area.

Joint fishery investigations for Lake Powell have continued by the Arizona and Utah fish and game departments, and at Flaming Gorge Reservoir by the Utah and Wyoming departments.

The 6-year studies of these organizations are being extended beyond the original completion date. Due to the continuing needs of fishery management and the desirability of an efficient transition of the anticipated workload, a 3-year extension has been proposed during which the States are to assume a progressively increased share of the pertinent costs.

TO SUSTAIN QUALITY

Objective of the organizations is to obtain the basic management data needed to sustain the outstanding fishing quality already developed at these reservoirs.

A contract was awarded for the third segment of the 6-year game and fish study at the Curecanti Unit complex of Blue Mesa, Morrow Point, and Crystal Reservoirs. This work is being conducted by the Colorado Division of Game, Fish, and Parks.

A modified contract was awarded for two fishing lakes (Dome Lakes) on Archuleta Creek to adjust to an anticipated increase in construction costs.

Five new multipurpose water projects were authorized by the Colorado River Basin Act that was signed by the President in September 1968. These projects, all in western Colorado, are the Animas-La Plata, Dolores, San Miguel, West Divide, and Dallas Creek Projects.

The act specifies that those projects must be constructed concurrently with the Central Arizona Project, also authorized by the act.

On the phases of the CRSP still under construction, work is continuing on the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project, the Bostwick Park Project and Morrow Point Powerplant in Colorado, the Lyman Project, in Wyoming, and the Navajo Indian Irrigation and San Juan-Chama Projects in New Mexico.

The Bureau of Reclamation expects that the reimbursable Federal investment in the CRSP will be repaid to the Treasury well within the allotted time span.

It is a huge program, and it holds promise of fabulous benefits which are known to be possible by the results of other Reclamation developments, and by the successful results of the CRSP's own 7 years of operation.

A STUDENT POLL REFLECTS MAJORITY SENTIMENT AGAINST AMERICAN TROOP ENTRANCE INTO CAMBODIA AND IN FAVOR OF IMMEDIATE WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, there is no problem or issue of greater interest and concern to the Congress and the country than the prompt resolution of the Vietnam war, and I am pleased to include, at this point, the announced result of the recent poll that was taken by Clark University and Holy Cross students, under the supervision of Prof. Roger E. Kasperson and assistant professor, Richard Peet, of the Graduate School of Geography, at Clark University, in the city of Worcester, Mass. The announcement follows:

THE SILENT MAJORITY SPEAKS

What does the silent majority think about the war in Southeast Asia? A poll taken in Worcester, Massachusetts, suggests that the majority are against President Nixon's decision to send American troops in Cambodia. Most also favor immediate withdrawal from Vietnam.

As part of the activities sparked by Nixon's Cambodia decision, two Clark University professors, 75 students from Clark and Holy Cross, and several city residents undertook a telephone poll of 3,000 people in Worcester and suburban towns. According to Dr. Richard Peet, Assistant Professor of Geography, people were selected from the Worcester telephone directory. Of the 3,000 contacted, only 600 refused to give their opinion.

Of those who gave their opinion, the results are as follows:

Question 1: Are you in favor or against President Nixon's decision to send American troops into Cambodia?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| In favor (23.9 percent)----- | 584 |
| Against (51.3 percent)----- | 1,250 |
| Undecided (24.8 percent)----- | 604 |

Question 2: Are you in favor or against the immediate withdrawal of all American troops from Vietnam?

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| In favor (56.4 percent)----- | 1,361 |
| Against (23.9 percent)----- | 577 |
| Undecided (19.7 percent)----- | 475 |

Of these who were against immediate withdrawal (defined as within six months), many people said American troops should be brought home as soon as possible. Many respondents wrote down the names and addresses of Massachusetts Senators and Worcester Congressmen so that they could write letters of protest.

According to student pollsters, the most common reasons given for continued support of the war were a belief that one should stand behind the President even if he were wrong or that the President possessed more information and his decision should be trusted. One comment was "we can only trust Nixon and God." The domino theory was also invoked commonly by respondents. Even among those supporting the President, however, many indicated that the extension of the war into Cambodia was his last chance to end the conflict.

The procedure for the sample was the selection of every 10th name from the telephone listings of Worcester and suburban

towns. According to Dr. Roger Kasperson, Associate Professor of Government and Geography, refusals to participate occurred for a number of reasons, indifference being the most common factor. The magnitude of the numbers contacted and the margin of the results provide confidence in the general character of the poll. Particularly striking, according to the Clark Professors, was the consistency of results from different pollsters and for different Worcester area communities. The poll was actually conducted in two segments, one at Clark and one at Holy Cross. The results were nearly identical.

There are a large number of people who do not hold with student protest, who do not write to their Congressmen and yet oppose the Vietnam War. The silent majority may be silent, but it is wrong to assume that they automatically support the war. The poll suggests a surprising amount of anti-war sentiment in Worcester.

LIMITATION ON FARM SUBSIDIES

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, at a time when this Congress is being attacked for not living up to its responsibilities, at a time when the administration and the Congress are seeking ways to eliminate waste and save money, at a time when many vital programs in health, education, and housing are being curtailed because of lack of funds, it is incredible and disgraceful that we continue to line the pockets of a few wealthy farmers with millions of tax dollars so desperately needed elsewhere.

The facts presented year after year by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), and others make it obvious that the farm subsidy program has been an outrageous, inequitable, costly failure. Year after year we have been told that this wasteful program has helped the poor, marginal farmer. In the meantime the marginal farmer has long since left the farm. Year after year we have been promised that a new, more equitable program is "in the works." In the meantime billions of dollars have been wasted. Yet, every time we ask for action we are told to be patient.

I have lost my patience, Mr. Speaker, and so have many of my colleagues. What is worse, the American people have lost their confidence in a government which is willing to perpetuate this fraud at their expense. How can we explain to the overburdened taxpayer that we can afford to give away millions of dollars? How can we explain to the consumer that we must subsidize wealthy farmers while food prices skyrocket? How can we explain to the Nation's hungry that we cannot afford food programs but can afford to pay wealthy farmers for not planting crops?

We cannot explain it, Mr. Speaker, and every Member of this House knows we cannot. The time for patience is over. The time for specious reasoning and delaying tactics is gone. The time has come

for this House to limit farm subsidy payments and to stand behind its action when this measure goes to conference. If we are to show courage, if we are to live up to our responsibilities as representatives of all the people, we can do no less.

I have fought consistently in this Chamber for an end to waste in the Pentagon. I have fought for an end to the misuse of funds in antipoverty programs. I must apply the same standards to our farm program.

WILLIAM C. SULLIVAN NAMED ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF FBI

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of Members to the appointment of William C. Sullivan as Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

From the biographical sketch of Mr. Sullivan which I shall include for the RECORD, it can easily be seen that this appointment is an excellent one and one for which he is eminently qualified.

It is indeed gratifying to see this position go to such a dedicated public servant and I compliment FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover on his choice.

Mr. Sullivan will succeed Cartha D. DeLoach who, as many Members know, has served long and faithfully in this demanding post.

I was sorry to learn of his decision to retire from the FBI but I know that I join his many friends in and out of the Bureau in wishing for him every success in his endeavors in the years to come.

I include, for insertion in the RECORD, at this point the biographical material on Mr. Sullivan:

WILLIAM C. SULLIVAN, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. Sullivan is a native of Bolton, Massachusetts, where he was born on May 25, 1912. After receiving his early education in the public schools, he did undergraduate work at American University in Washington, D.C. He subsequently did graduate work at Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts; State Teachers College, Fitchburg, Massachusetts; Boston College, Newton, Massachusetts; and George Washington University, Washington, D.C. He holds the Bachelor of Arts and Master of Education degrees.

Mr. Sullivan entered on duty with the FBI as a Special Agent on August 4, 1941, and has served in all sections of the United States, as well as outside the country during World War II on confidential assignment.

In July, 1954, Mr. Sullivan was designated as Inspector. In June, 1960, he became Chief Inspector of the FBI, and in June, 1961, he was named as an Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in charge of the Domestic Intelligence Division.

Mr. Sullivan has served as Guest Lecturer at the Army War College, Command and General Staff College, Naval War College, U.S. Military Academy, U.S. Air Force Academy, U.S. Naval Academy, various intelligence conferences and schools of the armed services, Department of State and other governmental agencies, and numerous colleges and universities throughout the Nation such

as Princeton University, Harvard University, Yale University, Southern Methodist University, Notre Dame University, William and Mary College, University of Oregon, University of Georgia, University of Colorado, Ohio University, and the University of California.

He is a Research Associate of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford University. In 1965, he received the Alumni Recognition Award from American University for a distinguished professional career in Government. In 1967, there was conferred upon Mr. Sullivan the degree of Doctor of Laws from American University.

Mr. Sullivan is married and has three children.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the issues raised by this Nation's involvement in Southeast Asia are many and complex. It is difficult to answer constituent inquiries on specific aspects of that involvement without either oversimplifying or expressing in detail the many ramifications of each aspect of that involvement. Having decided that I would prefer to err on the side of too much rather than too little explanation, I have prepared a comprehensive statement of my position which I am providing my constituents who contact me concerning this issue. Thinking my colleagues and others would be interested therein, I am incorporating the same in these remarks:

STATEMENT RELATIVE TO SOUTHEAST ASIA

Any statement of position with respect to this nation's present involvement in Southeast Asia must briefly take into account the facts of the past as the author of the position paper views them.

When I came to the Congress in January of 1967, this nation was embarked upon a course of action of gradual escalation of the war in Vietnam which continued, during the early part of the last two years of the Johnson Administration. During my first two years in the Congress and for several years previously, the Congress and the people had been promised a cooling off of that conflict only to see it grow hotter. The "light at the end of the tunnel" was always just a week, a month, or a year away; yet it seemed to grow dimmer rather than brighter.

Reasonably loyal to the Johnson policy at first, my patience began to grow thin toward the end of that Administration. At that time, I advised my constituents who expressed to me their concern about Vietnam and our involvement that I could not continue to support a similar policy by the new Nixon Administration if tangible evidence of our disengagement and assumption by the South Vietnamese of their own defense were not forthcoming.

The first few months following the inauguration of President Nixon, I urged my constituents to give the Nixon Administration an opportunity to formulate its policy with respect to Vietnam before condemning it for lack of progress. When President Nixon announced his plan for an orderly and responsible withdrawal of troops toward ultimate disengagement from Vietnam, I urged support of the Administration because such action constituted the first real evidence of a disengagement by this nation from its involvement in Vietnam. Many ex-

pressed the view that the President's plan for disengagement was not aggressive enough and, frankly, at times I shared that view.

However on April 15 of this year, when the President announced that 115,000 troops instead of the 110,000 he had promised, had been withdrawn from Vietnam, I felt somewhat relieved. Because I felt the disengagement and withdrawal of troops were proceeding at a fast enough rate? No, I felt relieved because it was the first time in too many years that a President and an Administration had promised something with respect to Vietnam and had kept their promise; yes, even produced more than they promised. For the first time in these many years that we have been involved in Vietnam, my predisposition toward disbelief became a predisposition to believe, and I extended to the President a presumption of good faith.

At this point it would be most appropriate for me to recite some figures which compare the progress made by the Nixon Administration with that of the prior Administration with respect to military spending in general and Vietnam involvement in particular, as follows:

| <i>Defense budget expenditures</i> | |
|------------------------------------|----------------|
| | <i>Billion</i> |
| 1967 | 68.3 |
| 1968 | 78.0 |
| 1969 | 78.7 |
| 1970 | 77.0 |
| 1971 | 71.8 |
| <i>Draft calls</i> | |
| 1967 | 288,900 |
| 1968 | 343,300 |
| 1969 | 266,900 |
| 1970 | 209,500 |
| <i>Troop ceilings</i> | |
| 1967 | 525,000 |
| 1968 | 549,500 |
| Jan. 1969 | 549,500 |
| April 15, 1970 | 434,000 |

April 20 speech, calling for 150,000 reduction thus a ceiling of 284,000 one year from now.

But why all this discussion about troop withdrawal and disengagement from a conflict, our involvement in which was volunteered? Frankly, I believe the implementation of the decision, if not the decision itself, to become involved as we have in Vietnam was an exercise in bad judgment. Although I reject the condemnation that our involvement was immoral and illegal, I doubt seriously that it was in our nation's own best interest. But, like the Good Samaritan or the person who volunteers aid, a responsibility could and did attach that was nonexistent before we volunteered our services in that conflict.

At this point in time, it is my position that it should be made abundantly clear to the South Vietnamese that we are on an unrelenting course toward removal of all of our combat forces from Vietnam and assumption by the South Vietnamese of the total responsibility for their own defense; jeopardizing as little as possible their growing ability to defend themselves as we withdraw forces.

I concur with those of my constituents who have urged that the defense of South Vietnam by a responsibility of the South Vietnamese. And, I concur with my constituents who have urged the earliest possible disengagement of our military forces from that conflict.

I have concluded the action taken and announced by the President on April 30th of this year is consistent with and facilitates, even expedites, these two aims.

Some may argue with the facts and assumptions I have accepted and made in arriving at this conclusion, but let me recite my analysis.

The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong for several years have been using the Cambodian territory adjacent to the South Vietnamese border for staging areas, supply depots, communications facilities, and even artillery, mortar, and rocket firing stations knowing that the political ramifications of the Cambodian border provided almost total security to their activities on the Cambodian side of that border. For the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, it was a very convenient arrangement. They could kill American and South Vietnamese forces, kill and maim South Vietnamese citizens, and generally harass any efforts towards stability in South Vietnam through their shelling of the hamlets and their forays into South Vietnam from their protected areas in Cambodia.

Prince Sihanouk, while he ruled Cambodia, found the accommodation which he had reached with the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, in effect authorizing their occupation of the Cambodian territory bordering on South Vietnam, to be mutually beneficial. The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong did not bother him and his government and he, in turn, made no effort to expel the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong from the significant portion of the Cambodian territory they had invaded and occupied.

Another factor of importance was the increasing ability of the South Vietnamese to resist attacks and to take the offensive within their own country despite the fact that American forces were being withdrawn. This caused the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong to rely more and more on their sanctuaries and refuges in Cambodia. Anticipating the monsoon season, the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong during the past several months had accelerated their efforts to stock and supply their many facilities in Cambodia along the South Vietnamese border. They knew that it was essential for them to accumulate enough ammunition, food, weapons, and other materiel to supply their forces for the five or six months of the monsoon season, since it would be next to impossible to effect any significant movement of goods, supplies, or materials while the monsoon season prevailed.

But while the foregoing conditions continued, one change occurred. Prince Sihanouk was overthrown by a regime not necessarily more favorable to the United States and the West generally, but at least more antagonistic toward the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong. I think this was one of the most important factors behind the President's decision to authorize action within the territorial confines of Cambodia.

It is a recognized principle of international law that a neutral country has the duty to prevent its territory from being used by any party to a conflict as a military base or in any other way for the conduct of military operations. Where the neutral is clearly not in a position to prevent the use of its territory in an attack on a belligerent, a belligerent may in the exercise of its right of self defense take action on the neutral's territory. In other words, to the extent a neutral country, or a country which espouses neutrality, permits its territory to be used in connection with military operations, it loses its character of neutrality. Likewise, to the extent neutral territory is used by one or both of the combatants, the territory so used in military operations can be considered to be within the premises of the conflict.

The foregoing recitation of the impact of international law and international understanding did not change between the time that Prince Sihanouk ruled Cambodia and the time the Lon Nol government took over; but the international political ramifications of that change in government were significant. When Sihanouk was deposed by a unanimous vote of the Cambodian National Assembly and the Council of the Kingdom at a plenary session, he was stripped of his ability to speak for the Cambodian government

in opposition to the "aggressive attacks upon his country" by the American and South Vietnamese forces while denying any conscious knowledge of use of Cambodian territory by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong.

Recognition by this nation of International law and its application to our incursion into Cambodia for the limited purpose I have described is confirmed by the fact that formal notification of our action was given the United Nations Security Council on May 4, in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The situation was further described to Secretary General U Thant by Ambassador Yost the same day.

Any President, faced with the foregoing facts and having as his primary interest America's disengagement from the war in Vietnam and assumption by the South Vietnamese of the total responsibility for their own defense would have taken the action that was taken by President Nixon; but, twice as much time should have been spent on the explanation to the American people for I believe President Nixon's original announcement fell far short of the rationale I think the American people expected and deserved.

But, so much for the background and the several factors which resulted in the President's decision. Many patriotic constituents are less than convinced about the wisdom of the President's decision to send American troops into Cambodia. Most of my inquiries and mail which either unreservedly criticize the action or seriously question its wisdom, do so in the context of widely differing considerations. Let me deal with them one at a time.

OBJECTION

Most of my mail and other contacts criticizing the President's action, vehemently contend the Cambodian incursion constitutes an escalation of the war in Vietnam and is contrary to the promise the President made only a few days before when he assured the American people in a nationwide television broadcast that he was pursuing a course of action to scale down our involvement and confirmed this policy statement by an announcement that he would withdraw an additional 150,000 troops by next Spring.

RESPONSE

The President's authorization of the Cambodian action did not constitute a breach of promise but rather, for the reasons I have stated, such action was necessary to counteract activities carried on by the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong which would have posed a serious threat to the relentless pursuit of withdrawal of troops which the President had announced. The decision to contest the immunity of the Cambodian sanctuaries which were very much a part of the "war" insofar as the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong were concerned, cannot be fairly considered a decision to escalate the war, when the attack upon such sanctuaries is limited to an attempt to neutralize their effectiveness as strongholds for the enemy's commitment to a continuation of the war.

OBJECTION

The President violated international law and our own Constitution by sending American troops into Cambodia.

RESPONSE

For the reasons I have already stated, international law has not been violated and, frankly, I have seen very little real evidence that even our enemies seriously contend that such is the case. Almost as clearly, under Prince Sihanouk, the North Vietnamese and the North Viet Cong invaded Cambodia and brought the border lands into the premises of the conflict by their own activities and therefore not our action but theirs made this Cambodian territory a part of the conflict in Vietnam; a conflict, authority for the conduct of which was clearly granted to

the President by the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. For reasons which I will subsequently state, I do not believe any court would determine that under the international and domestic law applicable, the President's action constituted an illegal act or an unconstitutional usurpation of power.

OBJECTION

The Cambodian action is a further manifestation of this nation's bent toward violence and is for that reason immoral, inhuman and wrong.

RESPONSE

It is difficult for me to understand how destruction of bunkers, firing sites, mortars, rocket launchers, land mines, weapons and ammunition can be construed as contributing to the causing of more deaths, more violence or more casualties.

To date, the following is the record of the Cambodian action in terms of items of violence and death which have been denied to those who otherwise would have used them against our American and South Vietnamese forces and civilians alike:

Captured or destroyed military equipment and supplies

| | |
|--|------------|
| Rocket rounds----- | 39,500 |
| Mortar rounds----- | 60,242 |
| Individual weapons----- | 16,101 |
| Crew-served weapons----- | 2,269 |
| Small arms ammunition (rounds)----- | 12,500,000 |
| Land mines----- | 5,150 |
| Bunkers (destroyed)----- | 9,358 |
| Vehicles----- | 388 |

The foregoing figures are relatively meaningless unless they are related to what they mean in military activity. For example, the 99,742 rocket and mortar rounds captured would be enough to conduct approximately 15,340 attacks upon allied bases, hamlets, and cities at the level of firing which has occurred recently in South Vietnam; the weapons captured are more than enough to equip 53 battalions with individual weapons and 23 battalions with crew served weapons; and, the small arms ammunition captured is in excess of that seized by both American and South Vietnamese forces during any previous 16 month period.

Again, can anyone, who truly abhors violence, criticize an action which effectively quiets these weapons of destruction and death?

In addition to the foregoing objections, many of my constituents have criticized the Administration for usurping the Constitutional authority of Congress to declare war and have advocated a restricting of the use of military appropriations as a means of controlling, even prohibiting, activities in Southeast Asia.

But, did the Cambodian action change anything from a Constitutional standpoint? I think not. The broad authority conferred upon the President by the Gulf of Tonkin resolution continues unrestricted. It has been the judgment of the Executive and Legislative Branches to date that a declaration of war was inadvisable. Since the Cambodian action is confined to the same enemies, namely, the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong, no new enemy or circumstance prompts a declaration of war; surely, it would not be suggested we declare war against Cambodia.

It is also contended that in the absence of, or as an alternative to, a declaration of war, Congress deny to the President the funds necessary to conduct military operations except as specifically authorized by the Congress.

Because I completely concur with those who think we should not become embroiled in the internal affairs of another Southeast Asian country, I supported the so-called Findley Amendment which would have prohibited the use of funds for military opera-

tions in Cambodia, Laos and Thailand except to the extent such operations were essential for the protection of U.S. troops in South Vietnam. Strangely enough, many of my more out-spoken antiwar friends in the House opposed the amendment and as a consequence even this attempt to exert Congressional authority was defeated.

But let me express myself more generally on these issues.

First, I have said, and do not now back away from the statement, that I believe the concept of a "declaration of war" as the fathers of our Constitution viewed it is no longer the same. The nuclear age and the assumption by this nation of its role as the world's leading power make very remote a set of circumstances which would prompt a declaration of war yet permit Congressional deliberation of that issue *before* any military action or commitment occurred.

I doubt very much that this nation will again declare war against anyone except in the event of a global confrontation which probably would entail the use of nuclear weapons. Even in this eventuality, military response would have to precede military authorization by Congress.

Rather, our future military involvements will probably be in the nature of our present one and the Korean conflict—in neither of which was war declared. I do not support any further unilateral engagements by this country in the affairs of others but the possibility of United Nations sponsored actions remains, and such participation has been assumed to prompt, and should necessitate a Congressional authorization rather than a declaration of war.

Finally, Congressional action to restrict the use of military appropriations as a means of effecting policy must be all inclusive or it will be ineffectual. And, if all inclusive it could seriously jeopardize the meeting of minor crises by the President in a timely and dispositive manner.

Although the Church-Cooper and more especially the McGovern-Hatfield ("To End The War in Southeast Asia") amendments purport to prohibit the use of our military assistance without specific authorization of the Congress or a Declaration of War, their application is limited to Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. Admittedly, Southeast Asia is the focal point of present dissatisfaction with Administration policy, but the other areas of the world to which such restrictions would have equally meaningful application are too numerous to necessitate naming. And, no one has proposed a functional limitation, as distinguished from this geographical limitation, which would clearly constitute an exercise by the Congress of its prerogative to control military involvement by this country.

In conclusion, many argue that the "invasion" of Cambodia has resulted in too high a price being paid at home. It can be argued in return that this is a specious argument for if all agreed, as it is alleged they should, with the President's action its projected success would result in greater unity rather than greater division.

Frankly, this claim of those who oppose the President's action I find to be the most valid. But, this objection to our involvement in Cambodia has nothing to do with the relative merits of the action itself, rather, this criticism is appropriately leveled at the intelligence and industry exercised by those who had an obligation to assure the American citizenry that the Cambodian action was not an escalation of the war; was not an illegal "invasion" of a neutral country; was not a foolish step toward further involvement in the internal affairs of another country in Indo China—but, rather, the action was tactically necessary as we relentlessly pursue our plan of disengagement. And, my support thereof is so founded and limited.

In the course of listening to the President's

television announcement of the Cambodian action on April 30, I became disturbed as he emphasized the significance of the action in terms of our ego, our pride, or to the contrary and most regrettably our humiliation. We are too successful a nation, regardless of the test applied, to let our vanity show. I believe there would have been less intense reaction at home had the initial announcement been more an appeal to reason and had developed the rationale the President subsequently explained.

If there is one axiom which will always be true in our democratic system of government that axiom has to be that no decision of the government or a President is any better than is its acceptability to those who are governed. Many in high places give lip service to the "sovereign will of the people", pointing out that the "people" in a democracy are both the ruler and the ruled, yet when it is inconvenient to do so, the sovereignty of the will of the people is ignored.

I anticipate the Cambodian action, despite all of its ramifications, will ultimately be viewed in retrospect as a wise move toward our disengagement from Vietnam. I am not so sure of the ultimate effect that action will have had on the domestic scene. But of this I am sure, America, that "wonderful experiment" in self-government, can only win when democracy wins. And, this battle will not be won or lost in Vietnam or in the Middle East. This nation will be as victorious in its maturity as it has been since the days of its infancy only when we, by example and by political and academic suasion, convince a continually increasing number of the peoples of the world that democracy works and the success of the "experiment" has been verified.

REPORT TO 41ST DISTRICT

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am sending one of my periodic reports to my constituents, as follows:

REPORT TO 41ST DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS TO RISE, COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES VOTED

Another 5% increase in Social Security benefits has been voted by the House to be effective next Jan. 1. This is in addition to the 15% increase approved last December and on which payments were begun in April, retroactive to last Jan. 1.

The House also approved an automatic system for raising Social Security benefits to help keep abreast of the changes in cost of living. I sponsored legislation similar to this provision, but its fate in Congress remains to be seen when the bill is considered by the Senate. I hope the plan will win approval.

As approved by the House, the first cost-of-living increase can come in January 1973, providing the cost-of-living index has increased 3% or more. Properly, the bill also provides for a related adjustment in the wage base on which Social Security taxes are paid, thus providing the income for the increase in benefits.

The bill also includes a variety of proposed changes in the Medicare and Medicaid programs, aimed mainly at curbing costs.

ARMY ENGINEERS MOVE TEAM

Curtailment of spending by the Defense Dept. on domestic activities hit the Buffalo District Office of the Army Corps of Engineers when a 36-man design team was moved to Chicago. I arranged for a Buffalo delegation to meet with top Corps' officials who

claimed a reduction in workload prompted the transfer.

The argument doesn't seem to make sense at a time when the Corps has a big chore ahead in dealing with pollution of Lake Erie.

Shown at the meeting, from left, are: Brig. Gen. Watkin, Division Chief, and Maj. Gen. Dunn, Chief of Corps' Civil Works.

INSPECTING POLLUTION CONTROLS

Inspecting controls on air, water pollution at Bethlehem Steel's Lackawanna plant in company with United Steel Workers officials. The company outlined its five-year plan to spend 11% of its capital outlay on controls. Bottle I'm holding contains treated water which is cleaner than water taken from the lake.

VA NURSE SHORTAGE CRITICAL

A severe shortage of nurses in our veterans hospitals is curtailing medical care for our veterans and is imposing a heavy burden on our valuable staff personnel.

I learned first hand of conditions at the Buffalo VA Hospital during a recent visit and meeting with many of the nurses. They told me of their constant on-call status and overtime demands without extra pay or proper rest.

Mrs. Irene Schwartz, RN, chairman of the nurses group, outlined the problems. Several weeks later I arranged for Mrs. Schwartz to tell her story to the House Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs of which I am a member. In the absence of Chairman Haley, I presided.

Our Subcommittee is consulting with the VA in preparation for taking legislative action, unless the VA initiates its own changes.

POSTAL REFORM IS TOP PRIORITY, DULSKI BILLS MAKE PROGRESS

Reform of our nation's postal system has had top priority on the agenda of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I am Chairman, since the 91st Congress convened in January 1969.

Our Committee has reported two postal reform bills to the House and I expect debate to be arranged in early June by the leadership of the House.

I introduced H.R. 4 on opening day of Congress last year. It was the most comprehensive postal reform plan ever offered Congress.

Details of the bill have undergone continuous debate over the past 16 months. Postal workers became frustrated at the delay, staging walkouts that led to a confrontation between the department and union leaders.

The resultant agreement included a revised reform plan, as well as a pay raise, which I immediately sponsored and launched new hearings. That bill, H.R. 17070, now has been sent to the House floor by our Committee with certain changes.

No subject has been more thoroughly debated and all parties allowed to be heard.

Reform of the postal system is urgent. We must give the officials more flexibility to do their job, both in finances and contracting. Both my bills do this. Our Committee has worked its will. The House is next.

COMPLAINTS POUR IN ON SMUT MAIL

Hardly a day goes by that I do not receive a letter complaining about receipt through the mails of material which is considered to be obscene.

These complaints particularly originate from parents and from those in homes where there are minor children. They feel the law should prohibit such mailings.

A prime control problem is in defining what is considered to be obscene. A bill I sponsored last year spells out this definition in very clear terms.

My bill deals with both these problems—banning mailings to homes where minors reside and defining obscenity.

My Committee on Post Office and Civil Service improved the details of my bill and then it was passed by the House. It is now pending before the Senate committee.

Not only does my bill protect homes where minors reside, but it also affords all citizens the opportunity to prevent unsolicited mailings to them of sexually-oriented ads.

This legislation is designed to attack the source of smut distribution—the dealers who are interested only in turning a profit—and it's a healthy one. If they violate the provisions of my bill, once enacted, they could be convicted of a crime and become subject to fines and/or prison terms.

The fight against smut is an endless one—one which I have waged throughout my years in Congress. You patch one loophole and another crops up. But the fight must continue.

Even though my bill is only part way along the legislative process, there are questions being raised by opponents on its constitutionality. This is a decision for the courts, but I am confident my bill will be upheld.

DRUG LEGISLATION

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, there are several issues involved in drug legislation now pending before the Congress. Of primary importance is the direction and motivation of S. 3246 and its enforcement.

To punish users and peddlers—who many times are users who must peddle to have access—solely, ignores the reasons for drug use, whether that be marijuana or heroin.

There is much reason to suspect that a major part of heroin use involves larger social questions found in ghetto and prison life. For instance, when New York City broke up the teenage gangs in the 1950's the heroin traffic dramatically increased, apparently because while the kids could take the life of a ghetto within the framework of a social structure—the gang life—facing it alone was too hard without drugs.

If the major reasons for heroin traffic are tied to ghetto and prison life, then tougher enforcement will probably have more effect on drug prices, and consequently the desperation of the user, than upon the volume of drugs or the amount of real prevention.

The marijuana question also has implications larger than the narrow legal problems. Quite simply, if enough people of whatever age continue to use marijuana and if competent scientific research continues to fail to show any physical or social effect of marijuana more dangerous than alcohol, then strict enforcement will probably lead to a situation similar to prohibition, with all the attendant benefits going to organized crime in the country.

The present legislation, while it recog-

nizes the problems involved in a first offense of marijuana and gives such first offenders a light sentence, avoids the central question by making marijuana peddlers and second offenders subject to sentencing much like the present legislation.

While there is a provision for study of the drug, it is to be conducted by the Department of Justice rather than by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and will therefore probably lead to enforcement-oriented conclusions rather than medical and social conclusions. This legislation also ignores the need for medical treatment and research for the use of hard drugs and concentrates instead mostly upon enforcement.

In essence, this legislation, even leaving aside the "no-knock" question, has little chance of dealing with the real problems involved in drug abuse. In practice, there is little reason to assume that this legislation will have either a deterrent effect or that it will, through the "no-knock" provision, be more enforceable.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend that we should treat marijuana in a category separate from the other hard drugs, and launch a comprehensive and unbiased research campaign regarding its medical and social effects, and legislate from that basis.

Regarding the other hard drugs we should also engage in research on the causes of this addiction, and upon curing this addiction. We must insure that the problem is handled as a social and medical as well as a criminal problem.

THE WIND MAY HAVE CHANGED

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Paul C. Johnson, retired editor and editorial director of Prairie Farmer magazine, is known throughout the Midwestern States for his profound statements and writings regarding agriculture. When he retired last December, the Illinois Agriculture Association honored him for his work and presented him a plaque which said, in part:

Paul Johnson's life and work have earned him the title of agricultural statesman. As Editor and Editorial Director for Prairie Farmer Magazine for the past 22 years, his judgment and opinion have demonstrated his progressive thinking and have served to stimulate farm opinion in a wide range of important areas.

Even though Paul Johnson is retired, he continues to write for Prairie Farmer magazine and his most recent "Viewpoint" column certainly does an excellent job of analyzing America today. I call your attention to this fine statement and include it here as part my remarks:

THE WIND MAY HAVE CHANGED

Out of the confusion and frustration of topsy-turvy America may come something good which we have been in need of for some time. It is described by a relatively new word which is turning up more often in more places. That word is *lifestyle*.

They are talking, of course, about a simpler way of living. When the change comes we will have to thank restless and unhappy young people to a large extent, altho I am sure their elders have been getting fed up too by the endless ratrace to acquire more things that cost more.

It is ironic that it should be the young people who have never known depression, except as it nibbles constantly at the fringes of our society, who should be telling us that our lifestyle has gotten way out of hand. Those of us who have lived in both the style of depression and the style of affluence should have realized that we were really just as happy when we had much less.

We have worked much too hard to acquire more worldly goods and bigger establishments. We may also have placed too great stress on getting the kids educated all the way up. Our idea that education would solve all things has been pretty well proved wrong.

After much costly effort we end up with too many Ph.D.s and not enough mechanics, plus a lot of unhappy young people in colleges and universities who really don't belong there.

Changing lifestyles is not easy, but I hope fervently that we can do it gradually and sensibly without burning the whole thing down as some revolutionaries are advocating. As always the middle road is the best one if we can only muster enough sense to travel it.

We will need to cultivate a new respect for people with simple tastes. Grinding poverty must go, but so also must the mistaken notion that we can solve all a man's troubles by increasing his income. Poor people suffer more from lack of respect and dignity than from lack of food.

We need to learn to respect God's creation. It ought to be rediscovered, enjoyed, preserved, and marveled at; not used up and thrown away as we seem to be doing now.

We need to reverse the forces that are tearing apart the family. These are the cause of a great deal of our unhappiness. Absence of a satisfying family life is one of the things that drives both parents and children to dangerous extremes.

We need to rediscover our neighbors and restore the intimate community life that gave much satisfaction and security in generations past without making great demands on our capacity to earn.

Our present lifestyle places too much stress on high income and high mobility. We tear ourselves out by the roots and never earn enough to satisfy our craving for the things the hucksters are pushing at us. We ought to listen to the kids and then apply ourselves to making a change.

RESULTS OF OPINION POLL

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I insert the results of an opinion ballot which I recently sent to the people of the 11th District of Indiana.

The respondents to the opinion ballot indicated their desire to see the following percentages of the Federal operating budget devoted to the respective functions. The figures in parentheses indicate those percentages requested by President Nixon.

| | Percent |
|-------------------------------|---------|
| Crime (0.6)----- | 7.18 |
| Education (3.2)----- | 10.34 |
| Farm subsidies (2.9)----- | 1.67 |
| Foreign aid (1.1)----- | 1.75 |
| Health (3.9)----- | 8.01 |
| War (64.9)----- | 33.92 |
| Pollution control (0.6)----- | 9.98 |
| Preschool training (0.2)----- | 2.47 |
| Space (2.2)----- | 3.05 |
| Welfare (3.5)----- | 5.15 |

Should we have a direct presidential election in 1972?

| | Percent |
|-----------|---------|
| Yes ----- | 67.0 |
| No ----- | 33.0 |

Should we have a direct national presidential primary in 1972?

| | Percent |
|-----------|---------|
| Yes ----- | 67.6 |
| No ----- | 32.4 |

Is the administration making available sufficient information about our Laos and Cambodia military involvement?

| | Percent |
|-----------|---------|
| Yes ----- | 36.7 |
| No ----- | 63.3 |

The respondents to the opinion ballot indicated their desire to see the financial burden of public education borne in the following manner. The figures in parentheses indicate the present distribution of the financial burden of public education in Indiana, as a percentage.

| | Percent |
|-------------------------------|---------|
| Property tax (61.0)----- | 37.34 |
| State assistance (34.9)----- | 46.04 |
| Federal assistance (4.1)----- | 16.62 |

Are high interest rates a partial cause of inflation?

| | Percent |
|-----------|---------|
| Yes ----- | 63.6 |
| No ----- | 36.4 |

Would you favor creation of separate courts to give priority scheduling to violent criminal cases?

| | Percent |
|-----------|---------|
| Yes ----- | 72.7 |
| No ----- | 27.3 |

Should the congressional seniority system be abolished?

| | Percent |
|-----------|---------|
| Yes ----- | 59.8 |
| No ----- | 40.2 |

**MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?**

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental

genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

**MILITARY SUCCESS BECAUSE OF
STATE DEPARTMENT INDIFFERENCE**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have been pleasantly surprised at the tremendous success achieved by the President's Cambodian campaign to protect the lives of American fighting men by destroying the enemy's sanctuaries.

Now we know why. The State Department was left out of the decision.

I include the newsclippings which follow:

[From the Washington Star, June 2, 1970]

STATE FEELS LEFT OUT ON WAR

(By Peter Lisagor)

To the surprise and chagrin of diplomatic officials here, President Nixon apparently considers the Cambodian invasion and the present status of disengagement from Vietnam in strictly military terms.

His failure to include any top-level State Department official in his weekend meeting at San Clemente, Calif., underscores what diplomatic sources believe to be an indifference to the political implications of his moves in Southeast Asia.

It further downgrades, in their judgment the ultimate necessity to find a negotiated solution to the war, even though the Vietnamization process can be carried out in theory without concern for the political outcome of the conflict.

Moreover, the absence of a high diplomatic official plainly tends to minimize the role of the State Department in the development of a policy with international consequences of a political nature.

Diplomatic sources say they have no explanation for the exclusion of a top departmental adviser.

Secretary of State William P. Rogers could not have attended personally inasmuch as he returned to the United States Sunday night from Europe.

But the two undersecretaries of state, Elliot Richardson and Alexis Johnson, have been intimately involved in Vietnam policy councils, and either could have represented Rogers, the sources said.

It is assumed that the President wanted a "progress report" from Gen. Creighton Abrams, allied commander in Vietnam, and other top brass on military operations in Cambodia and South Vietnam. But diplomatic officials regard the military and political factors as so closely linked as to require concerted attention.

Nixon has been criticized in Congress for appearing to ignore the peace talks in Paris. He has yet to replace Henry Cabot Lodge as chief negotiator and has left the task in the hands of a career Foreign Service officer, Phillip Habib.

The North Vietnamese have refused to negotiate seriously with Habib and have turned over the desultory meetings in Paris to second-level representatives.

Administration sources say that Henry A.

Kissinger, the President's assistant for national security affairs, attended the California meeting and undoubtedly will inform top State Department officials about the discussions.

But to the veteran diplomats, that hardly explains what they view as a serious rebuff to the operational and policy-making role of the State Department.

[From the Washington Star, June 7, 1970]

RICHARDSON PROMOTED: CREATIVE MANAGER FOR HEW

(By George Sherman)

President Nixon has opted for a creative manager at HEW in the person of Elliot L. Richardson.

When Richardson became undersecretary of state, he was an unknown—a moderate Massachusetts politician, schooled and polished in rarefied Boston society, a lawyer, and a personal friend of his new boss, Secretary of State William P. Rogers.

Eighteen months later Richardson has become a power in his own right. Quiet, unassuming, but tenaciously brilliant, he has proved himself able to cope with the vagaries of Washington bureaucracy.

His sudden promotion yesterday to be secretary of the troubled Health, Education and Welfare Department rests on the bedrock of this success. No longer is he the unsung "discovery" of an administration noticeably weak in recruiting outside talent.

"WATCHDOG GROUPS"

Richardson, no less than his subordinates, is believed to have been disgruntled by the failure to have any representative at the top-level "military briefing" on Indochina which President Nixon held last weekend at his San Clemente, Calif., home.

Shortly after the Cambodian operation began, a special Indochina "watchdog group" was set up on the sixth floor of the department mainly to make sure State was kept informed of matters being decided in the Pentagon and White House.

But intimates insist that Richardson has been happy in his work. He is leaving State, they say, with a mixture of regret over work left undone and excitement about the challenge to come. Whatever the policy differences over Indochina, these officials maintain that Richardson can claim achievement in giving the State Department a predominant voice in the day-to-day workings of the Nixon national security system.

Early on Richardson gained the respect of the President's national security adviser, Henry A. Kissinger, the real power in Nixon foreign policy formulation. Kissinger, who jealously controls national security machinery from his White House basement office, took to making daily calls to Richardson—who controls execution of Nixon policy decisions through the so-called "Undersecretaries Committee" of the National Security Council.

Richardson has worked on the premise that he who is best prepared and best organized will have the greatest voice in what comes out of that machinery.

Just recently he registered a small, and largely unnoticed, success. President Nixon's call two weeks ago for a new international agreement on peaceful development of world seabeds for developing countries was almost entirely the result of tireless work and argument by Richardson.

Richardson himself likes to talk in undramatic terms. He believes that the exaggerated claims for American power and resources over the past 20 years have fostered a dangerous temptation for disillusioned Americans "to crawl back into their shell" of isolationism.

"All we can do is to keep trying, to keep

pushing for more capability, to keep experimenting," he said.

He did just that in State with the perennial issue of youthful reform. At the time Richardson took office, the "Young Turks" of Foggy Bottom were furious with frustration. Rogers made his lieutenant the head of the formerly ineffectual Board of the Foreign Service, who immediately announced that it was to be the vehicle for re-examining "personnel systems" of all foreign affairs agencies.

REFORM SPEECH BACKED

Richardson proved he was serious. Last October Idar Rimestad, powerful deputy undersecretary for administration and enemy of the Young Turks, was replaced by William B. Macomber Jr.—darling of the reformers. And last January Macomber—with strong Richardson backing—produced a speech for the department proposing thorough-going reform. Thirteen task forces set up afterwards are about to report back to Macomber with concrete proposals.

OREGON'S SECOND DISTRICT SPEAKS OUT

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently completed a sample tabulation of my annual questionnaire to the voters of the Second Congressional District of Oregon. Covering a wide range of national, international, and local issues, the questionnaire went out in mid-April to about 160,000 constituents. I am pleased that so far nearly 25,000 have been completed and returned.

The results are most interesting. Most of my constituents are strongly opposed to expansion of the war in Southeast Asia. About half of those returned were received in my office before the announced expansion of the war in Southeast Asia; the rest came in after that announcement. The majority support the irreversible withdrawal of U.S. forces from all of Indochina on a clearly defined timetable.

The Vietnam war is considered the No. 1 cause of the Nation's present economic difficulties. The President receives low marks for his policies on inflation and high interest rates. Congress gets a poor rating for its efforts to control Federal spending.

Tough wage and price guidelines to be imposed by the Federal Government on business and labor are endorsed.

Support of stronger, expanded programs to clean up the environment is registered.

The economy, the war, and the environment emerge as the three great sources of concern. My constituents indicate dissatisfaction with the way each issue is being handled, and strongly express a need for changes in the present policy.

Some of the highlights of the poll follow:

Results of 1970 congressional questionnaire U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

1. What U.S. policy regarding South Vietnam do you favor?

| | |
|--|----|
| Irreversible withdrawal of U.S. forces over a clearly defined period of time?.. | 51 |
| Withdrawal of U.S. forces only if and when the policy of Vietnamization proves successful? | 30 |
| Increased military effort and return to bombing of North Vietnam?..... | 19 |

2. Defense Department officials indicate that a sizable U.S. support force may be needed in Vietnam after all U.S. combat forces withdraw to maintain the stability of the South Vietnamese government. Would you support such a force?

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Yes | 38 |
| No | 45 |
| Undecided | 17 |

3. Should the U.S. send ground combat forces to the aid of other Southeast Asian nations if requested by the governments of those countries?

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Yes | 13 |
| No | 68 |
| Undecided | 19 |

4. Should the U.S. remove most of its troops now stationed in Western Europe and leave ground defense of that area to the governments involved?

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Yes | 61 |
| No | 25 |
| Undecided | 14 |

NATIONAL AND POLITICAL ISSUES

5. I have proposed to end the military draft in 1972. Under my bill, the draft could be reactivated in time of war or national emergency only by consent of Congress. Do you favor?

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Yes | 71 |
| No | 19 |
| Undecided | 10 |

6. Do you favor President Nixon's proposal to expand the federal welfare program to cover an additional 3-million low-income families?

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Yes | 33 |
| No | 50 |
| Undecided | 17 |

7. Do you favor the elimination of nerve gas and other chemical warfare materials from our national weapons system?

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Yes | 50 |
| No | 37 |
| Undecided | 13 |

8. The press and television have been criticized for distorting the news. Do you believe this is a serious problem?

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Yes | 59 |
| No | 31 |
| Undecided | 10 |

9. Do you believe that the federal government should take strong action to bring down interest rates?

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Yes | 72 |
| No | 14 |
| Undecided | 14 |

10. President Nixon has outlined a program to fight the threat of air and water pollution. Do you believe this program is adequate to meet the need?

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Yes | 19 |
| No | 49 |
| Undecided | 32 |

11. Do you support the President's plan to reduce criminal penalties for first-time drug

users, and to increase penalties for drug peddling?

| | |
|-----------------|----------------|
| | <i>Percent</i> |
| Yes | 78 |
| No | 14 |
| Undecided | 8 |

12. Do you think the President should impose strong federal guidelines on business and labor to limit increases in prices and wages?

| | |
|-----------------|----------------|
| | <i>Percent</i> |
| Yes | 74 |
| No | 14 |
| Undecided | 12 |

13. Listed below are five possible causes for the nation's present economic difficulties. Please indicate your opinion by numbering these five causes in order of importance (1 for the most important, 5 for the least important).

| | |
|---|---|
| Administration economic and monetary policies | 3 |
| Congressional legislative action | 4 |
| Business and labor pressures for price and wage increases | 2 |
| Consumer spending | 5 |
| Vietnam war | 1 |

14. How would you rate the President's performance in the following areas?

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|
| <i>Interest rate policies:</i> | <i>Percent</i> |
| Good | 11 |
| Fair | 29 |
| Poor | 46 |
| Undecided | 14 |
| <i>Price inflation:</i> | |
| Good | 7 |
| Fair | 25 |
| Poor | 58 |
| Undecided | 10 |
| <i>Wage inflation:</i> | |
| Good | 4 |
| Fair | 22 |
| Poor | 62 |
| Undecided | 12 |
| <i>Education:</i> | |
| Good | 21 |
| Fair | 41 |
| Poor | 25 |
| Undecided | 13 |
| <i>Crime control:</i> | |
| Good | 14 |
| Fair | 30 |
| Poor | 45 |
| Undecided | 11 |
| <i>Farm policy:</i> | |
| Good | 6 |
| Fair | 29 |
| Poor | 39 |
| Undecided | 26 |
| <i>Housing:</i> | |
| Good | 8 |
| Fair | 31 |
| Poor | 43 |
| Undecided | 18 |

15. How would you rate the Congress in the following areas?

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| <i>Controlling federal spending:</i> | <i>Percent</i> |
| Good | 4 |
| Fair | 25 |
| Poor | 64 |
| Undecided | 7 |
| <i>Tax reform:</i> | |
| Good | 4 |
| Fair | 30 |
| Poor | 56 |
| Undecided | 10 |
| <i>Social security:</i> | |
| Good | 24 |
| Fair | 42 |
| Poor | 24 |
| Undecided | 10 |
| <i>Crime control:</i> | |
| Good | 3 |
| Fair | 28 |
| Poor | 57 |
| Undecided | 12 |

| | |
|--|----|
| <i>Cooperation with the President:</i> | |
| Good | 12 |
| Fair | 44 |
| Poor | 31 |
| Undecided | 13 |
| <i>Ethical standards:</i> | |
| Good | 9 |
| Fair | 32 |
| Poor | 41 |
| Undecided | 18 |
| <i>Congressional reform:</i> | |
| Good | 4 |
| Fair | 24 |
| Poor | 47 |
| Undecided | 25 |

AWARD WINNING ESSAYS SPONSORED BY NEBRASKA REA

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, it has become an annual practice for the Nebraska Rural Electrification Association to sponsor an essay contest among teenagers on the subject of REA.

The Third Congressional District of Nebraska, which I am privileged to represent, as more REA districts than any other congressional district in the country. Six of the district winners in my congressional district this year had keen competition, and I congratulate them for the fine essays they have written. Each of these young people has earned a trip to Washington to see their Government at work. I would like to share their award-winning essays with the Members of the House, and consequently am inserting them as follows:

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN MY AREA

When I was born, everything in my home was done by electricity except the cooking and the heating. Now, even that is done by electricity.

Allow me to take you back in time to 1946. My parents had just moved to their farm. There was no electricity. The heating was done by an oil burning stove, which proved inconvenient, and produced an uneven heat.

The cooking was done by a wood-burning cookstove. There was always the problem of carrying in a necessary supply of wood, and keeping an even baking temperature was an impossibility.

The lighting was done by kerosene lamps, which gave off a black smoke and fumes.

The food was kept in an old-fashioned ice chest. This presented the problem of having to go to town every other day to get a block of ice.

A gas range was purchased in 1948. The gas was supplied in a small gas bottle, which had to be changed every six weeks. Often the gas would be gone in the middle of cooking something because there was no gauge on the bottle to tell when it was near empty.

The heating was changed to propane in 1953. Propane, too, had its drawbacks. It coated everything in the house with an oily film, and made cleaning a constant problem.

In 1948 the house was wired for electricity, because the South Central Public Power District was being developed in the rural areas. At this time an electric generator was bought and produced electricity for the

house for one year, while waiting for the South Central Public Power District. At this time my parents bought an electric refrigerator.

In 1949, electricity came to the farms. On my parents' farm, gas was still used for heating and cooking, but the lighting was now done by electricity, which was a great improvement. This continued until 1967, when we built a new all-electric home. Our new home, with radiant electric heating in the ceiling, allows the temperature in each room to be controlled separately, which makes for greater comfort. The electric central air-conditioning system gives us complete summer comfort.

South Central Public Power District electricity provides my mother with the same conveniences as the city house wife. She, too, can have an electric stove, refrigerator, dishwasher, garbage disposal, an electric washer and dryer and many other electrical appliances.

Electricity also provides many conveniences on the farm besides those inside the home. The farmer can now move grain much faster with electric grain augers. Some of his tools run on electricity, such as the electric drill and the electric saw. He can also fix some of his own machinery with an electric welder. Temporary fencing is much easier with the electric fencer. The farmer's work day is made longer by the electric lighting systems that he can now have.

Our family and our neighbors have found that living with electricity makes any other way of life obsolete.

INFORMATION

My Name: Ricky Gebhards.
Age: 15.
Grade: Sophomore.
School: Nelson High School.
Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Chester Gebhards, Superior, Nebraska.

Contestant sponsored by the South Central Public Power District, Nelson, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

Have you ever sat down and asked yourself what you'd do if a day came that there wasn't any electricity? Well, I started, but before I got far I found the results rather frightening. Let me take you through a typical morning on the farm without the use of electricity and we'll see how a family, which has become so accustomed to electricity that they don't realize how much they use it, reacts to the situation.

The alarm clock that's supposed to ring at 6:30 A.M. to wake Dad and Mom up didn't ring and when Dad finally wakes up at 7:00 A.M., he's not in the best of moods. After failing to get the lights to go on, Dad stumbled around the room, getting dressed, and only stubbing his toes four times. This of course didn't help his mood one bit and by the time he was outside his voice was almost gone from yelling so much. Mom went through much the same but without quite as much yelling.

When Dad tried to get the cows in to milk without the lights he got by with only falling down twice and getting kicked three times. Dad got a good exercising of the fingers since the milking machine didn't work, and got a good backache pumping water since the pump jack didn't work. Otherwise, Dad got through with the rest of the chores fairly well.

Meanwhile back at the house Mom dropped only three dishes and one glass of orange juice before it was light enough to see. She couldn't hear the news and weather without the radio on and couldn't fry eggs without the electric range or frying pan. No water for

coffee because of the pressure pump and anyway the electric perculator wasn't working. We also couldn't have toast because of the electric toaster. By this time the only thing that could of boiled water for coffee, fried eggs, and toasted bread was Mom, but she must not of thought of that idea since she didn't try it. So we had to settle for a cold breakfast only it wasn't cold. The milk for the cereal and the orange juice were warm since the refrigerator wasn't working.

Mom had to wash the dishes by hand since the dishwasher wasn't working. She tried the electric can opener, the electric knife, blender, and mixer but had no luck. Sis wanted to watch TV but couldn't and then wanted to play records, but had no luck even when she turned them by hand. Mom told her to vacuum the carpet but to Sis's delight the vacuum cleaner didn't work.

Mom had wanted to wash clothes but neither the electric washer or dryer worked. Dad meanwhile had tried to use his electric razor and electric tooth brush but he couldn't even get hot water because of the water heater.

So by 8:30 A.M. the whole family was in the worst disposition you'll ever want to see. In just two hours the family began to realize what it would be like without electricity. Maybe if the electricity was off for a few hours everywhere people would begin to realize how much it's worth and wouldn't take it so much for granted. The surprising thing is that electricity is one of the cheapest and most dependable means of lighting, heating, and cooking there is. Also it has to be the most important element in my home and my community in helping us get along with everyday burdens. Now aren't you glad electricity's so dependable in staying on!

INFORMATION

My Name: Douglas N. Johnson.

Age: 17.

Grade: Junior.

School: Minden High School.

Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. John N. Johnson, Upland, Nebraska 68981.

Contestant sponsored by the Franklin County Rural Public Power District, Franklin, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

Little do we, in the hustle and bustle of life, realize the importance of the modern conveniences that surround us. Since its beginning in 1935, the REA has served hundreds of farms throughout the United States. The program made it possible for rural families to have electricity which has brought with it the many modern conveniences. The REA plays an important role in the economic development of our rural communities by increasing farm production and encouraging the establishment of local businesses and industries.

A few years ago our area was stricken with a severe ice storm, we were without electricity for twenty-four hours. Up until this time I had never conceived just how important a part electricity plays in our lives. We were cold, hungry, and in the dark, what a relief when our electricity was restored! This is just one of many instances when I realized the value of the REA and how we each take it for granted.

Since the time when Ben Franklin did his first experiments with electricity and Thomas Edison developed the light bulb, electricity has continually become a greater factor in the lives of Americans. The REA has indeed become the modern conqueror of the wilderness, offering to rural America an existence holding many more conveniences and a more comfortable situation, eliminating many back-breaking and time-consuming jobs.

To fully appreciate our electrical power, a person must stop and think of all the ways it helps us in our daily lives. Electricity keeps us warm in the winter, cool in the summer, and provides light into a world which would otherwise be quite dark and dreary. To me one of the most gratifying things to see is my father coming home from working in the field, irrigating or putting up hay, on a hot, humid day of 100° or more, take a shower, put on clean clothes, and relax in an air-conditioned home. All of this made possible by the REA.

My mother tells of carrying water from a windmill 200 feet from the house, on Sunday evening so she would get an early start on the washing Monday morning. Then she would hang the clothes on the line, only to have a dirt storm come and have to do it all over again. Today, what a wonderful thing our automatic washers and dryers are. Everyday can be a wash day if we want! To do the ironing they would have to heat the iron on a wood stove, what a blessing our electric irons are today. Making your own clothes was quite a chore in the early years, either sewing by hand or using a treadle sewing machine. However much handier our electric sewing machine is! You can create a new outfit in a matter of hours.

The kitchen has become the dream world of every housewife, with its many modern appliances the preparation of a meal can now be enjoyed more than ever. Can you imagine cooking on an old cook stove and having to heat water to do dishes? Then they had to take food down to a cave to keep it cool or keep it in a messy ice box. You often hear people speak of "The Good Old Days." I can't imagine what was so good about them!

Have you ever dreamed of corn on the cob with golden butter? Then go down to the sweet corn field only to see it slaughtered as if hogs had been in it the night before! I have, and it wasn't hogs; it was raccoons. My father and I solved this problem by putting up a double electric fence around the field. No more coons, thanks to the REA!

The coming of REA has given the farmer a helping hand, with electric irrigation pumps, electric drying bins, and electric augers being used to help with the growth, preparation, and transporting of grain. The REA is also responsible for the change in the birth pattern of the animals and fowl. It was impossible to raise baby pigs, lambs, chickens, or calves in the winter months before the coming of the REA. Now with the help of heat lamps, space heaters, electric brooders, and ventilating fans the animals have their young as early as January, February, and March. This helps the farmer in many ways, at this time of year he is not as busy and has more time to spend with the animals. Also the stock can be put on the market earlier in the year and a better price is realized because of this.

The REA has indeed helped in the development and growth of our country and I feel will continue to move onward with newer and better ideas. A statement by O. S. Marden, I feel, best typifies what the REA means to Rural America, "There is no medicine like hope, no incentive so great and no tonic so powerful as the expectation of something better tomorrow," through the Rural Electric Association.

INFORMATION

My Name: Julia Ruzicka.

Age: 17.

Grade: Junior.

School: St. Paul High School.

Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Edward Ruzicka, R. R. # 1, St. Paul, Nebraska 68873.

Contestant sponsored by the Howard Greeley Rural Public Power District, St. Paul, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

I stepped out of the cold wintry air and into our all-electric home. As I paused there, I suddenly realized how important REA is. I thought what would I, a member of the REA generation, do without our friend Willie Wirehand. Willie Wirehand has been the farmer's friend ever since he was chosen the national rural electrification symbol by the members of the National Rural Electric Co-operative Association in 1950.

Through the efforts of the late Senator George W. Norris and Representative Sam Rayburn, the Rural Electrification Act was passed by Congress and was signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1936 making the REA a permanent agency. While only a mere 10 percent of the farms were electrified in 1935; today there are a commendable 98 percent. Constantly this free enterprise is faced with the problem of meeting the increased demands for electric power.

Everytime the calamity of a power outage strikes, the farmer is taken back to a pre-REA world. That is a world of longer and harder work with no more luxuries and considerable less time for relaxation and recreation. Electricity has revolutionized the farmer's everyday chores. While, before, grandpa had to milk the cows by hand, today he can milk them by machines. He can also feed his farm animals by simply pressing a button saving countless hours a year. The changes inside home are even more amazing. Now since the invention of hundreds of household appliances, the average homemaker has changed from a slave to everyday jobs to a ruler over an endless array of electric appliances for use in the home.

What we would do without electricity is beyond me! Our water is pumped with an electric pump, making water available whenever we want to use it. Our new home is a joy to live in with its electric heat and ample lighting. I don't know what my mother would do without all her electric appliances, such as washer, dryer, refrigerator and stove. My father also relies on electricity to run his farm power tools and electric welder. Many times an electric heat lamp has saved the life of a baby animal and been the difference between profit and loss for my father and me. Another use of electricity on our farm is using fans to dry our wheat and cool our 4-H calves. Our vapor light and yard lights make "chore time" possible anytime.

Each year more electrically-powered irrigation wells and confined livestock production set-ups are established. The demand for power continues to grow and the use of atomic power plants will enable REA to meet the continued needs of its customers today and tomorrow.

Electricity is truly the "life blood" of the American rural community and without it life would nearly come to a standstill. REA gives to us, the farmers, the incomparable power of electricity, the power for making our lives a thousand ways better, the power that beyond all doubt helps us live better . . . electrically.

INFORMATION

My Name: Marvin Swan.

Age: 16.

Grade: Junior.

School: Perkins County High School.

Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Robert Swan, Ogallala, Nebraska.

Contestant sponsored by The Midwest Electric Membership Corporation, Grant, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

It is difficult to evaluate the value of rural electrification. As to social value it brings

luxury, convenience and economy to the rural resident that equals that of the city dweller. In dollars and cents valuation, on our farm we have a hired-hand who pumped water for our home and livestock last month for 40 cents. Besides pumping the water he heated it, helped my mother cook, do the laundry, clean and light our house, operate our appliances and television. Outside he helped my father auger grain, weld and repair machinery, fence cattle, and even saved our baby pigs with heat bulbs when the weather turned cold. For all these services and more we paid him about a dollar a day. His name is Willie Wiredhand, the symbol adopted by the Rural Electrification Association in 1950. He is the most efficient and economical worker we've had and what is even more amazing about him is that he works for all our neighbors also.

Willie Wiredhand and rural electrification did not come about accidentally. It took years of planning and hard work by dedicated men before their dream of electricity for the farmer was realized. Senator George W. Norris and Representative Sam Rayburn worked long and strenuously on the Rural Electrification Act and in 1936 Congress passed the bill. The government provided money through loans and the electric lines began appearing in rural America. It brought about the most dramatic changes in the lives of the farmer and his family since the invention of the gasoline engine. Suddenly these people could live with all the advantages of living in the city.

In 1936, 10 percent of rural America had electricity. Now that figure is 98 percent and that represents 10 percent of the total population. The demand on rural electrification grows constantly as farmers find more and more uses for electricity, such as irrigation. This demand is met by the constant up-grading of services, equipment, and the building of higher voltage transmission lines. In the Midwest Electric Membership Corporation, the average KWH used per month has risen from 175 KWH a few years ago to a monthly average per farm in January, 1970 of 1046 KWH.

It would be hard to imagine what life on the farm would be like without electricity. We get a sampling of the inconveniences, disadvantages and even lack of necessities when there is a temporary power outage. The farmers are so dependent upon electricity today that they should do everything possible to work with their local Rural Electrification Association towards continual progress. This association is a membership owned, non-profit cooperative which is managed and controlled by the patrons it serves. Its main objective is to improve the lives of its members.

If one word were used to sum up the value of rural electrification, I think it could be "tremendous."

INFORMATION

My Name: Teresa Lee.

Age: 16.

Grade: Junior.

School: Wheatland High School.

Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. John Lee, Rural Route, Box 104, Madrid, Nebraska.

Contestant sponsored by The Midwest Membership Corporation, Grant, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

I'm not going to make this a boring factual report because I think it is more interesting for the reader if he forms his own conclusions about a subject. Ask yourself this question: Could we, as farmers live without a Polk County Rural Public Power

District? I think the answer to this question would be NO! Why? Simply because we depend upon it every day of our lives. We use electricity to supply light to our homes. I'm sure that you will agree that the lights in our homes are much more convenient than the oil or kerosene lamps of the past. Electricity is also used in the heating of some homes, I know ours is electrically heated. This type of heating is much cleaner because when we lived in our old home, the walls would look grimy at the end of the winter heating season. Not only is the heating of our homes important, but also the heating of the homes of newly born calves, pigs, and sheep to prevent them from freezing. After winter has past, summer is upon us in no time at all, it seems. Now, is when electricity is of probably the greatest asset to the farmer. It not only is used to cool his home, but also to supply the power to run irrigation pumps. Many of these pumps supply more than 1,000 gallons of water per minute. Thanks to irrigation, crop yields have as much as doubled.

But just where does this electricity come from? Actually very little is known about electricity. Scientists can't even figure out if it flows through conductors or in a belt around the conductor. We do know that one of the cheapest ways to produce it is at hydroelectric plants. These are usually built on a fast flowing stream, or at the bottom of a large dam. The water which these dams stop serves a dual purpose—to turn the blades of the turbines, and to be a resource that can be drawn upon for irrigation water.

Of all the potential water power in the world only 13% of it is utilized. Of the world supply the United States has 27% of the water and uses 40% of this in the production of electricity. Why use water you may say? One reason for using it is the fact that we have a bountiful supply of water and once you use it, it can be used again. This is not possible with gas or coal.

The number of kilowatts went up about 10% last year, yet the cost of electricity has declined 14%. I think that most Americans are not fully aware of the real value of electricity and actually take this convenience for granted.

Now that you have read my paper, I hope you have come to a candid conclusion, because I believe that electricity is truly the life-line of modern Rural America.

INFORMATION

My name: Thomas T. Wyman.

Age: 16.

Grade: Sophomore.

School: Silver Creek Public School.

Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Ted Wyman, Rt. 1, Silver Creek, Nebraska.

Contestant sponsored by the Polk County Rural Public Power District, Stromsburg, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, commitments in my district prevented me from being present to vote on Monday, June 8. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on rollcalls Nos. 154, 155, 156, and 157.

SPLENDID ADDRESS OF WILLIAM P. McCAHILL

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, William P. McCahill, executive secretary of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, recently delivered an outstanding address to the 25th national conference of the Veterans Employment Service in San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the Honorable McCahill received the Amvets Silver Helmet Award in recent ceremonies at their national awards banquet at the Mayflower Hotel. I commend his superb address to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the American people:

SPLENDID ADDRESS OF WILLIAM P. McCAHILL

I can't name many groups I'd travel six thousand miles for in a 36 hour round trip for the opportunity of speaking 15 minutes. But, then, there isn't any group anywhere with whom I've worked more closely during the past 24 years than the Veterans Employment Service. So, I'm happy to be with you today. I bring you the real appreciation and sincere thanks of Harold Russell. He is your own kind of "happy warrior," just as was Mel Maas before him.

The VES had a big hand in the early weaning of the President's Committee. We have not and will not forget your friendship or your hard work in the States since early 1946 as working partners with us and state and local committees on hiring the handicapped.

My first office in the Labor Department building was in the VES sector, sharing space with Elmer Jebo, Perry Hawkins and some other hardy old timers. We coaxed Vern Banta away from the VES when we got our first real money in 1949. In the two years prior to that, we were carried by the VES and the BES. I was on a 30-day appointment for 27 months, and never got a single ulcer! Later, we coaxed Larry Burdick and Vince Hippolitus, former assistant VESs in Wisconsin and Connecticut, to help us form our staff. Even later, we coaxed Perry Hawkins away from the VES. So, you see, the President's Committee has always leaned on the VES and always will. I'd hate to total up the budget, printing and transportation support the VES has given us through the years. I want some of the comparative newcomers to understand why our personal ties are even tighter bonds than the official ones which show.

There was never a time in the last 24 years that the VES ever had any doubts as to where the President's Committee stood when it came to jobs for disabled veterans. And, God willing, there never will be any doubt. We have never forgotten our origin or the reason for our existence. Although our mission and area of responsibility covers a necessarily wider range than your own, there will never be any question as to our priority, at least not under the leadership we now have.

Saying this, I want to pay your leader a most deserved tribute. He stood firm during recent trying times, and, almost single-handedly, carried the day for your continued flexibility and independence as a keen, lean, Federal arm in the field. The people who preceded me on today's speaking program

rallied to your cause and managed to help Ed Omohundro win the day for an autonomous Veterans Employment Service in a time of great change and turmoil. But, if Ed hadn't stood firm, if he hadn't stuck out his neck, the veterans groups would have had a hard time rallying to a fight nobody would have admitted was being fought. I'm proud to be in your company today. I hope to always be numbered as one of your vast army of auxiliary helpers. As a 29-year Marine Reservist this is one army I'm proud to belong to—your own army of volunteers.

When I agreed to Ed's invitation, I said that I'd check with the leaders of our Committee on Disabled Veterans relative to my subject. However, when I saw your agenda and found our leaders all speaking ahead of me I decided I would just share with you some of our plans for the future, plans which should benefit all those whom you in this room serve so faithfully.

First off, I'd like to say a most sincere "thank you" to Mal Lovell and Bob Brown for the recent almost dramatic resurgence of interest in the handicapped at the official Manpower Administration level. TES Program Letter 2522 of Nov. 21, 1969 and TES Program Letter 2555 dated March 27, 1970 indicate that the handicapped, including the disabled veteran, no longer are to be lost in the scramble. The Program Letter 2555 on Participation of Handicapped Persons in Manpower Administration Training Programs sounds like a most thoughtful answer to some of the statements I made at the Interstate Conference last year in New York. It emphasizes the fact that in six years of MDTA, only 8.4 per cent of enrollees in institutional training and only 4.9 of those in on-the-job-training were handicapped and that only about 2.0 per cent of the NAB-JOBS participants are handicapped. The Program Letter aims at correcting this situation, particularly with regard to the NAB-JOBS slots. We are most appreciative of Secretary Shultz' answer to Chairman Russell's voiced concern over these statistics. We will be grateful for VES active interest in this action area on your return home.

As many of you are aware, our Executive Committee in one of its rare resolutions, stated its fixed purpose on November 29, 1967 as follows:

"While in no way neglecting its responsibilities to the older veterans the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped recognizes the contributions that these Vietnam disabled veterans have made to the national safety and interest and resolves to direct its attention to determine and remove existing gaps which the Nation may have in its plans to serve this most deserving group of disabled citizens returning to civilian life."

Since that time, this has been one of our major priority items and we have highlighted disabled veterans at every opportunity, most notably at last year's annual meeting luncheon and in the title of this year's Ability Counts Writing Contest. Just recently, we have made staff adjustments so that Vince Hippolitus soon will be freed to work exclusively with employers and employer organizations as a Special Assistant to the Chairman with no other assigned duties. You can be sure that disabled Veterans will be in all Vince's employer plans. Bob Ruffner, our Deputy Director of Information, has been assigned responsibilities for servicing the Committee on Disabled Veterans which will shortly have a new Chairman, now that Phil Robrecht's retirement has been announced from the DAV. I hope that Bob Ruffner will soon become practically another member of the VES headquarters "family" as he works into his new and challenging responsibilities.

Other changes of interest to the VES are these:

(1) We are naming a Committee on Bar-

rier Free Design under architect Leon Chate-lain to bring together those professional groups who will be structuring our future environment. The Committee will have the announced purpose of making certain that the less-than-physically-average will be able to operate effectively and competitively in tomorrow's world. Areas of concern will include transportation, housing, recreation, work places and all of living a full and free life in the America now taking shape. This is a significant expansion of our crusade against architectural barriers.

(2) We are naming a Committee on Workshops and beginning a more formal partnership to the previous fruitful cooperation between the workshop movement and private industry and government agencies having hiring and contracting authority. As the Wagner-O'Day Act is amended, and possibly the Randolph-Shepherd Act, additional opportunities will open up for government contracts with non-blind workshops and additional job possibilities in the Federal-State vending stand program for the blind. Many severely handicapped veterans will benefit from improvements in these two legislative keystones in the handicapped program. Chairman Russell will testify early in June in favor of an expanded program in these areas.

(3) We have held preliminary discussions with the Bureau of Labor Standards in connection with possible legislation for a national Second Injury Law for disabled veterans. Both the Department of Labor and the Veterans Administration are interested in our proposal that the Federal government underwrite any unusual employer risks in the case of disabled veterans. In some 34 states, many employers are not adequately protected against serious damages if a previously injured worker suffers an additional disability and may well be charged for significant compensation damages since the law provides no adequate compensation for the initial injury. We feel that the lack of adequate second or subsequent injury legislation works against severely disabled veterans being hired. We want to equalize the employer's risk and cease penalizing him for hiring the handicapped in those cases where an accident does actually occur. We may need your help on this.

(4) We have named a group to help us plan our 25th anniversary in the fall of 1972 and will be setting up an informal group of Federal agency executives to work alongside the special committee. The VES will be represented.

(5) We are moving to increase minority and ethnic group representation on the President's Committee and have asked the Governor's Committees for their advice and counsel. We are also moving toward streamlining the President's Committee itself and toward a modest staff expansion to better serve our volunteer members.

(6) Our Youth Committee has completed its first year of service and is undergoing an evaluation process to see what action its member organizations are taking in carrying out the excellent goals of doing more for more seriously handicapped young people so that they may be better able to do for themselves later in life. Thanks to the DAV, the Boy Scouts have a full-time staff person now working with handicapped scouts. I shall have the honor of chairing a special panel on scouting for the handicapped next week at the National Meeting of the Boy Scouts of America in Denver.

(7) The work for the mentally retarded and mentally restored is bearing much fruit, all of it good. In fact, the disabled veteran with a mental history may well be one of the real beneficiaries of two new programs now being tried in cooperation with our Committee on the Mentally Handicapped. One will involve employers in the affairs of mental hospitals and the other will involve

a team of a psychiatrist, an employer and a former mental patient in a lecture series at schools of rehabilitation counseling.

There's lots more, but it will keep and we'll share it with you, as we have with everything else we have done of any significance these last 23 years. Let me close with the last two paragraphs of Harold Russell's speech, prepared for delivery at your 24th Conference two years ago in New Orleans. In doing this, I speak for both of us as well as for the entire staff, many of whom would be with us today if the distance were not so great and the budget so slim: He said:

"We are all working a three day week in this time of crisis. The three days in our week are yesterday, today and tomorrow. There's not much we can do about yesterday except to learn from it. There's not much we can do about tomorrow because if we don't get on with today's business, tomorrow won't be worth living. That leaves us just one working day, today. But, there's a small rub here. Today stretches into eternity. That's what we've got to do together, you and I and all the volunteers we motivate, we've got to work so hard each day that tomorrow will be worth living and eternity will be a more blessed place because of us and our efforts here on earth.

While I charge you to be better than you have been, I also charge you to be as good as you can be. Saying that, I salute you for there never was a greater group of shock troops in the President's program for the handicapped. Good Luck and God Bless you, each and every one.

HOW MANY SOLDIERS DIED BY PROTESTERS?

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in reading the letters to the editors which appeared in the June 9, 1970, edition of the Atlanta Journal, I was most impressed with the letter from Mr. Tom Day of Forest Park, Ga., and would like to share the contents of his excellent letter with my colleagues.

The letter follows:

HOW MANY SOLDIERS DIED BY PROTESTERS?

THE EDITORS: I am an airline pilot with one of the companies serving Atlanta. In the past five years I have flown from coast to coast and border to border. In every city that I have been, I have seen caskets of soldiers killed in Vietnam removed from the cargo compartments of our airplanes.

In every case this sight has saddened me. In some cases I have come close to tears with the realization that the young man in that gray box is within two or three years of my age, that he has been deprived of ever knowing the great joys of life that I enjoy each day with my family.

Why did he die? He died protecting the principles on which this country was founded. He died protecting my wife, my two children, my friends and neighbors and myself.

I am not writing this to argue the merits of the Vietnam war, but to ask one question. How many of these men died as a result, directly or indirectly, of the antiwar protests in this country? The enemy gains strength to persevere by knowing we are a nation divided. In some cases they have received supplies from the most radical protesters. These have extended this war. I ask the protesters to do one thing. The next time you see one

of those gray boxes, the next time you see a crippled war veteran, ask yourself, "Have I, in any way, contributed to this man's death or wounds?"

FOREST PARK.

TOM DAY.

APOLLO 13—"ODYSSEY"

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the flight of Apollo 13 inspired my constituent, Mr. Boris Golokow of South Gate, Calif., to compose a poem of deep sentiment in honor of the courageous crew. At this point in the RECORD, I insert Mr. Golokow's poem, which follows:

APOLLO 13—"ODYSSEY"

Girded fueled and poised
On pad "A"
Apollo 13 awaited blastoff
And a lunar rendezvous.

The command ship "Odyssey"
For a crown it wore;
Astronauts Swigert, Lovell,
And Haise are the crew.

In the blockhouse
Men at their consoles-alert,
Pre-launch countdown complete
All systems go.

The third voyage to the
Surface of the moon had begun
A most hazardous adventure,
That, we knew.

The gnarled lunar highlands
Of "Fra Mauro"
Boulders, craters and hills
Would have presented
Monumental problems
To try the astronauts skills.

Bits and pieces of rock
Five billion years old;
Lunar core samples
From ten foot deep
Were some of the treasures
Science had hoped to reap.

On April 13, three days into flight,
At a point quite close to their goal
A sudden loss of oxygen
From a ruptured tank
Forced cancellation of the Mission
And orders for the crew to return.

Grave peril gripped
The power-crippled ship;
Only the calm attitude
And prayer of the crew
And the expertise
Of the men at mission control,
Could assure their eventual return.

The voyage continued around
The far side of the moon;
No need precious fuel to burn
Then a short blast of the engine for speed,
And out from moon orbit again.

A day later—a midcourse correction
Many miles out in space
On a trajectory toward splashdown
Where the spacecraft will place.

The life saving landing module
"Aquarius", a haven had been
Now it must be jettisoned
So that reentry can begin.

Ships and planes and anxious men
Were there
To assist in the recovery and
A most joyous welcome prepare.

Then as one people
The whole world prayed.
Most gracious and compassionate Father
Creator of the universe,
Who made the earth for man to dwell upon,
Accept our humble thanks for your answer
To our prayers.

The safe return of astronauts Lovell,
Swigert and Haise prove indeed
That it was your hand that guided
Them safely through the heavens
Back to the earth from whence they came.
—Boris Golokow.

WO JOHN R. CLAWSON WRITES

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD the following letter I received from WO John R. Clawson who is presently flying helicopters in the Mekong Delta.

Warrant Officer Clawson's letter is most unusual and interesting and gives the personal and thoughtful view of our current operations in Cambodia of one American soldier who has been in the midst of action for many months. It is encouraging to note this fine young American's spirit of patriotism and devotion to his country. We can only hope that our current efforts in Cambodia will help bring an end to this dreadful war and speed his safe return, and that of many thousands like him, to his family and loved ones.

The letter follows:

MAY 1, 1970.

HON. MR. McKNEALLY: Several months ago (Oct. '69), Hon. John Lovett forwarded a letter to you, written as "Dear Dad" from a G.I. in Viet Nam, I wrote that letter. I am in the Army, a warrant officer flying helicopters, stationed at Vinh Long, in the Mekong Delta.

Last week, the word came down that the S. Viet Army had been on operations inside of Cambodia, along the IV Corps border. This week, the U.S. finally announced that they were, in fact, sending advisors with the ARVN and supporting with Arty. and Tac Air. Mr. McNeally, all I can say is "Bravo"! It is about time!!! I was witness to one of the weapons caches that was uncovered in Cambodia, yielded 45 tons of arms and ammo, 19 Chinook Sorhes!! Our company, flew a night hunter-killer operation along the IV Corps border for 6 months, and we were at the mercy of Communist anti-aircraft, mortar, and rocket fire, without being able to do anything about it. Meanwhile we were getting kicked around by the troops and supplies that were getting across the border. It is frustrating to see your friends and fellow G.I.'s getting hurt, with one hand tied behind your back.

I still feel that this war, as it has been waged, is a mistake. We should either win it or get out. But, I support any measures that you take to get us finished with this nonsense, in such a way that 40,000-plus lives would not have been given in vain! I am also sick of hearing people, who know so little about what's happening here, trying to exert their influence for the "cause." What ever happened to the old postulate that the majority rules?

I continue to wear the uniform in pride, and may the good Lord guide you in your decisions.

Yours truly,

JOHN R. CLAWSON.

FACTS OF DDT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that a nationwide effort has been undertaken to urge President Nixon to immediately ban the use of DDT.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be familiar with this effort, I include the texts of two National Wildlife Federation communications and the text of a new sheet entitled, "The Facts of DDT," appear at this point in the RECORD:

FACTS OF DDT

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A nationwide letter writing campaign urging President Nixon to ban immediately the controversial pesticide DDT was kicked off in the Nation's Capital this week by the Rachel Carson Trust For The Living Environment and the National Wildlife Federation.

The campaign comes on the heels of a May 28 U.S. Court of Appeals order giving Agriculture Secretary Clifford M. Hardin 30 days either to take action toward banning the interstate shipment of the persistent pesticide or come to the Court with a convincing argument for not doing so.

DDT has recently been blamed for causing cancer in test animals by the National Cancer Institute, and is responsible for pushing a number of wildlife species to the brink of extinction, including the national symbol, the bald eagle.

The controversial pest killer has been banned in several states and in many other countries, including Russia.

The national controversy over the disastrous side effects of DDT on the environment was stimulated by the late Rachel Carson's best seller "Silent Spring." But over the years conservationists' pleas to ban DDT in favor of safer means of pest control have been stamped out by the powerful agricultural chemicals lobby.

Frustrated by the DDT lobby's success in defeating repeated legislative attempts to ban DDT and the apparent reluctance of the Agriculture Department to take decisive action, the Environmental Defense Fund, Sierra Club, West Michigan Environmental Action Council, National Audubon Society and Izaak Walton League of America took the case against DDT to the courts.

On May 28, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia gave Agriculture Secretary Hardin 30 days to act in the public interest by taking steps to ban DDT or capitulate again to the DDT lobby by studying it and our Nation's wildlife to death," a campaign spokesman said.

"Today, right now, is the time for the American public to write the President and his Agriculture Secretary that they want DDT banned, and they want it done now."

IMPORTANT BREAKTHROUGH ON DDT

DEAR FRIEND: Please excuse this Xeroxed note, but emergency situations warrant expeditious, albeit unorthodox tactics.

As you know, the Environmental Defense Fund, Sierra Club, West Michigan Environmental Action Council, National Audubon Society and Izaak Walton League of America recently made an important breakthrough on DDT. Based upon their overwhelming case before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, on May 28 the Court ordered Agriculture Secretary Hardin to either suspend the registration of DDT and implement cancellation proceedings to bar it from interstate commerce or come to the Court

with a convincing argument why he should not do so.

With this order, the Court seized the initiative from the powerful agricultural chemical lobby that's been so successful thus far in preventing the abolition of DDT. The Agriculture Department is now in the best position ever to be convinced to decide in favor of the public interest by essentially banning DDT over the protest of powerful vested interests.

But things being what they are in the real world, even under these circumstances, to say it will not be an easy decision is a gross understatement. Because there are powerful political forces at work the ultimate decision will undoubtedly come under consideration of the White House.

The chemical lobby is working at a feverish pace to push the Administration into opting for further study, for further delay. Now, perhaps like no other time in this long struggle, is the time for the American public to deluge the White House with encouragement to seize this opportunity to ban DDT and rid ourselves of this totally unnecessary environmental contaminant.

That's what this note is all about. To urge you to join with us in mobilizing our respective constituencies and make an urgent plea to the general public to immediately telephone, telegraph or write President Nixon that now, right now, is the time to ban DDT.

Because the Court on May 28 only gave Agriculture 30 days to decide whether it would end the DDT issue or prolong the environmental agony, the time is obviously critical.

Whatever is done must be done immediately. We are going to do everything possible with the short time available to mobilize our members to write the White House; and make a special plea through the mass media describing the current situation and urging concerned citizens to immediately voice their support to the White House to ban DDT.

Our design is not to influence in any way the judicial considerations nor to influence legislation, but to give President Nixon and his Agriculture Secretary the support they will need to withstand the intense pressure from the agricultural chemical lobby to opt for further "study" and further delay.

The people intimately involved in the DDT issue today are convinced that now, like no other time, is the moment to act. If we, individually and collectively, are able to mobilize wide public support in the few critical days ahead, it is just possible that DDT and its attendant environmental horrors will be truly on the way out.

Please act now.

Sincerely,

THOMAS L. KIMBALL,
Executive Director, National Wildlife Federation.

SHIRLEY A. BRIGGS,
Executive Director, Rachel Carson Trust
for the Living Environment.

THE FACTS OF DDT

WHAT IS DDT AND WHERE CAN YOU FIND IT?

DDT—properly though not often termed dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane—is widely used in a variety of economic poisons as a pesticide. First used in World War II, its efficacy as a bug-killer gained instant and continued popularity with more than 100 million pounds of the poison being manufactured and released into the environment each year.

DDT's chemical stability, near insolubility in water and solubility in lipid or fat-like materials gives its poisonous environmental existence a "half-life" of ten to twenty years. Because of its extreme mobility and tendency to concentrate in fatty tissue, DDT does not stay put. It is found today throughout the biosphere, in rainwater, in birds living hundreds of miles at sea, in animals from

the Antarctic to the Arctic, in the foods we eat, the water we drink, and naturally enough in each one of us.

WHY GET UPSET?

DDT has been proven, among other things, to be a cancer-causing agent in test animals by the National Cancer Institute. Another study found human victims of terminal cancer to contain more than twice the concentration of DDT residues in their fat than did victims of accidental death. (This becomes particularly noteworthy when considering statistics indicating an average deposit of 12 parts per million DDT in the fatty tissue of human beings.) Such carcinogenic characteristics were observed in test animals by the Federal Drug Administration as early as 1947.

As for wildlife? DDT has been catastrophic. The relationships between DDT residues and hazards to bird populations, by both direct mortality and reproductive failure, have been particularly well documented. The American bald eagle, the peregrine falcon, and the brown pelican are among species confronting outright extinction because of DDT contamination.

Fish have proven particularly vulnerable to DDT. The chemical inhibits their reproduction and causes abnormal mortality of the fry following contamination of adult fish and their eggs. DDT has caused direct mortality of large numbers of fish. Important freshwater and marine fisheries have been seriously threatened and in some cases been destroyed by DDT concentrations. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife studies in the spring and fall of 1967 and 1968 found DDT in 584 of 590 samples of fish taken from 45 rivers and lakes across the country. At least a dozen states reported pesticide residues in fish above the Government's recommended safe level of five parts per million.

Damage to invertebrates of many species is extensive. DDT has frequently disrupted insect communities by killing beneficial predatory and parasitic insects resulting in an increase of the pest initially intended to be controlled.

Why get upset? DDT is endangering the reproduction and survival of many non-target organisms: birds, fish, invertebrates, and man himself.

WHAT HAS THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE DONE ABOUT DDT?

Not nearly so much as it might.

The Secretary of the Department of Agriculture was first required to register "economic poisons" under the 1947 Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Until 1964, if the Secretary wanted to cancel a registration, the burden of proving safety was on him. With the 1964 amendments to FIFRA, however, the burden of proof was shifted to the manufacturer.

Because cancellation of a product is a long and complicated statutory procedure, the amendments also provided a safety-valve in situations where the Secretary found cancellation "necessary to prevent an imminent hazard to the public." In such a situation the Secretary is authorized to suspend registration of the product during cancellation proceedings.

DDT is such a situation. But due to the relentless pressure of the pesticide industry, the agricultural chemical lobby has effectively blocked any cancellation. Although the Pesticides Regulation Division has had specific cancellation authority for more than five years, it has never secured cancellation of a registration in a contested case. And the would-be attempt to ban certain persistent pesticide use on November 20, 1969 has been effectively circumvented by the pesticide industry through a series of appeals.

Attempts to ban DDT through congressional legislation have also failed. In many cases, such as that of Maryland Senator Tydings who tried to initiate a four-year moratorium on DDT and three other persistent pesticides, legislation died a quick death in the Agriculture Committee which is notorious as a graveyard for regulatory bills and a rubber-stamp for industry demands.

COULD DDT BE REPLACED?

Yes. That is the horrible, macabre irony of the DDT controversy. Alternative pest control techniques, particularly integrated techniques which would not pose the same threats to the environment and to human health as DDT, are available for all DDT uses.

Research of these alternatives at present, however, is not encouraging. The Department of Agriculture has admitted that research in this field is underfunded by \$7 million for fiscal year 1971. Last year's programs were underfunded by \$4 million.

CAN NOTHING ELSE BE DONE?

Something else can and is being done?

A petition was filed on October 31, 1969, to initiate court proceedings under Section 4c of the FIFRA to cancel DDT on grounds that pesticides containing DDT are not in compliance with FIFRA standards, in particular that DDT is causing immediate, serious, permanent and irreparable injury to man, the environment, and animals, including fish and wildlife. This petition (filed by the Environmental Defense Fund, Inc., the Sierra Club, the West Michigan Environmental Action Council, the National Audubon Society, and Izaak Walton League of America) also requests the immediate suspension of DDT registrations under Section 4c on ground that DDT is an "imminent hazard to the public." Suspension would protect the public by removing immediate hazards from the market during lengthy deregistration proceedings.

It demands, in effect, that the Secretary of Agriculture exercise his already established authority which up to this point, he has not responsibly initiated. It contends that not to do so constitutes an abuse of discretion. The U.S. Court of Appeals agrees and has demanded that Secretary Hardin suspend within 30 days the registration of DDT or give the court reasons "for his silent but effective refusal to do so."

CAN THE AMERICAN PUBLIC HELP IN ANY WAY?

As part of the American public, each one of us can do something. DDT is an increasing daily threat to our lives and the world in which we live. As an established carcinogen it constitutes what the FIFRA has termed an "imminent hazard." It is our responsibility to express our concern through a letter to President Nixon. It is time for the Secretary of Agriculture to stand up against an industry whose totally unnecessary product daily jeopardizes our environment.

MINSHALL BILL OFFERS TAX INCENTIVES FOR INDUSTRIAL, BUSINESS POLLUTION CONTROLS

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yesterday introduced legislation, H.R. 18015, to encourage construction of water, air and solid waste facilities by providing greater tax incentives than present law allows.

My bill would provide a 20 percent tax credit and an amortization period of from 1 to 5 years. Present law does not provide any tax credit, although it does allow a 5-year amortization period for industrial and business installation of air

and water pollution control equipment. Present Internal Revenue Code statutes are hazy as to whether solid waste disposal facilities can be included.

It is up to Congress to do all it can to encourage industry and business to energetically enlist in the campaign to clean up America. Tax incentives such as my bill proposes can provide real impetus in our fight against environmental pollution.

THE OVERSEAS MILITARY CREDIT UNIONS SAVE SERVICEMEN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 a special subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which I was privileged to chair, began an investigation into the high interest rates charged to servicemen when they made loans or purchased items on credit.

Although the problem of high interest rates was critical in the United States, it was of even a greater magnitude in the areas around our military installations overseas. It was not uncommon for a serviceman stationed overseas to pay 30- to 40-percent interest charges when obtaining a loan.

After visiting virtually every major military installation in both the European and Pacific commands, it was the subcommittee's recommendations that the best way to put an end to the loan sharking was to establish a system of military credit unions.

The first of these credit unions was opened only a little more than 2 years ago, and we now have 10 credit unions operating in the European and Pacific commands. A number of these credit unions have suboffices so that a vast majority of our military personnel stationed abroad are included in credit union fields of membership.

At the end of April of this year, the overseas credit unions had a membership of more than 113,000 servicemen and their dependents and had made loans of more than \$93 million.

Mr. Speaker, when the subcommittee first began its overseas investigations, it found that the average interest rate charged servicemen stationed abroad was 25 percent per year. The overseas credit unions charge no more than 12 percent a year and, in a number of instances, charge only 9 percent. The 12-percent charge is only 1-percent-a-month interest on the unpaid balance of the loan, or in terms of dollars and cents, a charge of \$6.52 per hundred dollars of loan. In addition to these low-interest rates, the serviceman is given free life insurance on the loan and can use the free counseling services provided by the credit unions.

It is estimated that since the overseas credit unions have been opened, servicemen have saved from \$12 to \$15 million in interest charges over those they formerly paid to high-rate credit extenders.

A serviceman borrowing money for a new car can save from \$200 to \$500 in interest cost by dealing with the credit union.

These are indeed impressive figures and are made more impressive because of the pessimistic outlook forecast for the overseas credit unions, by those who opposed their formation.

For instance, it was suggested that credit unions were not needed in Korea since no more than 1,600 servicemen would join the credit union even after it had been in operation for a number of years. Credit union service was begun in Korea by the San Diego Navy Federal Credit Union on April 1, 1969. Thirteen months later, that credit union, which according to the experts would never gain more than 1,600 members in Korea, had acquired 10,956 members and is growing by several hundred members every week. During the month of April alone, of this year, San Diego Navy Federal Credit Union made more than 2,000 loans to servicemen in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, the credit unions have made this outstanding record in spite of many adversities. It is my hope that, based on the record established by these credit unions, the military services will provide every assistance possible so that the growth of the credit unions will not be hampered and so that they may perform their services in the best possible way.

I am including in my remarks a monthly report of the Defense Credit Union Council on the operation of the overseas credit union program. The report spells out exactly how each credit union is performing, and it should be of interest to the members of this body that the credit unions are providing service and loans to all ranks, with a majority of the loans going to the middle grade enlisted men. The report follows:

PROGRESS REPORT

The following progress report concerning the operations of credit union suboffices in Germany, England, the Philippine Islands, Korea, and Italy is submitted for your information.

Andrews Federal Credit Union began operations at Wiesbaden on 11 March 1968. It has since opened a sub-office at Frankfurt. As of 30 April these sub-offices had acquired 18,790 members, made loans in the amount of \$20,608,965.57, and received share deposits in the total amount of \$8,823,794.28. During the month of April, 895 loans were made to military personnel. These loans were distributed by pay grades as follows:

| | |
|-----|-----|
| E-1 | 1 |
| E-2 | 2 |
| E-3 | 64 |
| E-4 | 232 |
| E-5 | 251 |
| E-6 | 134 |
| E-7 | 68 |
| E-8 | 6 |
| E-9 | 5 |
| W-1 | 2 |
| W-2 | 5 |
| W-3 | 2 |
| O-1 | 13 |
| O-2 | 24 |
| O-3 | 56 |
| O-4 | 17 |
| O-5 | 12 |
| O-6 | 1 |

Fort Belvoir Federal Credit Union began operations at Wurzburg on 1 February 1968. As of 30 April this sub-office had acquired

4,902 members, made loans in the amount of \$3,943,669.02, and received share deposits in the total amount of \$356,105.64. During the month of April, 299 loans were made to military personnel. These loans were distributed by pay grades as follows:

| | |
|-----|----|
| E-2 | 6 |
| E-3 | 17 |
| E-4 | 53 |
| E-5 | 77 |
| E-6 | 47 |
| E-7 | 11 |
| E-8 | 4 |
| E-9 | 2 |
| W-1 | 1 |
| O-1 | 4 |
| O-2 | 51 |
| O-3 | 18 |
| O-4 | 8 |

Pease AFB Federal Credit Union began operations at Ramstein on 15 January 1968. It has since opened sub-offices at Baumholder, Bitburg, and Pirmasens. As of 30 April these sub-offices had acquired 25,323 members, made loans in the amount of \$18,261,207.90, and received share deposits in the amount of \$6,163,474.80. During the month of April these sub-offices made 1,451 loans to military personnel. These loans were distributed by pay grades as follows:

| | |
|-----|-----|
| E-1 | 15 |
| E-2 | 76 |
| E-3 | 242 |
| E-4 | 438 |
| E-5 | 332 |
| E-6 | 212 |
| E-7 | 75 |
| E-8 | 15 |
| O-1 | 30 |
| O-2 | 16 |

Lackland AFB Federal Credit Union began operations in Berlin on 26 December 1967. As of 30 April this sub-office had acquired 2,005 members, made loans in the total amount of \$3,134,356.97, and received share deposits in the amount of \$1,126,560.69. During the month of April this suboffice made 218 loans to military personnel distributed by pay grades as follows:

| | |
|-----|----|
| E-2 | 1 |
| E-3 | 24 |
| E-4 | 57 |
| E-5 | 62 |
| E-6 | 34 |
| E-7 | 19 |
| E-8 | 2 |
| W-3 | 1 |
| W-2 | 1 |
| W-4 | 1 |
| O-1 | 7 |
| O-2 | 1 |
| O-3 | 3 |
| O-4 | 3 |
| O-5 | 2 |

Redstone Federal Credit Union began operations in the Mannheim-Stuttgart area on 15 February 1968. It has since opened a sub-office at Heidelberg. As of 30 April these sub-offices had acquired 18,385 members, made loans in the total amount of \$18,535,754.00, and received share deposits in the amount of \$3,243,708.00. During the month of April these sub-offices made 990 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grades as follows:

| | |
|-----|-----|
| E-1 | 1 |
| E-2 | 4 |
| E-3 | 64 |
| E-4 | 259 |
| E-5 | 328 |
| E-6 | 173 |
| E-7 | 53 |
| E-8 | 9 |
| E-9 | 3 |
| W-1 | 1 |
| W-2 | 11 |
| W-3 | 1 |

| | |
|-----|----|
| O-1 | 20 |
| O-2 | 23 |
| O-3 | 19 |
| O-4 | 9 |
| O-5 | 5 |
| O-6 | 2 |

Finance Center Federal Credit Union began operations at Furth on 15 February 1968. It has since opened sub-offices at Bamberg, Ansbach, and Plesheim. As of 30 April these sub-offices had acquired 9,137 members, made loans in the amount of \$5,793,719.95, and received share deposits in the amount of \$1,072,880.32. During the month of April these sub-offices made 254 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grades as follows:

| | |
|-----|----|
| 1-2 | 2 |
| E-3 | 5 |
| E-4 | 46 |
| E-5 | 76 |
| E-6 | 54 |
| E-7 | 13 |
| E-8 | 6 |
| E-9 | 3 |
| W-2 | 3 |
| W-3 | 1 |
| O-1 | 19 |
| O-2 | 11 |
| O-3 | 12 |
| O-4 | 3 |

Kessler AFB Federal Credit Union began operations at Lakenheath, England on 15 November 1968. It has since opened sub-offices at South Ruislip, Bentwater, Whetherfield, and RAF Alconbury. As of 30 April these sub-offices had acquired 6,561 members, made loans in the amount of \$6,267,137.84, and received share deposits in the amount of \$906,100.54. During the month of April these sub-offices made 635 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

| | |
|-----|-----|
| E-2 | 3 |
| E-3 | 146 |
| E-4 | 178 |
| E-5 | 153 |
| E-6 | 62 |
| E-7 | 32 |
| E-8 | 5 |
| E-9 | 3 |
| O-2 | 10 |
| O-3 | 29 |
| O-4 | 9 |
| O-5 | 3 |
| O-6 | 2 |

Barksdale AFB Federal Credit Union began operations at Clark Air Base in the Philippine Islands on 20 December 1968. As of 30 April this sub-office had acquired 14,507 members, made loans in the amount of \$9,672,979.40, and received share deposits in the amount of \$5,244,573.69. During the month of April this sub-office made 940 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

| | |
|-----|-----|
| E-1 | 2 |
| E-2 | 6 |
| E-3 | 247 |
| E-4 | 237 |
| E-5 | 221 |
| E-6 | 90 |
| E-7 | 60 |
| E-8 | 10 |
| E-9 | 4 |
| O-1 | 2 |
| O-2 | 17 |
| O-3 | 31 |
| O-4 | 10 |
| O-5 | 1 |
| O-6 | 2 |

San Diego Navy Federal Credit Union began operations at Seoul, Korea on April 1, 1969. It has since opened sub-offices at Taegu, Camp Casey and Osan AFB. As of 30 April these sub-offices had acquired 10,956 mem-

bers, made loans in the amount of \$4,720,669.51, and received share deposits in the amount of \$1,622,901.13. During the month of April these sub-offices made 2,003 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

| | |
|-----|-----|
| E-1 | 3 |
| E-2 | 52 |
| E-3 | 367 |
| E-4 | 656 |
| E-5 | 381 |
| E-6 | 225 |
| E-7 | 114 |
| E-8 | 50 |
| E-9 | 7 |
| W-1 | 5 |
| W-2 | 12 |
| W-3 | 4 |
| W-4 | 5 |
| O-1 | 15 |
| O-2 | 52 |
| O-3 | 33 |
| O-4 | 16 |
| O-5 | 6 |

Fairchild AFB Federal Credit Union began operations at Aviano Air Force Base, Italy on May 19, 1969. It has since opened a sub-office at Vicenza. As of 30 April these sub-offices had acquired 2,616 members, made loans in the amount of \$2,661,657.96, and received share deposits in the amount of \$592,401.23. During the month of April these sub-offices made 305 loans to military personnel and these loans were distributed by pay grade as follows:

| | |
|-----|-----|
| E-2 | 8 |
| E-3 | 40 |
| E-4 | 105 |
| E-5 | 63 |
| E-6 | 44 |
| E-7 | 19 |
| E-8 | 3 |
| E-9 | 2 |
| O-1 | 1 |
| O-2 | 7 |
| O-3 | 9 |
| O-5 | 1 |
| W-O | 3 |

As of 30 April 1970 the sub-offices had signed up 113,182 members, received share deposits in the amount of \$29,152,500.32, and made loans in the amount of \$93,600,148.12.

BABE RUTH BASEBALL

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday we will be asked to consider a special order for Babe Ruth baseball, a program that involves youngsters 13, 14, and 15 years old in the Nation's greatest pastime.

We, in Oregon, are no strangers to this fine program. Thousands of Oregonians participate each year in Babe Ruth baseball activities. In 1968, the city of Klamath Falls with a population of some 17,000, was host to the Babe Ruth World Series. Backers agreed it was among the most successful tournaments ever held, and that the city's hospitality and facilities just could not be beat.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of Oregon's participation in this vital sports program and I would like to urge my colleagues to express their wholehearted support for this special order.

A MOST SUCCESSFUL OPERATION

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's candor and forthrightness in approaching the American people has been demonstrated many times since he took office. He has been seen to be a President who will lay out the facts, both good and bad, clearly before the Nation and let the people judge for themselves the wisdom of his decisions.

Therefore, it is significant that in his speech on Cambodia last week, the President called this the most successful operation of this long and difficult war. The facts by which he supported this statement are indeed convincing, for from military, logistic, and psychological points of view, the enemy's position has been seriously weakened by the bold U.S. action.

I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Dallas Morning News, discussing various factors which make Cambodia "most successful":

MOST SUCCESSFUL

If there is one thing that the Southeast Area war has taught us, it is to beware of premature self-congratulation. The President didn't claim a decisive victory in his talk to the nation Wednesday night, but he did say that the Cambodian operation has so far been "the most successful operation of this long and difficult war."

The claim seems amply justified by the facts. In no other battle in the war has the enemy been dealt such a setback at so low a cost in casualties to the free world.

In capturing hundreds of tons of weapons, ammunition and rice, the Cambodian sweep has taken from the Communists in one month almost as many of these vital necessities as were captured in all of Vietnam during all of last year.

These are the means that would have been used by the Communists to kill American and South Vietnamese soldiers, to destroy South Vietnamese towns and murder South Vietnamese civilians. Deprived of these vital supplies, the Communists must wait for a new buildup before they can make new offensives from Cambodia.

For President Nixon, the Cambodian operation was a calculated move to protect not only Saigon but the safety of American troops still in Vietnam. So far it has proved to be a resounding success, marred only by the political scars inflicted by American leftists in this country.

If the sudden sweep across the hitherto-untouched sanctuaries was a shock to the North Vietnamese, the success of the operation has been an even greater disappointment to the group in this country who seem to hope for an American defeat in Cambodia. Such a defeat is necessary to prove them right and it is likely that we will see more of the sort of low-rating of this success that has appeared in various statements and analyses by the usual spokesmen for the group.

However, these feeble attempts have failed to convince. The Cambodian operation is not yet over and the communists forces can be expected to try to give their American comrades a communist victory to work with. But so far the operation has marked up clear advantages for our side.

In addition to the military and logistic

blows dealt the Communists, they have also been forced to reexamine some of their mistaken assumptions about the U.S. The Reds clearly believe that the President's warnings against continued step-ups in Red aggression were only window dressing for the home folks. They clearly believed that the Cambodian sanctuaries were as safe from vulnerable supply dumps as they have been in years past. Now they must acknowledge that both these beliefs were wrong.

Another plus is tremendous improvement in morale and combat effectiveness among the South Vietnamese units. The South Vietnamese fighting spirit has surprised their allies and their critics alike.

Yet another encouraging development is the beginning of a working cooperation among three nations that have traditionally been bitter enemies, South Vietnam, Cambodia and Thailand. This is a sign of progress, not only for the present war but for postwar development of the region.

That time of peaceful postwar progress still seems far off in the future but not so far as it did six weeks ago.

SALE OF JETS TO ISRAEL

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on January 20 of this year I wrote the President urging him to reconsider the course this Nation was forging in its relations with Israel, the last bastion of democracy in the Middle East. The statement of December 9, 1969 issued by Secretary of State Rogers left no doubt in my mind that the administration was all too eager to trade the blood of gallant Israelis for American oil.

My appeal to the President at that time was that the United States had a vital interest in the survival of Israel in the Middle East and the wiser way to peace would be to seek an accommodation which would guarantee Israel's security instead of jeopardizing it by calling for indirect negotiations to a peace settlement, as the Rogers proposal did.

Now the situation in the Middle East has grown even worse than it was before. The Soviet Union has continued to pump massive shipments of arms, military hardware, planes, munitions, boats, tanks, artillery, and supporting equipment to Egypt and her Arab neighbors until the balance of power in the Middle East is threatened once again. These massive supplies of arms are in the hands of those Nations which have vowed to destroy the State of Israel and her people in a war of attrition.

Mr. Speaker, I believe now, more than ever, that the United States must respond to the latest escalation of tension in the Middle East by furnishing Israel with the weapons she so desperately needs to put the balance of power back on a more even scale.

This week I joined with several distinguished colleagues in the House in sending a letter to the President urging him to sell American Phantom and Skyhawk jets to Israel. It is all too evident that Israel cannot, with her planes, surmount the dangers of the newly remodeled Mig-21's now in Arab hands. Only F-4 Phantoms and A-4 Skyhawks can aid

Israel. France continues to refuse to supply her with the planes Israel has already paid for.

The arms embargo imposed by the United States on the Middle East nations has failed in its intent. Right after the June 19, 1967, 6-day war the Soviet Union started to resupply Egypt and her neighbors with huge quantities of weapons, and the French followed suit, thus negating our policy which was formulated in the hope that other nations would impose a similar arms restriction on the countries of the Middle East.

The results of the Soviet and French arms supply to the Arabs are plain to see. Daily clashes along all of Israel's borders, artillery barrages on Israeli towns and counterattacks are adding to a constant buildup of tensions in the Middle East. Negotiations are a moot question. The Arabs refuse to negotiate, and Ambassador Gunnar Jarring intermediary efforts have been met with stone wall responses from the Arab states. Our humanitarian antiwar pleas to the Soviet Union have fallen on deaf ears. Not only has the Soviet Union failed to work in the interests of peace, but her actions have indicated a thirst for war between the Arab States and Israel.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to me that the Soviet Union will not curtail its supply of weapons to the Middle East belligerents. It is past time for action on our part. The United States must act swiftly to sell jets to Israel.

The sale of jets to Israel is not a commitment of American fighting men or money, but it is an indication of our willingness to help this brave nation provide for its own defense against heavy odds. I cannot emphasize too strongly the strategic importance of a democratic ally in the Middle East. For centuries the Russians have desired the warm-water ports of the Mediterranean. Let us not make this dream of Soviet dominance in the Mediterranean a reality through inaction.

Let us not, Mr. Speaker, sacrifice the lives of countless Israelis in a war of attrition because we stubbornly pursued an outdated, sterile policy in the Middle East. If we do, it is entirely possible that we will upset the entire balance of power and containment in Europe that we have been working so hard to build since World War II.

The intrusion of Soviet pilots and other Soviet military personnel in Egypt has significant meaning to the intense dangers of further escalation in the Middle East crisis. Let us respond to the challenge by sending Israel the jets and weapons they so desperately need to defend themselves in their hour of need.

THE PLIGHT OF TRANSIENT WASHINGTONIANS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Washington, D.C., is in part, a lovely city, is a home of Presidents, Ambassadors, Senators, Congressmen,

hawks, doves, pigeons, the very rich, and the very poor. It is unlike any other city in the world. The decisions made by its famous residents affect the rest of the population on this planet. One distinguishing characteristic about the people of Washington is the lack of permanence. Rarely does one find a person who was born here and rarely does one find a person who has any intention of spending a lifetime in our Nation's Capital.

Due to this lack of permanence by a large segment of its population, I feel that many of its people are not really involved with the type of activity that makes a city a community. People are in "their own little world" and only on rare occasions are they concerned with the future of Washington.

This "transient psychology" is transferred to the merchants and businesses in Washington. They are aware that today's customer will probably be tomorrow's ex-Washingtonian. Any intention of cultivating a lasting relationship with a Government official, a Congressman, a civil servant, a salesman, or a soldier is strictly unintentional. Due to this attitude, which obviously is not prevalent with all of those who deal with the public, one does not receive the best service in Washington. Usually, one visit to a particular garage or store is enough to keep a prospective customer from returning to that particular garage or store, even if it is conveniently located or its prices are reasonable.

An interesting, though not surprising, article appeared in the May 31, 1970, Los Angeles Times. I feel that such an article is not doing much to encourage travel to Washington by those in the hinterland. This is a shame, for Washington, D.C., is, in part, a lovely city.

The article follows:

FTC CHIEF LEARNS CUSTOMERS' PLIGHT FIRSTHAND

(By Marlene Cimons)

WASHINGTON.—Caspar W. Weinberger has learned as chairman of the Federal Trade Commission that nobody is safe from consumer fraud. Not even Caspar W. Weinberger.

"We've been the victims several times since we moved here," said the man who is considered one of the country's top watchdogs in the area of consumer rights. "And all the incidents, naturally, have been reported to me by my wife. . . ."

"We've had more go wrong with the appliances in this house, with everything in this house," he said. "California certainly has spoiled us. Living here has become a matter of survival."

They were both sitting in the living room of their small yellow town house on Capitol Hill. In front of them, through the window and across the street, loomed the large gray granite Library of Congress. Behind them, through glass doors, a swimming pool and barbecue area gleamed in the sunlight. A cheerful house, comfortably furnished. Not a single sign of the aggravation that went into it.

It all started back in December when the Weinbergers moved here from California. The first week, the pipes froze.

"Obviously nothing like that has ever happened before," Mrs. Weinberger said. "So I called the plumber. He couldn't do anything and he left. So I thawed it out myself."

How? She smiled. "I just started a little fire."

WASN'T GOING TO PAY

But that wasn't the end of it. "Ten days later I got a bill from the plumber," she said. "So I wrote him a letter—this time I

didn't deal with the FTC. I just told him flatly that I wasn't going to pay. I never heard from him again."

"That wasn't all," Weinberger said. "When you go into a store in California and order something, it's usually delivered within a day or two. Not here. We ordered some lamps here and told the salesman we'd bring our car around to pick them up."

"The salesman was aghast—he asked us if we knew how far away their warehouse was. No, we said. It was 9 miles—and it would take at least three weeks to ship them 9 miles."

"This was our introduction to merchandising practices in Washington," she said.

And then came the Washington furniture stores where the price mysteriously climbed between the time the Weinbergers looked at something and the time several hours later when they called back to order it. "It happened twice at different branches of the same store," he said. "We called and said we wanted the desk. And suddenly it was 25% higher."

These may not have been major swindles, but Weinberger feels they are typical of the day-to-day shopping hassles any consumer might face. And although Weinberger didn't like them one bit, they still served as a first-hand help in teaching him the importance of his job.

Somehow, the Weinbergers came through it. But the bitter memories still linger on.

"Washington is an interesting city," Weinberger said. "Maybe even a fun city. But it does take patience. And I wouldn't say there was any chance of either of us getting Potomac Fever."

SEVEN-YEAR TERM

The Weinbergs have seven years to acclimate themselves to life in Washington; the length of his term on the commission. And despite the pains of relocation, Weinberger is finding the job challenging and interesting.

"We have many important responsibilities in consumer protection and anti-trust," he said. "It is our job to try to prevent unfair business practices and to enforce truth-in-labeling and truth-in-advertising."

The commission has certain responsibilities in all three branches of government, he said, but his reason for being is a very simple one. "The consumer is asking for certain things," he said. "He wants to buy a product that's safe and usable, and repairable if it breaks down. We're here to try and make sure that's what he gets."

Weinberger, an outgoing, darkhaired man of 52, known to his friends as Cap, assumed his office Jan. 13 after having served since March, 1968, as California's director of finance. A native of San Francisco, he is an attorney who served six years in the State Legislature beginning in 1952.

In 1958 he was defeated in a statewide Republican primary for the office of attorney general. He is a former newspaper columnist (he used to write a twice-weekly column on state government), and for nine years he moderated a local public affairs program for the San Francisco educational television station.

In 1960 he was a delegate to the Republican National Convention, and two years later he was named state GOP chairman. He has worked together with President Nixon on all of the latter's political campaigns.

Weinberger is still busy with what he calls on-the-job training, since he had no real experience in the consumer protection area before.

"Mr. Nixon told me he felt my unfamiliarity was one of my strongest assets," he said. "I tried to tell him there was a difference between an open mind and an empty mind, but he just wouldn't listen."

VA REBUTTAL TO STAGED LIFE MAGAZINE ARTICLE

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

MR. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have long been interested in making certain that our veterans with service-connected injuries and illnesses have care and treatment second to none.

This year the budget for the Veterans' Administration is the highest in our history. I believe this administration, and most officials and employees, are striving conscientiously to provide the best possible medical and hospital services.

The May 22, 1970, issue of Life magazine carried an article which shocked me. Although the photographs and story obviously portrayed only a few of the 800,000 patients and was clearly planned to discredit an important Federal institution, I wanted to obtain the views of the Veterans' Administration.

In response to my inquiries, I have received the following letter from Donald E. Johnson, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. Every Member of the Congress, every veteran, every citizen ought to read this letter.

The Life magazine article was totally unfair, demoralizing to the Veterans' Administration, and detrimental to the veteran who needs hospital care.

Life magazine will not retract its article because it was done purposely and much of it was staged. The damage cannot be undone. But the other side of the story ought to be told.

The letter referred to follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1970.

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TALCOTT: In reply to your inquiry of May 25, I am glad to have the opportunity to provide comment on the staged photographic coverage and accompanying distorted narrative that appeared in the Life magazine issue of May 22, 1970. The article serves to needlessly alarm present and prospective patients; to discredit the competent and dedicated staffs at VA's 166 hospitals, and to make more difficult the recruitment of medical staff the article says we so sorely need.

The two photographs on the cover of Life tell a story of designed contrast that should be evident to every reader. The top photo (in color) shows happy and smiling servicemen during a moment of respite on the Cambodian front. The lower photo (a dimly lit and grainy study in plain black and white) depicts a VA patient sitting in an attitude of dejection. The latter picture, although by no stretch of the imagination a typical scene in any VA hospital, does carry out the article's theme, "From Vietnam to a VA Hospital—Assignment to Neglect."

The same unsmiling patient, who plays the leading critic role in the article, crops up again in the lead photograph. This is a shower room scene with the notation that the veteran "waits helplessly to be dried."

On May 22, 1970, Dr. A. M. Kleinman, Director of the Bronx VA Hospital, wrote the Life Editor that, "Actually he (the patient) had been wheeled under the shower by a

nursing assistant assigned to this task, and after he had been partly shampooed with soap, the assistant was asked to step aside by the photographer who wished to take this picture. The fact is that no patient is left under the shower after completion of the bath. All are wheeled away and dried immediately. This picture, like the others to be described, was posed to illustrate a point, but the point illustrated is untruthful as in this instance, or a partial or distorted truth in others." In fact, nurses, attendants and other VA helpers at the Bronx VA Hospital were often asked to stand outside camera range during the photographing—apparently to heighten the impression of patient neglect. Of 10 Bronx pictures in the article, VA employees are clearly visible in only two of them despite the fact the hospital staff numbers more than 1,600.

We now have many affidavits from reliable eyewitnesses in the Bronx VA Hospital telling in detail exactly how the pictures that did appear in the article were engineered far beyond mere normal direction.

I stated before the Subcommittee for Independent Offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development of the Senate Appropriations Committee on June 3, 1970, "We will be glad to submit these affidavits . . . or to summarize them picture-by-picture . . ."

In further support of my public statements, the New York Sunday News of May 31, 1970, reported an interview it held with the aforementioned veteran-patient who was featured in most of the Life pictures.

The News story read, in part, "the paralyzed Marine on whom the article focused, acknowledged this week that some photos were posed, but asserted that they were justified in that they reflected conditions in the hospital over the last 21 months."

The News also reported that this veteran acknowledged his pictures were exaggerated.

In support of my statement that the Life article has damaged the morale of many VA employees, I call the following to your attention.

A head nurse in one VA hospital wrote the President she had not been able to sleep for two nights because of the magazine article. She believes in veterans. Her father is a World War I veteran . . . her two brothers and the nurse and her husband are veterans of the Second World War . . . her only son is serving in the Navy on a missile submarine in the present conflict.

She describes the article in Life as "the last straw." Her letter said, "I'm writing to you, Mr. President, because I'm so demoralized to think that a well-known magazine in these great United States could or would print such a story without checking the true facts."

This nurse—one of our best—is on the verge of resigning, and she works at a hospital where we are trying desperately to recruit more nurses for our patients.

VA contact representatives regularly visit every military hospital in the nation to assist soon-to-be veterans in claiming all of their VA benefits. During the last fortnight they report real apprehension and alarm among military patients destined for transfer to VA hospitals. One father flew hundreds of miles to plead with military hospital authorities not to transfer his young son into VA hands.

With reference in the Life article to rats at the Bronx hospital, there has never been a single verifiable report of a rat ever having been seen in the long history of the hospital. This is attested to by long-time employees as well as commercial exterminators who are called in periodically (as they are in many large institutions) to guard against the intrusion of mice.

In a telegram to Life Editor Thomas Grif-fith I noted that, "The Life reporter held a nearly 90-minute interview with me in my capacity as head of the VA. What survived of this in-depth interview was a single two-line sentence in the final article, and even this one sentence contribution was airily dismissed in the next sentence of the story."

"Life staffers visited the Washington, D.C. VA Hospital on three separate occasions, talked freely to many patients including severely disabled Vietnam veterans, and shot scores of photographs, many of a 22-year-old Vietnam amputee in his treatment routine."

"Could the fact that all of these veterans voluntarily praised VA medical care be the reason that not one word or one picture about these veterans appeared in Life?"

"Could it be that of the 800,000 veterans treated each year the one complaining patient featured in Life better fitted the story Life wanted to tell?"

"The truth is that each month VA hospitals receive literally hundreds of unsolicited letters from veterans and their loved ones expressing gratitude for the excellent VA care these veterans received."

In my statement to the press on May 25, I pointed out that "the Council of Deans of the American Association of Medical Colleges—at a regularly scheduled meeting held here in Washington (May 21)—unanimously went on record in two particulars."

"The Council, composed of the Deans of the 101 medical schools in America that set the pace for the best there is in medicine, condemned—as completely unjustified—what that body referred to as intemperate and inaccurate attacks on the VA medical program that have recently appeared in some news media, and expressed the Council's confidence in the continuing ability of VA hospitals to render high quality medical care."

I also wish to note that in its January 1970 report the Joint Commission on Hospital Accreditation of Hospitals singled out the Bronx hospital thusly: "The medical staff and administration of the Bronx VA Hospital are commended for the evidence shown of continued high quality care given to the patients in this facility."

The approval by the Commission is the highest accolade a hospital may receive. Its report followed a survey at the hospital just last December.

The Joint Commission is a survey team under the auspices of the nation's four leading medical organizations—the American College of Surgeons, the American College of Physicians, the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association.

The Joint Committee conducts surveys at all hospitals, both private and public, to see if they meet high standards of patient care. The accreditation by the Commission is the highest accolade a hospital may receive.

I hope the facts I have mentioned will reassure you in regard to the Life article.

The VA is now operating with the highest medical budget in history, and the President has asked Congress for \$210,000,000 more than even this record sum for the fiscal year starting July 1, 1970. With this extra money we will be able to hire some 5,700 more medical employees, bringing such employment to the highest peak in history.

All of this is not to say the VA program cannot be improved. We must, and we will, seek constant improvement, for we think the veterans who have defended their nation in time of war deserve the best possible medical care.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. JOHNSON,
Administrator.

ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON—STATE'S
GAIN IS HEW'S LOSS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Elliot L. Richardson as the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is a fitting successor to discredited and removed Robert H. Finch.

Certainly Mr. Finch's qualifications as a personal confidant and friend of the President are trivial indeed to the credentials of Mr. Richardson.

In addition to being a Harvard-trained lawyer and a law clerk to former Justice Felix Frankfurter, he has the experience of being a crusader in civil rights matters. In 1965, while serving as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Massachusetts, Mr. Richardson announced at a Boston Common rally that "he would go to Alabama to join a group of friends and fellow citizens in a pilgrimage to Selma." The occasion is said to have arisen out of the tragic and mysterious death of a Boston clergyman, the Reverend James J. Reeb—a white Unitarian minister, without a pulpit, whose occupation at the time of his death is said to have been rent collector in an integrated housing project in the Boston area. Little is known as to who ordered Reeb to Alabama or what "rent he was collecting there."

Mr. Richardson comes to HEW fresh from his position as Under Secretary of State, and bearing a grudge because he was not consulted on the Cambodian campaign.

While at the State Department, his great contribution to diplomacy was that of pacifying the young Turks of Foggy Bottom in their demands for personnel reforms. He saw to it that the administrator was replaced.

Mr. Richardson, at the State Department, was rated as the strongest voice at the White House, despite Secretary Rogers' long and close personal relationship with the President.

Secretary Richardson's specialty has been the strategic arms limitation talks—SALT—to disarm the American people.

A related newsclipping follows:
[From the Washington Post, June 7, 1970]

STATE LOSING A POTENT VOICE

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The switch of Elliot Lee Richardson to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare was so sudden that Secretary of State William P. Rogers only yesterday was considering possibilities for the soon to be vacant post of Under Secretary.

The switch may be good news for the badly demoralized HEW because of the managerial skills of the slow-speaking but tough-minded Richardson, a Massachusetts "modern" Republican. But his departure deprives State of what many consider the department's strongest voice in the administration at a time when morale has badly sagged because the department seemed to have minimal influence in the Cambodian affair.

At State, Richardson was depicted as "half

exhilarated, half sad" at the switch in jobs. He has been especially admired in the department for his close working relationship with the key Nixon aide on foreign policy, White House adviser Henry A. Kissinger.

Richardson worked in HEW during the last two years of the Eisenhower administration as assistant secretary, ending up as Acting Secretary for several months, before he went home to enter Massachusetts politics.

In 1962 he lost a GOP primary race for Massachusetts attorney general to Edward Brooke, now a senator.

In 1964 he won the lieutenant governorship, and in 1966 was elected attorney general.

A Harvard-trained lawyer, Richardson was a law clerk to Justice Felix Frankfurter and to appellate Judge Learned Hand. In World War II he landed in Normandy on D-Day as an Army litter bearer, was twice wounded, won the Bronze Star and rose from private to first lieutenant.

His medical relationship, however, goes deeper than his wartime experience.

Richardson's father taught surgery at Harvard Medical School and was on the staff at Massachusetts General Hospital, of which Richardson was to become corporation secretary. Both his grandfathers were medical men and two brothers are in medicine.

The new HEW boss once was an aide to Senator Leverett Saltonstall (R-Mass.) and came to HEW in 1957 as assistant secretary to handle legislative problems. Before that for some months he had been an HEW consultant on legislation.

At HEW Richardson tried unsuccessfully to sell Congress on the Eisenhower program of trimming the so-called "impacted aid" to public schools. But he also favored more funds to combat juvenile delinquency though President Eisenhower had dropped that item from his budget.

Richardson plugged both for salary increases and better personnel at the National Institutes of Health, part of the HEW complex.

In 1965, as lieutenant governor of Massachusetts he announced at a Boston Commons rally that he would go to Alabama "to join a group of friends and fellow citizens in a pilgrimage to Selma." The occasion was the slaying in Alabama of a Boston clergyman, the Rev. James J. Reeb.

These bits and pieces of Richardson's career put him in the liberal side of the Nixon administration, much as the man he succeeds, Secretary Robert H. Finch.

Whether Richardson can control the huge HEW bureaucracy remains to be tested. His associates at State, where the bureaucracy is much smaller but also often unhappy over policy, were stressing Richardson's executive ability yesterday.

One said, of Richardson that "he thinks managerially."

At HEW, where personnel now numbers about 110,000, or about triple what it was when Richardson was there, Finch has been criticized as a poor administrator. HEW assistant secretaries have felt cut out of policy determination. Finch has relied instead on what several yesterday called "his palace guard."

One high HEW official commented that Richardson was moving over with an impressive reputation as an administrator. He added that "it could be a great thing for this place, tighten us up."

Richardson came to State as the personal selection of Rogers after he turned down an offer of the HEW undersecretaryship. Richardson had served as U.S. Attorney of Massachusetts in 1959-61 when Rogers was President Eisenhower's Attorney General. As U.S. Attorney, Richardson prosecuted the touchy

case of Bernard Goldfine, the industrialist who got President Eisenhower's White House Chief of Staff, Sherman Adams, into so much trouble he had to resign.

Richardson came to State with no foreign policy background but he was a quick learner. Indeed, so high is his reputation at State that the professionals have hoped that he would succeed Rogers as Secretary assuming President Nixon's re-election. Rogers has publicly said he will serve only one term.

Some Richardson associates yesterday were saying that his departure from State was a "a disaster." Richardson himself was silent, beyond his brief White House remarks yesterday.

At State, Richardson has been widely rated as the strongest departmental voice at the White House, despite Rogers' long and close personal relationship with President Nixon. One of his specialties has been the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT).

While names of some current State Department officials were being mentioned yesterday as possible Richardson successors, Rogers' intention was reported to be to bring in an outsider.

[From the New York Times, June 9, 1970]

IN THE NATION: A GOOD MOVE BY
MR. NIXON
(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, June 8.—Whatever the deep-seated motives of those involved, which may be some time in emerging, the Richardson-for-Finch swap at the troubled Department of Health, Education and Welfare looks like an intelligent move by the President and maybe even for the country. This could be canceled out if the new Under Secretary of State is not chosen with care.

There seem to be at least three ways in which this high-level shuffle is of benefit. The first lies in the obvious fact that H.E.W. was in a real mess—with major posts unfilled, damaging resignations being tendered, revolt brewing among civil servants of all grades, and Secretary Finch worn down by all these cares. Underscoring all that were the difficulties of the department's substantive programs—school desegregation slowed or repatterned, health programs held down in the budget, and the welfare reform—the most innovative Nixon domestic program—in trouble in Congress.

Elliot Richardson, the new Secretary, has shown himself at the State Department to be a forceful administrator and a quick learner. With former experience in H.E.W. and a term as Massachusetts Attorney General under his belt, he has a good background for his tough new assignment. In the state H.E.W. is in, it can hardly fail to benefit from a new hand at the tiller, particularly one as firm as Mr. Richardson's appears to be.

LIBERAL REPUBLICAN ELEMENT

But the Richardson appointment brings another gain that is mostly promise. He has solid credentials in previous stages of the civil rights movement, and is one of those "modern Republicans," as they used to be called in the Eisenhower era, who knows his party's deepest traditions derive from Lincoln. As such, he should be a strong and needed force in the Administration for a progressive desegregation policy.

He will represent, more directly than could Mr. Finch—a Californian always associated with Mr. Nixon—the once-strong Eastern and liberal elements of the Republican party, perhaps even re-establishing some of their lost confidence in the Administration. With their backing, with his freedom from any entangling personal relationship with the President, and with the high standing he earned at State, Mr. Richardson might prove a different breed of cat for Attorney General John Mitchell to tangle with in the inner councils.

Finally, Mr. Finch's shift to the White

House staff, in addition to providing Mr. Richardson the kind of essential support at the top that Mr. Finch himself seldom had, might well have good general effect. More than most in this Administration, he has moved around the country, keeping as much in touch with it as he could, even daring to make some commencement addresses in the wake of the Cambodian uproar. And while he was never the "liberal" some publicity suggested, and did not claim to be, he is still a good deal to the left of Mr. Mitchell and Vice President Agnew, and considerably more knowledgeable politically than either.

HOPE FOR SOUND COUNSEL

In his new role, relieved of administrative and policy battles, Mr. Finch may provide the sound political counsel that seems to have been lacking in the making of the Cambodian mess, in the Carswell nomination, and that has been most conspicuous by its absence from the Administration's handling of students and blacks. It is not even too much to hope that, in the White House, the scope and soundness of Mr. Finch's counsel to the President might be as great as they appeared to be in Mr. Nixon's '60-68 campaigns.

This leaves the question of a successor for Mr. Richardson at the State Department, and it is a good omen that Secretary of State Rogers is talking of bringing in someone from "outside." That would be useful for more reasons than that the present State Department organization is overloaded at the top with career officers of the kind who have always approved the Vietnam war and who, in the most recent revelation of this mentality, were happy to pay the Thais \$50 million a year to bolster the cause with one combat division.

It is even more important that a new voice and a fresh outlook be injected into the high councils of the Administration, after it has been a year and a half in office. Vested interest in the success of a policy of one's own making, ambition, sycophancy, even simple fatigue, as time goes along, tend to fix any Administration inflexibly on an established policy line; and none ever suffered from having someone free of all these handicaps move in near the top and ask a few skeptical questions.

"RUSTY" YARNALL NAMED TO
HALL OF FAME

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a most pleasant and proud moment when a Member of the Congress can recognize in the presence of his colleagues the accomplishments of a man such as "Rusty" Yarnall. Waldo W. "Rusty" Yarnall is the athletic director of Lowell Technological Institute of Lowell, Mass. He has experienced a long and memorable career in the field of baseball, and I am honored to be able to call him my good friend. It is thus with a special sense of pride that I offer him tribute and congratulations today for being awarded a place in the Hall of Fame of the American Association of College Baseball Coaches, the highest award in baseball other than that of professional baseball's Hall of Fame.

"Rusty" Yarnall is the first in Lowell to receive this honor, and I join his many friends and admirers, both within

and out of the sports world, in extending sincere and heartfelt congratulations and in wishing him the greatest happiness in the years ahead. I include his article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, May 29, 1970]

YARNALL REACHES TOP

(By Frank Sharkey)

LOWELL.—If you see a glow in the sky over the Athletic office of Lowell Tech for the next two years, don't be a bit surprised. There's a very happy and proud gentleman sitting in the seat of the Athletic Director with the name of Waldo W. "Rusty" Yarnall who has received word from the American Association of College Baseball coaches that he has been named to the Hall of Fame in that organization, the highest award in baseball other than that of professional Baseball's Hall of Fame and the first in Lowell.

Was Rusty a happy man? "Oh yes," he said with a broad smile. "I've been on cloud nine since I received the word of my selection. It made me so happy when I opened up the letter. I let out a whoop that startled my secretary."

Yarnall will be retiring in two years after having served Lowell Tech for 43 years, 10 of them as Athletic Director. When asked how his reaction to the last two years will be of controlling athletics at LTI and knowing what he has had and what he expects of the future, Rusty just smiled and knew that his rewards to the sports world especially his great career in baseball were rewarded beyond his expectations and now there will be an aura of sunshine and happiness around him through the next two years.

"I'm just so glad I was alive to enjoy what has transpired through the last few months since I found out I had been nominated," stated Yarnall. "I was happy, of course knowing I had been chosen as a nominee, but there was some apprehension on the selection."

Maybe Rusty thought so, but according to some big names in collegiate baseball circles he was a shoo-in.

Ethan Allen, head baseball coach at Yale wrote and said, "You can't miss with what we all owe you for your dedication."

Danny Litwhiler, Michigan State baseball coach. "Your record proves your ability." "Justly deserved," wrote Marty Karow, Ohio State.

Dutch Fehning, Stanford University, "You have my vote all the way." Tony Lupien of Dartmouth cited Rusty's background as speaking for itself.

There were more too. Archie Allen of Springfield College a long-time friend of Yarnall's said, "Desirable and qualifications make you a natural pick." And finally Cap Trimm of Iowa State topped off the list of accolades with his "high recommendation."

If this wasn't a falling in of old friends to honor a fellow coach then grass is red. There were telegrams, phone calls and even a letter from Rusty's wife's 83-year-old aunt who gained enough strength to wish a great gentleman a congratulation.

This was listed as his greatest thrill in all that has happened throughout his trials and tribulations in sports.

From Rusty's 24 straight pitching wins off the high school grounds of Swarthmore, Pennsylvania in 1918-1920, two winning seasons on the campus of the University of Vermont (1923-24), with the Philadelphia Phillies part of the 1926 season. He also played with York in the old New York-Pa. league; for Montreal in the International League; Martinsburg in the Blue Ridge; Jeannette in the Mid-Atlantic; Crisfield in the New Shore and Portland (Maine) in the New England League, he has blazed a trail of glory that matches few men of his calibre.

This memorable career finally brought Rusty to managing Lowell in the New Eng-

land League and then Lowell Tech was fortunate enough to gain the services of Rusty as baseball coach in the spring of 1928 which brought about this compatible marriage of superb effort and spirit with the institute until he replaced himself with Jim Stone in 1967.

This record involved a period of 39 years with a mark of 188 wins and 268 losses, very creditable for the type of material Rusty had and the strict academic programs the athletes had to endure.

In 1960 Rusty was honored by being admitted to the Helms Foundation College Baseball Hall of Fame, has his 25-year plaque as having served on the Rules Committee of the AACBC and holds membership card No. 198.

There were memories that went through Rusty's mind while talking like a kid with a new toy about his selection. His happiness was evident. He remembered 1922 when he was a halfback with Vermont and his team was the only Vermont football team ever to beat Dartmouth.

There were times of sorrow when he knew he could go no further in professional baseball when a previous football injury had taken the zip off his once-famous fastball. But Rusty being the solid type he was just forged ahead and made do with what he had in knowledge of the game.

These intangible items make for a hall of famer and Professor Yarnall is one of the very few throughout the nation that can look back and know with some regrets and enough happy moments to know it was well worth it.

"I have been busy getting letters out to those who helped along the way," said Rusty modestly. "I have had many nice things happen to me, but wow, I just can't put into words what it means. You set goals and some are made. You try your hardest and maybe, just maybe, the rewards are rich."

Yes, the years have been good to Rusty Yarnall. He has slowed down a little, but the speed of his knowledge and fortitude keeps him in step with the times.

If ever a devoted man deserved such an honor, then we say, Rusty Yarnall, the overseer of athletics at Lowell Tech got what he deserved.

The names of those selected for the Hall of Fame will be announced at the College World Series around June 12 at Omaha, Nebraska, and Rusty will get his plaque in January 1971 at a date set up by the committee for a dinner and ceremonies appropriate of the honor.

A NATION OF FLAGS

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, June 14, is Flag Day in the United States and year after year this annual observance becomes more widely recognized.

This past Monday an editorial appeared in the Johnson City Press-Chronicle, one of the outstanding daily newspapers in my congressional district, outlining briefly the history of Old Glory.

I am certain the editorial will prove interesting reading for those persons who may have forgotten the flag's history and also for those who have never known its history.

The editorial referred to follows:

A NATION OF FLAGS

Betsy Ross might fumble her needle in astonishment if she could see on Flag Day (June 14) this year what she supposedly started.

From sea to shining sea, the nation is becoming bespangled and striped as never before. More Americans than ever are rallying around the flag as a red-white-and-blue symbol of all things that have made the United States what it is, the National Geographic Society says.

The Stars and Stripes may be unfurled from at least every 10th American household, and possibly more, say the nation's biggest makers of flags. They are recording a banner year, turning out flags twice as fast as in 1969 with sales mounting well into the millions.

Hand-sized decals show the flag in automobile windows across the country, and the astronauts left the colors standing proudly in the windless world of the moon.

George Washington supposedly reported to the Second Continental Congress on the new flag: "We take the stars from the heavens, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty."

Another explanation is the flag's red stands for courage, white for liberty, blue for loyalty, and the stars and 13 stripes for the American colonies.

Nearly a year after the Declaration of Independence—or 193 years ago this Flag Day, on June 14, 1777—Congress accepted the new ensign with its circle of 13 stars. The Navy sailed with it. Army use came later.

As a distress signal, the flag has been flown upside down intentionally by war protesters and accidentally by the Pentagon. Stars and stripes adorn policemen's uniforms, Uncle Sam outfits, drum majorette costumes, and mod fashions.

Replicas of flags are proudly hailed on newspaper mastheads, postage stamps, and tattooed chests. They are made into expensive jewelry, and are used in far-out art and on posters outspokenly backing both pro and con views on war, peace, and politics.

Stern courts frequently decide the flag is being desecrated, and widely varying fines and jail terms may be handed down according to state and federal law against misuse of the national colors.

Once Old Glory was a favorite advertising gimmick of a type that today would be guaranteed to raise patriotic hackles. Everything from chewing gum to Japanese tea, from beer to bicycles was once wrapped in the flag by ambitious hucksters, apparently with little censure.

But now such use is considered an affront to all who have died protecting the flag, as well as to all who have marched victoriously with it in war.

HORTON PRAISES MRS. EVELYN GAY—A SPECIAL KIND OF TEACHER

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who can boast of having a good teacher are very fortunate. It takes a special kind of teacher to open doors to a love of learning.

This month marks the 25th anniversary of such a teacher, Mrs. Evelyn D. Gay of West Henrietta, in my 36th District. Here is a dedicated teacher who has served as an inspiration to both students and fellow instructors.

For 25 years, she has worked at instilling a love of learning and a questioning mind in her students. She retires this

month from Rush-Henrietta Central School after teaching Latin and English there from 1953 through 1970.

Mrs. Gay has been instrumental in organizing experimental programs that have become permanent. She did extensive research and worked on the first slow learner program in my district. She understands that students cannot be lumped together, that some have a faster capacity to learn than others, and that these slow learners should never be ignored.

She makes one distinction between students and pupils. Pupils are those that have to be taught and students are those willing and eager to learn.

Her principal at Carlton Webster Junior High, Mr. William Mayer, describes her as "one of the finest ladies I've ever met." She has been a forerunner in the area of education leadership. She was instrumental in obtaining two additional periods at the high school, and was building coordinator of English and social studies for 5 years. She also initiated a writing program relating composition to literature.

Through Mrs. Gay's personal contact with thousands of students and many student teachers, she has guided the course of education. For years she has been a moderator of the Latin Club, and she has supervised innumerable student teachers whom she has tried to imbue with her love of learning and students.

Mrs. Gay meets teaching with a sensitivity and love. She has lowered the barriers which sometime isolate teachers from students.

Mrs. Gay has continuously pursued higher education for herself. She graduated valedictorian and magna cum laude from Keuka College, Keuka, N.Y., in 1934 with a B.A., majoring in Latin and French. She taught Latin, French, and English in Pike, N.Y., from 1934 to 1937. She taught in Caledonia from 1937 to 1942. She completed graduate study at Middlebury, Vt., Syracuse University, and the University of Rochester.

Her work has not been confined to the academic world. This year she was district coordinator for the community chest. She has also hosted foreign students for the American Field Service.

In addition, Mrs. Gay is a member of Delta Kappa Gamma, New York State Teachers Association, Pi Gamma Mu, and has served as a trustee of Keuka College.

Mrs. Gay's service will be deeply missed by the entire student population. Her students have a deep respect and affection for her. Her store of wisdom, tolerance, understanding, and love have persisted and grown during her 25 years of service.

I cannot praise her work enough. Her dedication, her love of the profession, her outstanding contributions—all of these will leave a great void.

There is no greater service than what Mrs. Gay has performed. She has served where many are not privileged to serve. She has touched lives as no one else can. She has given the necessary encouragement to inspire success.

In recognition of her profound influence on the course of education over the past 25 years, I commend her and wish her well.

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS OF JUDGE
ROLAND C. RUTLEDGE

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, though Memorial Day 1970 is some 2 weeks past, I happen to be one of those individuals who believes that the time for honoring the memory of those who have died for their country need not be relegated to a single day of the year. And I know there are many thousands of others who daily appreciate the sacrifices of the men who have given their lives to protect our freedoms.

Rhetoric is a word we have been reading and hearing a great deal about nowadays, so much in fact that I fear we are strangling it ironically with excessive verbosity. However, I feel I must risk one more repetition to say that some of the finest, most heartfelt rhetoric—in the original Grecian sense of the word—ever prepared for a Memorial Day observance was delivered last May 30 by the Honorable Roland C. Rutledge, the Presiding Judge of the West Valley Division of the San Bernardino County Municipal Court District, at Ontario, Calif.

It was a scholarly, perceptive and extremely relevant address, and above all it came straight from the heart, and for all those reasons it will be—and should be—long remembered. Certainly it will enable us to renew our appreciation for our honored dead. And for that reason I am proud to ask that the text of Judge Rutledge's oration be inserted in the RECORD at this point so that all our colleagues may share his inspiring words:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

(By Judge Roland C. Rutledge)

The solemnity of an occasion such as this, where we have met to honor those who have gone before us, should cause us to pause and contemplate the crisis facing us today, the solution to which will determine whether democracy will continue to survive or whether our country, in the light of those events, will turn to another or different form of government.

America has had its crises before. Its democratic form was purchased at the price of six years of costly and bitter strife. A civil war tore the country asunder. It re-united, but some of the scars are to be detected to this day. The forces that brought on the Civil War came mainly from within. Those preceding the two world wars came from without. In each instance, democracy stood the acid test.

The means by which dictatorships on the one hand and democracies on the other are maintained and perpetuated are totally different in concept and nature. A dictatorship continues to exist by cold, harsh force; a democracy only at the will of a self-restrained people willing to live by the rule of law. Whether our present form survives or changes in the direction of a totalitarian state will depend, as a whole, on the manner in which the mass of the American people respond to the challenges manifest today.

It is said that those who would read the future should read history. A study of history shows that democracy is nothing new. It was tried in ancient Greece, 500 years before the time of Christ. It did not last. Strong

men took over. Today, 2,500 years later, it is ruled by a military clique.

Rome passed through a period of self-rule, with a satisfactory balance being worked out in a division of power between the patrician Senate of the wealthy and the Comitia of the people. Nor did it last. Forces boring from within destroyed the freedom and dignity of the individual and the Caesars took over.

The evils which, in the time of Caesar, Pompey and Cicero, were undermining the Republic bear so many striking resemblances to those which threaten the civic and national life of America today that the interest in the period is by no means merely historical. Standing in the Roman forum last June, in front of the pitifully few remains of the Rostra near the Senate House, which was the center of the political life of Rome, your speaker was reminded that here, in the century before the commencement of the Christian era, in the days of the crumbling of the Roman Republic, rioting drove the Senators from the Senate House—the Curia—; here was where pitched battles occurred between rival factions, interrupting the attempts of the Senators and those assembled in the Comitium to carry on the orderly functions of government, leaving hundreds dead, forcing the leads from the forum and the magistrates from their benches, and burning the Senate house to the ground. Here was where Pompey found it necessary to surround the high ground around the forum with a legion of soldiers to maintain order during the trial of Milo; here, on this Rostra, the voice of Cicero, perhaps the greatest orator of all times, rang out in defense of the democratic processes and in opposition to those seeking its destruction; and here his severed head was displayed following his arbitrary execution after being proscribed by Antonius, of the Second Triumvirate.

Julius Caesar had set the trend by seizing power and imposing himself as dictator six years before, and Octavianus, his Grand Nephew, assumed the title of the first of the Roman Emperors, vestiges of which are still faintly to be detected today, 2,000 years later, when Italy maintains with the greatest difficulty a government barely able to prevent the emergence of another Mussolini.

Following World War I, most experiments in democracy disappeared in a rash of dictatorships, good examples being Italy and Spain. Hitler took over with less than 2% of the population of Germany, and embarked on a war which cost the lives of between 20 and 30 million civilians, 16 million military personnel, and 6 million Jews and other minorities, killed on his direct orders in an open program of genocide. These are some of the things to consider if we elect placidly to sit back and depend on the goodness of the human spirit to bring us through our difficulties.

If, in truth, history foretells the future, history discloses that once the people of a democracy lose their sense of destiny and of self-discipline; let them sow an unwillingness to live by the rule of law; allow their trust in the ability of their elected representatives adequately to administer the civil, political and military affairs of the country to become shaken; allow rioting, looting, burning and bombing to become the order of the day and the protective arm of the police to become the object of ridicule and contempt, then such a people are steering a course of disaster and destruction, as did the ancient democracies.

Nature abhors a vacuum. Let democracy fall as a way of life, and something quite different in nature rushes in to fill the vacancy.

Winston Churchill once said, "Democracy is the worst system of government in the world—except all the others." Apparently a contingent of our citizens seeks some type

of "the others." Jerry Rubin, one of the Chicago 7 facing jail, visiting at Stanford U. a month ago, addressing a large part of the student body said, "What goes on in your head is irrelevant. It's action that counts." Another little jewel he dropped was, "Schools are the biggest barriers to education. That's why schools are being burned." Both statements brought strong affirmative responses from his student audience. Another was, "I don't care if 99.99 per cent of you students want ROTC, it shouldn't be left on campus. There's no civil liberty to kill." And more cheers. That's democracy as some would have it. Rubin, you will recall, was one of the Chicago rioters who attempted in effect to drive a Federal judge off the bench. It did not succeed and when the inevitable day of reckoning came, was the first to scurry behind the protection of the Constitution he and his kind seek so desperately to destroy. All this is faintly reminiscent of the ravings and ranting of Hitler, but Hitler did take over Germany and took the world to the brink of destruction. Let's not laugh contemptuously at the Rubins of today. Julius Caesar, Mussolini, Hitler and Napoleon took over with comparatively small minorities of well-organized and determined military and militant organizations. Better to have a show of hands—today—with the Rubins in our society.

No one can look at the tragedy at Kent University; at 3 buildings blasted in one day in New York City; watch Watts burn to the ground; see on TV one of the most serious riots in the history of Berkeley, nor consider the wrecking of Isla Vista with its senseless burning of a Bank of America building because it is supposed to be representative of the "Establishment" and in good conscience deny that we are in serious trouble here at home. We restrain and disarm an excited man with a loaded gun and give society adequate protection against a mad dog on the streets. Our Rubins are equally as dangerous, and perhaps much more so in judging on the effect they are having on the excited young people of today.

Present day youth complain that we won't listen to their views and demands. Admit justice to many of their criticisms. We still find difficulty in listening amidst the chants and screams of mobs and the crash of glass as store fronts are smashed. Waving flowers and shouting "peace" is commendable. No arguments against flowers and no opposition to peace; but shouting the word "Peace" does not bring Russia nearer to an arms limitation pact nor the North Vietnamese and Viet-Cong to the peace table. Certainly the scent of a rose is more pleasant than the smell of the smoke of bombs and burning buildings, but neither of the two renders our air, land or water less polluted.

Action breeds reaction. The tragedy at Kent U is proof of the inevitability of that law of human nature. The radically inclined seem oblivious of the fact of what the future may hold if more buildings are blasted, more Isla Vistas wrecked and more million-dollar computers used in the colleges blown up, can only be conjectured. Just as youth is heartily sick of the war in Vietnam, so more and more people are becoming just as sick of the upsurge of violence, disorder and destruction here at home. Further crossing of the legitimate boundaries of the right of peaceful protest can bring a counter-reaction, making the events of today child's play by comparison. I doubt that those students who resort to violence under the guise of "dissent" are motivated by any sense of morality. One of the greatest dissenters in history was Adolph Hitler.

Some suggest that we have over-educated today's youth to a sense of "morality" and to a sense of social values. I consider that pure nonsense. Let us consider some further facts and ask a few questions which might put that argument in its true perspective.

In February, 1969, pamphlets entitled "Your Manual" were distributed on campus of the San Francisco State College. "Your Manual" is truly a frightening document. It lists the equipment to bring on the campus for use against the so-called "pigs", (police) and "scabs" (non-striking students.) It lists rocks and bottles, and directs they first be thrown against cameramen to drive them off so no pictures can be taken, then at "scab" students, then at windows; directs the use of red pepper and darts; states that ice picks and can openers are used to best advantage on the car tires of scab teachers, and adds "very good on plainclothes pigs, too"; tells how to use sling shots on windows and with relative safety against uniformed police; advises that large, sharpened picket sign handles can be used as clubs and spears; suggests the use of spray paint on the bodies of scab cars; reminds that a Zippo cigarette lighter readily ignites curtains and waste baskets and that a little lighter fluid increases its usefulness and that oven cleaner in an aerosol can be used as a weapon, doing severe damage to the exposed skin of an enemy and instructs in the use of the four main types of bombs: Cherry bomb with armament, stink bombs, molotov cocktail and pipe bombs. Over-education in a sense of morality? Ridiculous. Directives such as these are not typical on all college campuses, but do shed some light on the underlying purpose and intent of the groups causing the trouble. Why we continue to permit this type of thing under the guise of "free speech" and "free press" is more than your speaker can understand, but does make the events of Kent and Jackson more understandable. Constitutional guarantees never were intended to condone this type of conduct. Certainly it cannot be explained away as an exemplification of the extent to which we have educated our youth to a sense of morality and of social values.

Is throwing bottles and bricks at the policeman "moral"? Is the burning down of the ROTC building on campus an expression of "morality"? Is swarming into a business area, tearing down signs, destroying phone booths, smashing store windows and painting revolutionary signs on walls a mere "moral expression"? Is threatening to kill reporters from the local newspaper if they take pictures of the destruction a "moral act"? And yet, all these things were done at Kent, leading the National Guard to be there in the first place. Retreat forthwith from Vietnam and the Cong will sweep down and administer a blood bath that will cost a million lives. Would that be a gesture "moral" in its concept? The TV pictures of the bodies floating down the Mekong River gives a good indication of what would happen. We Americans have certain moral obligations ourselves. It's time we examined them. Duty is not synonymous with "morality". Debating whether we should, or should not, have moved into the Cambodian sanctuaries of the Communists forces from which they endangered our entire flank should turn on the question of military necessity, not on the "morals" of the problem, as war is seldom fought on the basis of what is moral and what is immoral or unmoral. Questions of morality will not prevent further "reaction" if excited students continue to openly attack armed soldiers and uniformed police. As pointed out by a local editor, let two groups of youngsters chase each other around, both sides armed, one with stones and the other with guns, and someone is going to get hurt. It has happened, and will continue to happen unless stern measures are taken. Unless we wish to follow the pathways of ancient Greece and Rome, it's time to start taking such measures as will accomplish the intended purpose. The Colosseum and Pantheon of Rome were made of stone and still stand. The moral fiber of its people was of

a weaker substance. Internal strife, dissidence and the rot that comes with a welfare state weakened and eventually destroyed the social structure from within. Cicero saw it coming. One of the keenest minds of his time, he said in a letter to a friend, which is still extant,

"Once depart from law and everything is uncertain.

Then, nothing can be guaranteed as to the future which depends on another's will, not to say caprice."

Within six years his head adorned the Rostra.

Could it be that with the tumult and uproar in our civic life, our streets unsafe at night, our colleges slowly but surely coming to a grinding halt, with our very institutions attacked and challenged by those who would utterly destroy, but without a blueprint from which to rebuild after the destruction, we, as Cicero worded it, have "departed from law?" Only the events of the immediate future will determine the answer to that question.

Certain of the dissident groups have drawn their battle lines and taken their stance on a platform of destruction and anarchy. It's high time we formed our own lines on the basis of present institutions of self-rule and of law and order. Attempts to reason with excited youngsters are seldom successful. A few strong shocks can do wonders in calming hysteria. We have prisons for the criminal elements of the opposing movement. If adding some iron inside the silken glove proves necessary to re-establish authority in our universities and to bring order and safety to riot-torn streets, then it's time we added the iron. Clearing the campuses of the radical totalitarians could be the first logical step back in the direction of rationality. Meeting action with reaction will soon reveal whether democracy is geared to stand the stresses and strains being imposed upon it today by a militant and drug-oriented minority. In heavy storms, only a firm hand at the helm preserves the ship. The torch of freedom has gone through storms before and still burns. Storms ahead will cause the torch of democracy to dim and flicker, but held aloft it will endure. Those whom we honor here today ran the course and threw to us the sacred torch. They kept the faith. We can do no less. We will hold it high. We will keep the faith.

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT, THE VERY REVEREND JOHN P. RAYNOR, S.J., CALLS FOR MASSIVE FEDERAL AID TO SUSTAIN INDEPENDENT HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1970, the Very Reverend John P. Raynor, S.J., president of Marquette University in Milwaukee, told the Special Subcommittee on Education that "a program of massive financial aid to independent colleges and universities" is necessary if independent higher education is to remain competitive on the national scene.

Reverend Raynor's testimony before the subcommittee accurately portrays the financial peril facing many of our Nation's great independent institutions of higher learning. I commend Reverend Raynor's statement to my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY THE VERY REVEREND JOHN P. RAYNOR, S.J.

Madam Chairman and distinguished members of the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor of the United States House of Representatives:

My name is John P. Raynor. I am President of Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and a member of the Society of Jesus. I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before this subcommittee to present some of my thoughts concerning independent higher education in the United States, its potential for the future, and the role the Federal Government might play in assuring that today's independent colleges and universities will survive.

Before going any further, I would like to take just a moment to tell you a little bit about Marquette University so that you may better understand the base from which I must draw the conclusions, hopes and aspirations for independent education in America.

Marquette is a private, independent, co-educational, urban university conducted under the auspices of the Society of Jesus. It received its charter in 1864 and opened formally for classes in 1881. This year we have nearly 12,000 students attending our 9 colleges and schools with 44 departments, including schools of graduate study, law and dentistry. Our students come from every state in the union and from more than 35 foreign countries. The faculty at Marquette numbers some 600. They come from all over the world with a variety of backgrounds and religious beliefs. Of these, 60 are members of the Society of Jesus.

In January 1969, a most significant step was taken at Marquette when we completely reorganized our Board of Trustees, changing from a Board of only three Trustees, all Jesuits, to an expanded Board of 29 members which provides for 21 lay members. The Chairman of the Board, Mr. Elliot G. Fitch, is a prominent banker and business and civic leader in Milwaukee. This shift to a predominantly lay Board of Trustees was undoubtedly one of the most important events in the history of the University. It points out the growing partnership between the community and the University as well as our increasing responsibilities to the public.

Marquette's budget for the current academic year is approximately \$24,300,000. Despite a tuition increase in each of the past two years, and six in the past ten years, we still face an operating deficit in this academic year of \$275,000. The funding crisis is especially critical in the professional programs essential to the health and welfare of society. This problem has reached such severe proportions in Marquette's School of Dentistry, for example, that substantial state and federal funds will be necessary in the near future if we are even to maintain the present levels of support for our School of Dentistry. We have already announced a tuition increase for the 1970-71 academic year, raising tuition to an all time high of \$1,660 a year. This compares to \$1,250 just three years ago and only \$800 ten years ago. We are striving for a balanced operating budget for 1970-71.

This year Marquette has provided student financial aid, exclusive of any federal or state programs, totaling \$1,600,000 and we expect to increase this next year. We currently have capital loan obligations to the Federal Government alone of nearly \$12,000,000. Our endowment totals approximately \$7,000,000, an average of only \$804 per full time equivalent student, extremely low in comparison to other major independent universities and entirely inadequate when compared to the resources of public universities.

Madam Chairman and Members, I submit these facts to you so you can understand in a concrete way the financial plight we are facing in independent higher education. I

submit these facts knowing full well that Marquette University, even with its deficit, large loan obligations and small endowment is actually in a better position than many of our sister institutions.

The next few years are going to be critical to the future of independent higher education. It is obvious that if we are to remain competitive on the national scene, something must be done, and done in a major way, by the Federal Government through a program of massive financial aid to these independent colleges and universities. This is not to say that independent colleges and universities are not trying to raise funds from private sources. They most certainly are. At Marquette we are in the midst of a campaign to raise \$30,000,000. More than one third of this has already been raised but with the new tax laws affecting philanthropy, our task in the future will be more difficult.

In simple terms, the United States soon may find itself without the competitive benefits of our dual system of public and private education which has been traditional in this country. Unless this strong competitive system is maintained, the relative quality of education will suffer greatly and education's responsibility of serving in the public trust will be impeded.

In his message on Education Reform, President Nixon spoke of the need for educational diversity, noting that "the absence of competition would neither be good for that school system nor good for the country." The collapse of the independent higher educational system and its unique contributions to the commonwealth would be tragic. It can, and indeed must, be avoided if congress acts now in a responsible manner to assist all institutions of higher education, but especially the hard pressed independent colleges and universities.

These independent institutions, however, must not lose their identity. They offer distinctive educational programs based on integrative educational philosophies; and approach to education which provides a great promise for providing the ideals and values so sorely needed by modern youth in a time of rapid change.

To continue in this intellectual tradition, these institutions must remain free of direct governmental control. They must be free to retain their independent boards of trustees for institutional governance. To distort this principle would be contrary to the traditional educational concepts of our country.

Never before has the Congress of the United States faced a time when more demands were being made by the public for post-secondary education. At the same time, the institutions which must provide this education are facing a widening gap between income and expenses as they strive to meet these increasing public demands with new and expanded facilities, as well as new academic programs and increased financial aids for students.

And yet, you will agree, I think, that the dual system of education in our nation should be preserved. Hearings such as this serve to show the nation that there is a special interest in Congress to see that this dual system continues.

There are two basic principles that must be weighed in any consideration of increased aid to higher education. The first is to provide universal education opportunity to our young men and women of college age, and secondly, to maintain educational diversity to assure freedom of choice.

The first principle, universal educational opportunity, is essential to the basic concept of educational goals which has been an historic tradition in our nation. We must remember that, while we speak of "independent" institutions, these colleges and universities serve in the public trust. They perform public services which would otherwise have

to be passed on to the taxpayer. There is no question but that the public good, and a higher public priority, is being served by the existence of independent institutions as well as those publicly controlled. It is imperative that the Federal Government determines how to establish methods of direct aid to independent institutions to help them to continue to be a viable force in higher education.

Many will argue that federal funds for independent higher education could mean strict control and an eventual loss of identity. I fully realize that there must be accountability by private agencies for the use of public funds granted for public purposes which have a high priority today such as higher education. Such accountability does not entail a violation of the integrity and independence of such agencies. I see no reason why such accountability necessarily would in any way mean a breakdown of the independent system. The American people are the most responsible and imaginative in the world. If they really believe in our independent educational system, and its service in the public trust, then ways will be found to maintain these schools.

The second principle, educational diversity to assure freedom of choice, is equally important to the future of higher education in the nation. A student's financial situation should not be the dominating factor in his decision to attend a post-secondary institution, nor in the type of institution, public or independent, that he may choose to attend. Some form of equalization, which would tend to place all students in the same relative position concerning governmental subsidies, must be spearheaded by the Federal Government. It is folly to talk of equal opportunity at support levels which forbid true choice among colleges to the needy students. His opportunity is equal only if he is given a realistic chance to go to the college of his first choice.

Wisconsin was the first state to move toward this, at least in a small way, when in 1965 the State Legislature passed the Wisconsin Tuition Grant Program. This Program provides Wisconsin students a State grant up to \$650 a year based on financial need, if they decide to attend an independent institution of higher education in the State. The student obviously is freer under such a program to select a college on the basis of personal desires, abilities and academic considerations rather than on the basis of economic restraints.

With these basic principles of universal educational opportunity and educational diversity to assure freedom of choice as guidelines, let me now turn to a few additional comments on three recent bills which have been introduced to formulate federal guidelines for future financial assistance to higher education. These are H.R. 16621, the "Higher Education Opportunity Act of 1970"; H.R. 16622, a supplement to H.R. 16621, referred to as the "Higher Education General Assistance Act of 1970", which would provide institutional grants, introduced by the Honorable Albert Quie of Minnesota and a member of this Committee, and, of course, H.R. 16098, the "Omnibus Post-Secondary Education Act of 1970" sponsored by the Chairman of this Committee, the Honorable Edith Green of Oregon.

The "Higher Education Opportunity Act of 1970" is the Administration's bill. While this bill contains many admirable points, including increased aid to the economically disadvantaged and increased emphasis on the two year technical institute and community colleges, it falls far short of the all-encompassing operational support which is desperately needed for higher education. As a matter of fact, in many ways, it is a decided step backward and leaves the middle income families with little or no federal as-

sistance to turn to in sending their children to college. In short, it offers little help to either the student or the institution. It is especially negative in its affect on a middle income families.

It is especially disturbing to note that under this bill, according to the President's message, a student from a family with an income of \$6,800 would not qualify for any federal grants nor would he qualify for participation in the Work-Study Program. Can the Administration possibly believe that such a program will allow for freedom of choice for such students when the costs at many independent colleges and universities are more than \$3,000 a year? It is with the greatest reluctance that colleges raise their tuition, however, we simply must keep pace with inflation prices in order to maintain the quality of education the public has come to expect from our institutions.

I would point out further that, if this bill were to pass, a student from a family with an income of more than \$10,000 may not even consider attending an independent college or university since he could not even receive a federally subsidized loan and would, therefore, have to turn to the open money market, with its shortage of capital and its high rates of interest, to assist in financing his education. Even under the current guaranteed student loan programs, a student is apt to be burdened with debt at the time he leaves school. This bill would make the situation even more intolerable.

I am particularly concerned about that portion of the bill which would repeal NDEA fellowships as of July 1, 1971. Marquette, as well as other universities with graduate programs, has placed increased emphasis on graduate programs, with the encouragement of the Federal Government. At Marquette, we now have 14 programs leading to the doctorate degree compared with only 8 in 1958. It would be tragic if this source of support for graduate students, along with its cost of education allowance to the institution, were to be cut off at this time when the demand for specialized manpower is so crucial to the future development of our nation.

This bill also repeals the Higher Education Facilities Act. This Act has been a leading factor in the physical expansion of the nation's campuses. Many buildings, including some at Marquette, simply could not have been constructed without this aid. As a member of the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin Higher Educational Aids Board, I know first hand how important these funds have been to our State's colleges and universities. To date more than \$28,000,000 have been distributed for facilities construction on Wisconsin campuses. At Marquette we have received more than \$3,000,000.

Yet the Administration's bill would eliminate this form of financial assistance altogether. It would put future expansion plans on many campuses in jeopardy, especially at institutions like Marquette which is an urban university trying valiantly to finance its obligations under an urban renewal contract. Such institutions cannot support such high financial programs on their own.

I will not take the time to get into details of other aspects of the bill, but suffice it to say that H.R. 16621 leaves much to be desired as a method of federal funding of higher education.

The "Higher Education General Assistance Act of 1970" does much to point the general direction in which I feel the Federal Government must go if it is to take a leadership position in funding higher education. Direct grants, such as Congressman Quie is proposing, are essential to supplement the income of post-secondary institutions and to assist them in raising the quality of their academic programs. Tuition simply cannot

pay for the overall operational costs of a college or university and such unrestricted grants as these are sorely needed to develop new academic programs and strengthen existing ones. This bill is a positive step forward in federal funding programs.

While I understand Mr. Quile's concern that the program be based on a formula centering around the Baccalaureate degree, I hope that eventually some consideration will be given to degrees which are, of course, far more costly to administer.

The "Omnibus Post-Secondary Education Act of 1970" has many favorable attributes. It is especially gratifying to see that it would extend for three years the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Educational Professions Development Act of 1965 and, at least in part, the National Defense Student Loan Program.

I would make several specific observations concerning this particular bill. In Part A of Title I, you are adding the phrase "Preference in the award . . . shall be given to those who show the greatest academic and creative promise." I would suggest that this tends to place the Educational Opportunity Grants Program on a merit basis and places the culturally disadvantaged student in a most difficult financial situation which is contrary to the original intent of the law.

The new section of Title IV, to be inserted as Part E of this act, could raise several difficulties, although in general it is a sound program, assuming it is not meant to replace the NDEA Program. Up to now, colleges and universities were allowed to transfer loan funds between undergraduate and graduate students depending on where the need was the greater. This new section of the bill, while establishing \$1,000 and \$1,500 annual limits for undergraduate and graduate loans respectively, does not allow for such transfers and therefore will limit the flexibility of the institutions in making the loans.

The manner in which these loans are to be repaid tends to be discriminatory toward women. Many students leaving college today find themselves in considerable debt. Those who marry compound the debt. Often the woman does not take an income producing job, yet this bill would require that she, as well as her husband, pay off their loans at the rate of five percent of net taxable income, starting with the second taxable year after ceasing their studies. Some provision should be made in such instances to allow for a joint contract for the family with a repayment schedule geared to either a joint income or single income depending on the family situation.

The recommendation in this bill, under Title VI, that a Department of Education and Manpower be established at the cabinet level is essential if we are to take care of the future educational needs of the country. The consolidation of all educational and manpower training functions now resting in the various departments of the Federal Government will not only be more effective for administrative purposes, but will also place stronger emphasis on national educational policies which have not been possible up to this point. Education is one of our country's greatest national resources and it must be treated as such in the structure of our Federal Government.

I would propose, however, that research granting agencies, such as NSF retain their independence. These highly-specialized agencies have served higher education quite effectively and I would hope they could maintain as much flexibility as possible.

I fully realize the highly controversial nature of Title VII, "Protection of Freedom of Expression", and I know that many have already commented on the subject, and others will in future hearings. I am sure. However, I must point out that the Federal Government must be careful to not legislate specific regulations concerning campus order.

While this section does not do this, it is an indication of the Federal Government's leanings in this direction. Each institution must be responsible to its constituencies, including the Federal Government if a college is receiving federal grants, and assure them that its administration has provisions which permit freedom of speech and the right of access to an education in an atmosphere free of riots or disruptive demonstrations.

However, each institution must adopt regulations peculiar to its particular campus which are not in conflict with law and order and existing laws, and then see that they are enforced accordingly.

In summary then, let me say again that I am pleased at the steps that are being taken to find a more satisfactory method of financing higher education, particularly through the initiation of institutional grants, as outlined in H.R. 16622. The Administration bill, however, is not satisfactory and would be a major step backward for higher education.

I might add that I found it somewhat disappointing to find that no consideration is being given to direct, across the board grants to students. As I mentioned earlier, we must strive to provide universal educational opportunity. A federal voucher system of direct grants to all graduating high school seniors, which could be applied toward tuition charges at a college or university of their choice, would help to assure educational opportunity for all qualified students.

The Government's Commission on Education in Wisconsin has recommended a similar program for Wisconsin students attending Wisconsin colleges and universities.

A federal program such as this would eliminate state boundaries as barriers to free access to higher educational institutions anywhere in the nation.

I wish to again thank the members of this Special Subcommittee on Education for the opportunity to make these comments today. Your particular interest in the plight of the independent colleges and universities of this nation is deeply appreciated. Every effort must be made to see that our dual system of education in this country is preserved. Educational diversity is essential. Through your efforts this goal can be attained.

MASSACHUSETTS COMMITTEE OF CATHOLICS, PROTESTANTS, AND JEWS, 33D ANNUAL DINNER, MAY 14, 1970

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for over three decades, the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, has been in existence. This great organization, which is dedicated to the furtherance and strengthening of understanding and of the American spirit and ideals, consists of outstanding citizens of all races, color, and creed. The contribution of this committee has been stimulating and most effective in extending areas of understanding and agreement, and thereby reducing areas of misunderstanding, of tension, and of disagreements.

It is also a most unusual organization in that it functions effectively without paid quarters, or any paid help, with voluntary contributions by its members and supporters.

This most unusual organization, with

its high ideals and purposes, constitutes an example for noble-minded persons in other cities and communities of our country to follow.

On the occasion of its yearly banquet, three persons, noted for their nobility of character and their contributions to decency and progress, are selected to be the recipients of the committee's awards.

The annual dinner this year was held the evening of May 14, 1970, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Boston, Mass., with over 1,100 persons in attendance.

The annual dinner is a splendid public manifestation of goodwill and of the American spirit and ideals.

At the recent banquet, Mr. Norman L. Cahners was the toastmaster.

The recipients of the awards and citations at this year's banquet were:

Mr. Donald H. McGannon, president, Westinghouse Electric Corp., for Broadcasting, learning and leisure time; Dr. Morris B. Abram, former president, Brandeis University; and Hon. EDWARD W. BROOKE, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts.

The members of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, are too numerous for me to mention, but all the members are distinguished and honorable gentlemen. However, there is one whom all members recognize as deserving of special commendation, whose dedication to the organization is recognized by everyone, and whose unselfish and untiring work and leadership has played a most important part in its success. I refer to Mr. Ben G. Shapiro, the secretary of the committee since its incorporation.

For 33 years leaders in the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths have worked together in this committee to improve group relations. It engages in many outstanding activities, too numerous to mention, but among which are: Good citizenship program of the Boston Park Department; Tufts University civic education project; Brandeis University three chapels program; Human relations center at Boston University; Institute of Human Sciences at Boston College; and, in addition, the committee has distributed many thousands of copies of educational material to schoolteachers and heads of educational institutions throughout the United States. For the last 19 years it has conducted an annual junior good-will dinner, bringing together boys of the Boston public and parochial schools, which has created favorable comment by leaders in human relations throughout the country.

The general aims and purposes of this splendid organization are:

First, to sponsor good will work in the general community of Greater Boston;

Second, to serve as a medium through which representative citizens can endorse the basic democratic principle of good will among men of different faiths and different racial origins;

Third, to bring out and emphasize the many fine things which citizens of different faiths have in common;

Fourth, to encourage and support those forces in the community which generate in the individual a respect for the validity and dignity of each other

individual's particular religious faith, with no qualifications or reservations based upon racial origins; and

Fifth, the committee is a separate, independent association, not connected with any other local or national organization.

I include herein:

Remarks by Thomas J. Galligan, Jr., chairman.

Remarks of Norman L. Cahners, toastmaster.

Remarks of Joseph L. Tauro.

Remarks of Kevin Kavanaugh.

Remarks of Ben G. Shapiro, secretary of committee.

Remarks of Hon. Francis W. Sargent, Governor, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The address of Donald H. McGannon and the citation presented by Sidney R. Rabb.

The address of Dr. Morris B. Abram and the citation presented by Peter Fuller.

The address of Hon. EDWARD W. BROOKE and the citation presented by Edward B. Hanify.

Head table assembly presented by Curt Gowdy.

The material referred to, follows:

OPENING REMARKS

(By Thomas J. Galligan, Jr., chairman, Massachusetts Committee Catholics, Protestants, and Jews; president Boston Edison Co.)

Reverend Clergy; Your Excellency Governor Sargent; Distinguished Guests; Ladies and Gentlemen:

There is, it seems to me, a touch of irony that this 33rd Annual Senior Goodwill Dinner of our Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants and Jews is being held now. A philosopher might argue against the dinner's being held at all.

Remember, please, that our primary job is spreading goodwill. Judging by recent headlines, our philosopher might say we have fallen down on the job. If anything is in short supply these days, it would appear to be goodwill.

There is, too, a touch of irony in the fact that this year our neighboring town of Plymouth celebrates the 350th anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims. As a matter of fact, Senator Saltonstall traveled to Plymouth, England on May 2 to participate in this celebration of the Plymouth across the sea.

My own Company is involved in the Plymouth celebration. We are involved partly because we have an interest in the town. But we are involved also because we recognize—as all business must—our obligation to get involved in community matters.

There is a lesson for all of us in what Plymouth is doing for the 350th celebration. They are calling for a rededication to the principles that originally brought the Pilgrims to these shores. Billed down, those principles may be stated as: Peace on earth, goodwill toward men.

In all that has happened since the Mayflower landed at Plymouth, some of us may have forgotten why the Pilgrims made that dangerous journey—why they came here.

They came to seek freedom and to find peace. They came to escape the wars and the tyranny of the old world.

A cynic might ask "Was this trip necessary—did it bring fulfillment?"

I believe the answer is yes—decidedly. The fact that this group here tonight—and many another—continues to function, continues to work for goodwill among men proves that the Pilgrims' trip was not only necessary—but inevitable.

These are tough times. But we have known tough times before. And we have won through. Some might say we muddled through. Yet, we're still in business—the business of trying to make a decent world for our children—and theirs.

In that job, much depends on communication; on getting the story across—to the right people, at the right time. Most of us pretty much agree that communications is an art.

Tonight we have as Toastmaster one of the leading practitioners in the art of communicating. He is Norman L. Cahners. His field is business communications. The Cahners group now numbers 42 magazines, annuals and special publications. They have branched out into Education and the Trade Show Fields.

I would infringe on the Toastmaster's time—and probably use it all up—if I were to do justice to his credentials as a businessman, as a concerned citizen, as a human being. As a businessman he could not object. As a concerned citizen he would. So, I'll digest his accomplishments.

Norman Cahners came to Boston from Bangor, Maine. He stopped en route to go to school at Phillips Academy in Andover, then on to Harvard. He went back to Maine long enough to get his Master's at Colby.

World War II found him a Lieutenant in the Navy devising new and better ways to move supplies to our men overseas. He was so good at his job that the Navy put him in charge of their Materials Handling Laboratory.

To anyone who knows Norm Cahners, it comes as no surprise that, after the war his first magazine venture was called Materials Handling. It's still going strong as Modern Materials Handling.

Norm Cahners is a sailing man. You wonder, though, how he finds time to get aboard his yawl when you consider all the demands on his time—apart from running his own business. I counted 22 such demands. They range from a trusteeship of Colby College to his duties on the Executive Committee of this group meeting here tonight.

It is an honor and a privilege to turn the proceedings over to my friend and yours, the Chairman of the Board of Cahners Publishing Company, Norm Cahners.

REMARKS OF NORMAN L. CAHNERS

Thank you very much, Mr. Galligan.

I'm sure you can each imagine what a thrilling experience it is to face an audience as vast as this one, and as I stand here on the podium I can tell you it's also a little nerve-racking!

This is the largest gathering Boston has seen in recent times, made up of people who have assembled because they are *for* something, rather than because they are *against* something!

That should make us all very happy and proud.

I would consider it an honor to be invited to participate in this program in any year. But I think it's a special honor this year because there is a special significance to our gathering tonight. Never in the 33 year history of this event has this dinner been held in the climate of violence, disunity and disruption which now grips our country. And I think the significance of this occasion is that we here tonight hold the key to what could be the solution to all our present problems.

Here's what I mean: there's ample evidence that we are losing our sense of "community," and whether the community is a university, a city, a business, or a nation, I think your definition of what "community" means would be the same as mine.

It is something to which one belongs, where he feels needed and wanted. It's a place where one can have a feeling of participation, the feeling that you are a member of the team in good standing. And we all know that what holds any community to-

gether are its common goals, its shared values and shared attitudes. These shared beliefs are what give a nation its tone, its integrity, and its capacity to endure.

Well, the question is do we have any such shared values? Of course we do and we all know what they are, and that they haven't changed since our country began.

America was founded on the grand scheme and design of peace, liberty, justice and equal opportunity. These are ideals that can sustain and strengthen a great civilization.

Thomas Wolfe summed them all up when he said: "To every man his chance: to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity: to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and become whatever his vision and his manhood can combine to make him—this has always been the promise of America."

If we have these lofty goals, then we might ask ourselves what's gone wrong? The answer, simple but profoundly true, is that ideals are realistic only if they are accompanied by vigorous action. And somewhere along the line we have failed in translating our ideals into action.

We know what we want—we want a society designed for *people*—a society in which no man need live in fear, nor fear to live; a society in which the preservation of human dignity should be the ultimate aim of all mankind. But, up to now, we've been paying lip service to this vision. That's why the vision seems to be fading before our eyes.

We must resolve that our meeting this year will not be a "one night stand." And that from this moment forward we will start living out our ideals by building them into our institutions, into our laws and certainly into our day-to-day relationships with one another.

For less than any other generation in the history of man are we the pawns of nature, of uncontrollable forces—unless we make ourselves so! We built this complex, dynamic society, and we can make it serve our purposes. We designed this technological civilization, and we can manage it for the collective benefit of mankind.

To do this requires a commitment of mind and heart—as it always did. If we make this commitment we will not only start to bind up our nation's wounds, but our society will more and more come to be what it was always meant to be—a decent place for the human being to grow and flourish under the eyes of God.

REMARKS OF JOSEPH L. TAURO

The pioneering efforts of the committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews in furtherance of brotherhood and understanding are well known and appreciated by each and every one of you.

Perhaps less known, but none the less equally significant, is another of the committee's pioneering efforts—the annual junior goodwill dinner—a program conceived jointly twenty years ago by Ben Shapiro and the late Michael Kelliher as a means of encouraging young men to recognize and adopt the spirit of brotherhood that is the very foundation of our organization.

At the junior goodwill dinner, several hundred public and parochial high school students, chosen by their headmasters, meet each January in the press rooms at Fenway Park. Four of these young men are chosen to give a talk on what brotherhood means to them. One of these is selected to speak at the annual goodwill dinner, as will be the case this evening.

Fenway Park has witnessed many thrills over the years, but not even the resounding homeruns of Ted Williams and Tony Conigliaro overshadow the impact of these dinners on those of us that have had the good fortune to attend.

Athletes, scientists, musicians, debaters, join together to provide the broadest pos-

sible cross section of greater-Boston high school activity and interest. These young men, though individuals in their own right, share a common denominator—the fact that they have been recognized by their headmasters as being outstanding citizens in their high school communities. And the judgment of their headmasters is borne out by the fact that of the more than 3000 boys who have attended these dinners over the years, none has ever been involved in any activity that has brought discredit to himself, his family or his school.

I mentioned at the outset that the junior good will dinner was itself a pioneering effort, and this is so. For just as the committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews championed the cause of brotherhood before it became fashionable to do so, the junior goodwill dinner twenty years ago pioneered the concept of giving the young a forum in which to express their views, and during a period when too many laconically adhered to the theory that children should be seen and not heard.

Today's headlines are a sad but forceful endorsement of the vision of Ben Shapiro and Michael Kelliher. Today we realize how important it is that the young be heard as well as seen. But perhaps even more important we realize how vital it is that the young be provided with appropriate forums such as this to articulate their perception of the world.

If there is a generation gap today, it is because for too long there has been a communications gap—one that will be bridged only when our generation learns to listen to and weigh the views of youth—and when the young realize that there is no significant or lasting message in a thrown rock or a clenched fist.

The right of dissent is important and must be protected. But dissent can have a positive impact only within the framework of debate and dialogue.

There is a popular song that tells us "What the world needs now is love sweet love." There is a great deal of truth in that message, but what the world also needs now is a dialogue between the generations.

But to achieve this, both sides of the generation gap must realize—that dialogue is a two-way street, that neither side can hear if they will not listen—that neither side can be heard at a riot.

This is why an occasion such as tonight's is so important. It provides us with an opportunity to hear the views of a young man and, at the same time, we hope it provides some encouragement to him to know that such a large and distinguished group of citizens welcome the opportunity to listen, to hear and to understand.

Tonight's representative from the junior good will dinner has an outstanding background. He is a senior at Christopher Columbus High School and, in addition to being in the top ten percent of his class, he somehow finds time to serve on the student council as well as on the baseball and football teams. Please join me in giving a warm welcome to our guest, Kevin Kavanaugh.

REMARKS BY KEVIN KAVANAUGH, CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS HIGH SCHOOL

INTRODUCTION

Before all else, I feel it would be appropriate for me to thank the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews, and especially Mr. Shapiro, the Secretary of the Committee, for selecting me to represent my fellow students who attended the Junior Good Will Dinner at Fenway Park this past January.

The opportunity to attend such an affair is certainly a great honor and a privilege. One of the most impressive aspects of the dinner was to see in attendance some of our city officials, school leaders, businessmen and some of our fine professional athletes.

Their presence seemed to indicate that the concern for brotherhood is not simply limited to a small number of men in a few professions, but rather, that it has become the concern of numerous men in all professions.

I believe the only way our country can solve its domestic and foreign problems is through brotherhood. Realizing this and realizing also the sincere interest that you have in spreading the ideals of brotherhood, I am honored to have been chosen to speak at this dinner.

WHAT BROTHERHOOD MEANS TO ME

Strictly speaking, Brotherhood is the relationship that exists in families between brothers. More important, however, it is the relationship that should exist between all people—not only among blood brothers.

Affection is perhaps the strongest bond between brothers, however, it is practically impossible to duplicate this strong feeling among our friends, among our enemies, and even more so among people with whom we never will have any contact. We shouldn't stop being brotherly, though, simply because an affection is not present. There are other intangibles just as important for a state of brotherhood to exist, such as—respect, tolerance, trust, understanding and charity.

Respect for others, whether they are our friends or enemies, whether they are black or white, or whether they are God-fearing or atheists—no matter what they are—respect is something all people as fellow human beings should be granted.

Either as a student or as an employee, we all have authorities whom we must obey. The question raised, however, is: do we by accepting these commands really show our respect for the individual or are we simply showing our respect for the authority. Respect is not something we should be forced to give to some people but rather it should be something we are willing to give to all people, not only to those who are in a position of authority.

What of those who are not over us but are our equals, or those who don't even measure up to our own level of maturity? How do we treat them?

In an attempt to answer this question, I chose to use the remark made by Goethe:

"If you treat an individual as he is, he will stay as he is, but if you treat him as if he were what he ought to be and could be, he will become as he ought to be and could be."

The amount of tolerance we manifest is another very sincere way of expressing our brotherliness. Tolerance is perhaps more of a virtue than anything else, for it is something easy for us to speak about but very difficult to put into practice. I'm sure we all can recall instances where vengeance seemed most equitable and yet for some reason we hesitated and held back. This is what is meant by tolerance, the capacity to control oneself even when revenge seems just.

As we move along in life, trust is something that becomes important to every individual, for we all need friends to whom we can confide our problems and know that they will go no further. Likewise, though, we feel the desire to be trusted and hope that others have faith in us.

There are individuals, though, who have never had anyone trust them and because of this, they feel reluctant to trust others and to relate their problems. Here is an instance, in being brotherly, where one must strive to rebuild this person's confidence by showing him that we trust him so that he will be able to trust us with his problems.

Another very important aspect of being brotherly is that of understanding. This is the ability to be sympathetic and patient, two very difficult things to practice. The individual who goes to see the psychiatrist often times does not seek advice but rather he seeks someone who will listen and understand his problem.

The old people in our neighborhoods who are always complaining are often seeking sympathy and, again, someone who will just listen, maybe not for very long but for just a little while.

Perhaps the most misunderstood virtue in all societies, past and present, has been that of charity. When the word charity is mentioned, "what to donate" is always the first question and "money" always seems to be the answer. The charity that refers to being brotherly always seems to be overlooked.

Kindness or help for the needy or suffering is the true meaning of charity and, although we cannot participate in charitable organizations which practice this virtue, there are many instances when we can do more than our share. We can offer advice to a person with a problem or encourage him along—whether this problem is great or small. There are numerous cases where a little charity of showing interest is worth more than any amount of money.

It seems to me that in our society today, people are full of talk. However, words are all too artificial and deceiving. In order to be brotherly, one must get out amongst the community, become involved, and show others through actions that brotherliness is not something idealistic. One must prove through his sincerity, warmth and kindness that brotherliness is not something that only people who go to church should possess, but rather it is something which we as believers in God have an obligation to extend to all mankind by our own way of life.

People talk, even as I talk up here now, about what brotherhood means; our religious leaders preach about how we should practice brotherliness; yet very few individuals really understand the true meaning of brotherhood and how it pertains to their lives.

Perhaps we may find the answer in this following remark which I quote from *The Brothers Karamazov*:

"Until you have become really, in actual fact, a brother to everyone, brotherhood will not come to pass. No sort of scientific teaching, no kind of common interest, will ever teach man to share property and privileges with equal consideration for all. Everyone will think his share too small and they will be always envying, complaining, and attacking one another."

REMARKS BY BEN G. SHAPIRO

Gentlemen of the clergy, Governor Sargent, our guests of honor, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is always a pleasure for me to have the assignment to welcome you to the annual dinner of the Massachusetts Committee Catholics, Protestants and Jews. This is our 33d annual dinner. We have surely grown over the years since our first meeting at the old City Club, when our attendance was 221 persons.

Tonight more than 1000 men and women are with us to pay tribute to the three distinguished Americans who are to be honored with our citations.

I am very proud of our committee and the contribution it has made in furthering the cause of human brotherhood.

During the past 33 years many outstanding citizens—Catholics, Protestants and Jews—have been gracious and kind in saying that it was their attendance at our annual dinner which motivated them to give of their time, effort and means to help destroy bigotry, hatred and the lack of respect for our fellow man. For these expressions I am grateful.

Certainly no one can measure the good we have accomplished over the years. We have made much progress, but there is still a lot more to be done.

Our committee is dedicated to a conviction that each person should have the right to grow, to achieve and to participate up to the limit of his natural abilities. It seeks

to remove social barriers to the growth, achievement and participation of people, particularly barriers which differentiate their rights according to their race, color, religion or national origin.

The Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants and Jews has continued its financial support of programs in some of our major institutions of learning.

The Human Science Institute, at Boston College; the Civic Education Center, at Tufts University; the Three-Chapels Program, at Brandeis University; and the Human Relations Center, at Boston University.

Through these activities we truly feel that we are involved with, and concerned for people on a day-to-day basis.

I wish I had the power of words to express the appreciation we of the committee, and the countless thousands of citizens have for the great leadership which Oscar W. Haussermann has given our committee during the past eighteen years of dedicated service.

With deep regret we accepted his resignation as our chairman, but with pleasure I announce that he will continue to serve as a member of our executive committee.

In 1959 we presented Mr. Haussermann with our citation, and I am proud to repeat an excerpt of this citation as an expression of our love and affection for this wonderful man—

Prominent in his profession, and a legal lecturer at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, he discovered time not only to serve as general chairman of the greater Boston emergency campaign of 1935, and as president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, but also to perform, over two score years, a myriad of disinterested acts in the public service. His has been a life dedicated in large measure to brotherhood.

We, his friends of the Massachusetts committee, are planning to recognize his long service to the committee at a later date.

I am very happy to announce that a member of our executive committee, and president of the Boston Edison Company, Mr. Thomas J. Galligan, Jr., has accepted the chairmanship of our committee.

I know that all of you join me in wishing him every success.

For your continued support and co-operation of the work of our Massachusetts Committee Catholics, Protestants and Jews, my sincerest thanks.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF GOV. FRANCIS W. SARGENT

We live in troubled times, times of crisis and uncertainty—days of discord and dissension throughout America.

There is a restlessness in the winds of change sweeping across this land.

Southeast Asia, thousands of miles away, has never been closer to New England shores.

Cambodia is more than a geographical locus, Kent, Ohio—more than a sleepy mid-western college town, Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, Roxbury—no more relieved of their squalor than tokenism will allow.

Is there any wonder that these times are troubled?

In fact, the very existence of this committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews suggests the anxieties and frustrations confronting our society.

For were we not so acutely aware of the differences that separate us—be they religious, racial, or political—we would not be compelled to foster brotherhood and understanding among men.

While some speak pessimism of a bleak future for this country, I view this as a period of hope in spite of our present troubles.

We are experiencing a catharsis—a renewal of spirit and resolve—in a re-examination of our values, moral and social.

Hundreds of thousands, young and old, have articulated an impassioned breath

and reasoned dissent for a restoration of peace and the brotherhood of man.

Tonight I urge you to actively join those dissenters.

There are those of us here tonight who recall when organizations like the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews proposed to promote toleration among men.

Well, toleration accomplishes little of itself.

It implies the acceptance of the status quo—doing nothing to ease the root causes of social ills.

I am proud of the strides you of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews have made to end the inequities and prejudices that make us a divided society.

It is clear that this committee is not content with the status quo, nor will it be satisfied until genuine equality of rights and opportunities of expression are secured for all people—at home and abroad.

The manner in which you have so often attempted to effect change convinces me that much could be achieved if you join your voices in dissent.

Dissent denying inequities among men; dissent directed toward a common good.

Your respect for, and utilization of, the liberties inherent within the establishment—the right to dissent and the right to strive for the ideals we cherish.

These are the keys to your effectiveness.

There are no easy answers to the probing questions of today—no reflex response to the challenge of contemporary crises.

But working together we can do much to effect positive change.

The men we honor tonight—my good friend, Senator Ed Brooke, Dr. Morris Abram, and Donald McGannon—have proven that beyond measure.

Their citations were won through exemplary action in their daily lives, by applying this committee's principles in practice in the halls of Congress, on the campus, and in private enterprise.

These men are dissenters in their own right, and so are we all dissenters—dissenters for a better America.

CITATION PRESENTED BY SIDNEY R. RABB

The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews, at its Thirty-third Annual Dinner, presents this citation and testimonial to Donald H. McGannon, industrialist, educator, public servant of uncommon versatility and scope, President of Westinghouse Electric Corporation whose rare blend of pragmatism, vision and profound concern for the human condition have made him a standard-bearer in man's quest for truth. President and Chairman of the Board of Group W, he has helped explore the frontiers of technology so that homes across the nation can share in the events of the hour; Chairman of the Westinghouse Learning Corporation, he has directed his imagination and insight to illuminating the significance of the ages, and the confusions of the twentieth century. Honored many times by the industry he leads, accorded tribute by the educational and cultural communities he serves, he has inspired us, entertained us, informed us—and made us care.

In recognition of his concepts of the art of communication and his distinguished contributions to an enlightened public opinion, the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews presents to Donald H. McGannon this citation and award.

Dated at Boston, Massachusetts this fourteenth day of May, 1970.

REMARKS OF DONALD H. MCGANNON

Senator Brooke, President Abrams, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen.

A moment like this, while filled with pride and happiness, is also filled with humility and conviction that this recognition is undeserved. I say this in part because I have not done enough or tried hard enough but also there is so much yet to be done in bringing about a quality of life in our country that offers every person the equality of opportunity and the chance for personal dignity and self fulfillment equal to each other. I don't want to be negative or pessimistic at a moment like this but I feel obligated to be candid in these statements less we delude ourselves that our gains in the field of civil rights has been more meaningful than, in fact, they have been.

In assessing the quality or inequality of people as we conclude the 60's and enter upon the 70's, certain obvious factors come to the forefront. These are more black actors and actresses appearing on television and in commercials. Attempts are being made to include within the entertainment field some relevant material concerning race relations. Business and industry have responded, although late, to the matter of training and hiring members of minority groups. Schools and institutions of higher learning are, with some degree of realism, embarking upon programs so sorely needed to transport a black student from 300 years of discrimination and depravation into a learning environment that will afford him or her an education that is both effective and enriching. I hasten to add that representation of black students within the total student body is, in my opinion, still grossly inadequate.

I guess we might think with some degree of pride that the battle against *out and out* bigotry, against hard racism has finally turned the corner. I had felt this way but get an occasional shock such as I did last Sunday when I read in the New York Times that the State Board of Education in Mississippi had reached the decision that Sesame Street would not be presented over ETV stations in that state because its cast was too integrated and Mississippi was not ready for this yet. I pray this might be a regrettable and unbelievable flashback of hard racism and a last vestige—never to be repeated.

I think we have a more difficult and subtle situation to face than hard racism and that's what I have come to call *soft racism*. I am convinced that for every hard racist in this country there are a million or more soft racists. Those people who do not necessarily "hate black people" but wonder why they should be given the same dignities and be allowed the same mobilities as other Americans.

This is reflecting itself in manifold circumstances and occasions whether it be in the outcome of specific elements, the impatience of people toward the racial problem or the ever enlarging backlash or reaction which one observes and experiences in the course of an active daily life.

In my opinion, the basic reason for this is that the average American has failed to make a personal commitment to the elimination of prejudice and injustice; or perhaps selfishly and pragmatically he has failed to correctly read the deep frustration of the black man. In either case, the inevitable impact that either of these alternatives will have upon the quality of life in the last third of this century can be disastrous unless a way is found to eliminate this failure of national will.

On which side of current American history do each of us place ourselves. On the side of concern, passion and a galvanized will to solve this problem, or on the side of indifference or aloofness or prejudice.

I believe that the hours remaining in which a real option is available to us as Americans are becoming fewer and fewer and fewer.

Thank you.

CITATION PRESENTED BY PETER FULLER

The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews, at its Thirty-third Annual Dinner, presents this citation and testimonial to Morris Berthold Abram, presented by Peter Fuller, attorney, diplomat and educator, whose initial call to public service came when President John F. Kennedy appointed him first General Counsel of the Peace Corps. He has ranged himself against discrimination on fronts around the world; as President of the American Jewish Committee, a post he resigned when he became President of Brandeis University, he has travelled thousands of miles to combat bigotry; as Senior Advisor to the United States Mission to the United Nations and U.S. Representative to the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, he has been deeply committed to the international promotion and protection of fundamental freedoms; and as a civil rights lawyer, he has stood foursquare against prejudice and injustice from his native Georgia northward. Firmly believing in Alfred North Whitehead's dictum, "Ideas won't keep. Something must be done about them," he has been a tireless champion of the unrepresented and a dedicated defender of democratic principles and ideals.

In recognition of his distinguished career of service, the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews presents to Morris Abram this citation and award.

Dated at Boston, Massachusetts this fourteenth day of May, 1970.

SPEECH OF MORRIS B. ABRAM

There are doom-sayers who proclaim that the United States is at the end of its road in history. They point to the youth, some turned off, others turned on, some in rebellion; to our minorities, so many frustrated and angry; to the appalling conditions of our cities and the desecration of our environment. These gloomy prophets conclude that our storied successes only measure the distance we have to topple.

Tonight I wish to assert my profound faith in this country and its future. I see awful dangers and pitfalls, but I know of no society which is better equipped than ours to face its problems and to overcome them—if we have the will.

The turmoil in the country is not necessarily a death rattle but the evidence of life and will for a better society. A democracy should be yeasty. Its vitality is measured by the people's ability and right to question every previously held position and sets of value. Today we are the witnesses, and I hope participants in the challenges to our old attitudes on the issues of peace and war, race, youth, women, environment and the responsibility and responsiveness of government in all these areas. I should be more disturbed by silence than by outcries in the presence of wrongs. What we have to fear from ferment is that it may be violent, thus injuring the rights of others, or that it may be suppressed. If we can continue to use our democratic institutions, especially our freedoms of speech, press, and assembly in constitutional ways we shall find and apply the reforms our society requires for the 70s and beyond.

We do have some tremendous national problems which must be dealt with decisively and promptly. I have chosen to spotlight three.

First, we are in the midst of a constitutional crisis. This President, as two before him, is continuing and expanding an undeclared war without the necessary Congressional approval. I do not believe that with such approval, this military expedition into Southeast Asia was wise or even in our national interest. However, if the Presidents who have involved us had been required to submit their explicit recommendations to the Congress for a declaration of war, we just possibly may not have taken the initial

steps or at least stopped short of an ultimate and tragic escalation of 1965. We certainly would not be in Cambodia tonight.

We stand 19th in life expectancy for males; 12th in maternal mortality and 14th in infant mortality. If baby death rates were no higher than in Sweden, we would save 50,000 American children each year.

Our whole system of national priorities is out of line; we spend annually \$22 million on ammunition alone for every Vietcong and North Vietnamese soldier in South Vietnam. We spend 44 federal dollars each year for the education of each American child.

Our streets are unsafe. We curse this and become enraged at segments of our population but the fault is clearly shared because of the inequality which all of us have permitted to stand.

Far too many Americans simply do not feel a part of the total society and with a stake in its peace and order, nor do we collectively really think law and justice is very important measured by our investment in society's enforcement and correctional institutions. We spend for local, state and federal law enforcement, including police, courts and correctional institutions, \$5 billion a year—almost precisely the same amount we give away for crop subsidies.

One wonders: Do we really care about our society? Would we rather complain than act? The remedy lies within the system. One which is reformed and renewed.

Our priorities can be set aright if we will do two things: re-distribute our national income and re-order our national priorities.

We can within the system re-distribute national income by a fair taxation arrangement, one resembling the level and progressiveness of other advanced Western states. American government at all levels takes for the public sector 28% of our product, while England, Sweden and Holland take around 38%. If we follow those examples, we would soon have the public funds to eliminate slums and personal poverty and the other causes of our human misery and national shame. And even at these tax rates, because of our great productivity and wealth, the average taxpayer would have far more than these comfortable Europeans.

However, it would do no good to tax appropriately if we spend for the greedy rather than the needy. Too many Americans now know that the oil companies, the shipping lines and farmers such as Senator Eastland are bigger welfare recipients than the hungry children of Mississippi and the cold children in Harlem. Many people are now becoming aware that the Federal budget for 1970 holds \$800,000,000 for military housing but only \$500,000,000 for model cities and that was before President's recent reduction in the latter program.

How do we straighten out these misallocated priorities? There is no way within the system except to reform the Congress and its creaky cronies committee system. If congressional government is to be credible, it must work in behalf of people, not for the benefit of the senior members of Congress. To those who declared that American Government cannot work, I say it is not getting a chance. There is nothing in the Constitution which says that 80-year-old men in the Congress should be able to frustrate the people's will and avoid the results of every national election. If congressional government is to survive, it must prove capable of surmounting the problems of the 70s.

Finally, we are in a crisis of human relations. The more things improve for the Blacks, the more startling the ancient inequalities appear and unbearable they become. I have always felt that the racial problem is at least two—one involving color prejudice and the other class discrimination. The cruel fact is that most Whites are in the middle class and most Blacks in the under class—economically. Integration in the

fullest sense required Whites to vault over skin and class prejudice. We can make the task much easier by wiping out poverty which will remove an enormous impediment to full human acceptance. When, however, Blacks have been fully incorporated into our economic mainstream, there still must be that act of human faith to overcome the barriers built by years of racism. However, the counter-walls of separatism and antagonism born of disappointment, frustration and despair must not be built higher and become a further divider. There is no answer to the problems created by diversity in America except the integration and incorporation of all groups into a common society and citizenship.

The day is past when groups with deep and justified grievances in America will bear them silently and submissively. This does not signal the end of America but perhaps the dawn of a better day—if we do not panic.

We must use democracy's freedoms as tools to make our representative institutions more responsive to the insuppressible urge for a more just domestic society and a less violent world.

We must reject the advice of those who see in every grievance a justification for a disruption, or worse still, a cause for revolution.

Nevertheless, men of influence and authority who have been selected to operate our government must not use their positions to frustrate reform.

There is no excuse for violence in any properly functioning, truly representative government.

The pledge of allegiance speaks of "one nation—indivisible." It also contains the prescription: "With liberty and justice for all."

CITATION PRESENTED BY EDWARD B. HANIFY

The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews, at its Thirty-third Annual Dinner, presents this citation and testimonial to EDWARD W. BROOKE, United States senator from Massachusetts, lawyer, alumnus and trustee of Boston University, who has represented the people of the Commonwealth with integrity and eloquence in both the national and international community. A sensitive crusader against crime and corruption in government—and a passionate believer in programs of crime prevention—he served for two terms as the thirty-fifth Attorney General of Massachusetts and, with rare vision and insight, early led the campaign to reduce air pollution in the state. Chairman of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee on the Poor People's Campaign and member of the National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders, he has provided courageous and exciting leadership in many fields—political, military, social, and cultural. His list of distinguished achievements contains many historic "firsts," including becoming the first Negro in history to be elected by popular vote to the United States Senate, but he stands before us—as he has steadfastly stood before the voters—not because of the color of his skin, but because of the excellence and scope of his accomplishments.

In recognition of his invaluable public service within and beyond the confines of our Commonwealth, the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews presents to Senator Edward W. Brooke this citation and award.

Dated at Boston, Massachusetts this fourteenth day of May, 1970.

REMARKS OF SENATOR EDWARD W. BROOKE

As I speak to you this evening, this country is caught in the midst of a crisis of confidence scarcely paralleled in our modern history. This evening American men are fighting and dying in another Asian country. Our campuses and cities are torn by dissent, and even by death. Internationally, we are being

subjected to a barrage of warnings and criticisms from friend and foe alike. The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks in which we have placed so much hope may well be jeopardized by the escalating conflicts in Asia and the Middle East.

The clashes of our own age remind us that violence—among and within nations, pitting ideologies and generations one against another—has plagued mankind for millennia.

Today we see a coalescing of many of the tensions that have gone before. We have an unpopular war; black people seeking full admission into American society after three hundred long, hard years of inequality. We have a body of young people—educated, articulate, impatient and concerned, divided in their methods and their goals, but united in their dissatisfaction with this country as they find it.

In the last two weeks thousands of your sons and daughters and grandchildren have come to Washington to petition their government. I have listened to them and talked with them. On Saturday I went with them to the Ellipse because I believe in their cause and because we in government must be responsive or they will turn to the bomb throwers and radicals who want to destroy the system. These young people seek not to destroy the system from without but to change it to improve it from within.

And I can find nothing wrong with a generation which campaigns for peace instead of war, which works for equal justice and equal opportunity for all, which labors for clean air and clean water instead of the filthy environment which threatens life on earth. Every concerned American shares those objectives and citizens, young and old, ought to be encouraged to pursue them in the commendable fashion set by those who have come to the nation's capital in recent days.

The motto, "Let us reason together," rings false, if political leaders disparage peaceful protest and bar the door to a free and frank exchange of views. And how effective a tool is reason in a country where polls reveal that an alarming majority of the American public would deny to their countrymen the right of assembly and free speech, and incarcerate a suspect until his trial proves him innocent? Surely we must see that most of our young people are not challenging America to abandon its traditions, but to live up to them.

We bear a collective responsibility for bringing understanding to a troubled land. Understanding requires not only information but a "psychological set", a willingness to perceive the meaning within the frantic facts of our time. We cannot speak of "pigs" and "fascists" and "reds" and at the same time portray all men as brothers! If a liberal or a conservative, a long-haired kid or a short-haired cop, is automatically suspect in the eyes of any beholder, then that beholder is not helping to build a bridge of understanding; he is raising ever higher the walls of misunderstanding.

In this time of tension and trouble, it behooves all of us to seek anew the answer to the age-old question: Who is my brother? Perhaps we can begin by recognizing as our brothers all men whose lives touch ours, or who are affected by what we do. As our world grows increasingly interdependent, that simple test must bring us to the understanding that all men are brothers, and all brothers are hostages to fate and to each other.

Talking with students and others these past few days, one central theme seems to mark their thinking. There is a widespread belief, grown out of disillusionment with the relative ineffectiveness of numerous demonstrations, that further long-term action is essential. People who once spoke of marches now speak of campaigns. People who were once contemptuous of "the system" now distinguish areas where progress may be made.

The need to work within that much-criticized "system", and the awareness that people within it share the general goal, are gradually becoming apparent.

This movement must be encouraged if it is to succeed, and if hope is not to turn to despair.

It was Lincoln, I believe, who said that what is morally wrong can never be politically right. That profound truth is a wholesome standard for every citizen and every politician.

But there is another truth which is essential to the functioning of an open society, and one which is imperilled when passion and conviction merge into self-righteousness. That is the insight which says, not every difference of judgment is a difference of principle, not every political disagreement is a dispute in ethics. And a nation which values rational discourse will be wary of transforming political issues into bases for moral conflicts.

In a period of immense tension, I consider it imperative that we retain this sense of balance. For, to the extent that we lose our ability not merely to tolerate but to respect the variety of political judgments which complex problems evoke, we will indeed have lost a necessary quality of a free society. One does not advance toward humane objectives by damning political adversaries as moral ogres. For, as the great religions have taught, even adversaries are brethren. And, as sensible politicians have taught, today's adversaries may well be tomorrow's allies. Prudence and principle alike argue that the intemperate politics of moral castigation is itself immoral and ineffective.

In the context of the current controversy, perhaps I should be quite explicit in applying this doctrine. I believe the strikes against the Cambodian sanctuaries were wrong. I believe they are unwise and have served to undermine confidence in the President's commitment to continue de-escalating the war in Southeast Asia. I doubt that such operations will improve prospects for negotiation. I think the risks far outweigh any potential gains.

But I also believe that the President and those who support his decision hold precisely chances of a negotiated settlement. My contrary judgments. They believe the attacks on the sanctuaries will curb hostilities in South Vietnam, reduce American and South Vietnamese casualties in the coming months, facilitate U.S. disengagement and raise the doubts about this decision are exceeded only by my prayers that the President's policy will actually bring an end to the war.

The commotion of recent days should not be allowed to obscure the deeper consensus that exists in America. That consensus, I submit, supports orderly disengagement of U.S. forces from South Vietnam. It is that consensus which many of us in Congress are trying to re-assert by establishing firmer legislative controls over operations in Southeast Asia.

Our efforts have already brought important commitments from the executive branch. We are assured that U.S. forces will not re-enter Cambodia after July 1. We are told that the South Vietnamese will assume all ground combat responsibilities in their country by June of next year, when American troops will be used only for protection of remaining U.S. logistical and air personnel. And Secretary Laird has indicated that South Vietnamese forces will not be spread so thinly that further withdrawals of U.S. troops are impeded.

Here at home, the most encouraging by-product of this difficult experience may be an earnest effort by the Administration to reach out toward young people and dissenters. The President and members of his cabinet have gained a new awareness of the need to deal constructively with the views and concerns voiced by students and other

critics. I am hopeful that more sympathetic communication can be established. But the establishment of national harmony and productive collaboration will demand much of us all. We who preach brotherhood, and seek to practice it in our lives, should be the first to heed this call. Our country needs us. Our children need us. Our friends and neighbors need us to show the way.

If we would have a better life, we must make a better world. Tonight, here and all over our land, that effort is underway.

For in trying to understand lies the germ of understanding. In groping for unity lies the path to unity. And in seeking compassion lies the seed of compassion which will flower into the greater community America can be.

CONNECTICUT PASSPORT LOG-JAM BROKEN

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Connecticut passport applicants will not be meeting frustrating delays very much longer according to the recent announcement by the State Department that all first-class post offices in Connecticut will take passport applications on a 6-month trial basis starting July 1.

This action by the State Department represents the result of years of attempts to arrive at an effective and lasting solution to this problem. In previous years I have tried to find a legislative remedy to speed up the passport application process, and I have continuously worked with the State Department Office to provide Connecticut residents with better service. My Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations has held open hearings to publicize the problem and hasten a solution.

In April I wrote to former Senator Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts, chairman of the State Department Committee To Facilitate Travel, and suggested that the committee consider immediate administrative action as an alternative to the long and difficult legislative road to remedy the annual passport logjam experienced by Connecticut travelers.

Senator Saltonstall assured me that the committee would have a June report and Executive action to remedy the perennial crisis and I congratulate Senator Saltonstall and his committee for adhering to their stated timetable.

In my April letter to Senator Saltonstall I noted that the problem of inadequate facilities for the issuance of passports has spiraled in recent years until it has become a noteworthy example of failure of Government to respond to the legitimate needs of its citizens, and that if prompt action were not taken, interested citizens would justifiably feel frustration and resentment.

I am pleased that the committee adopted my suggestion for an immediate administrative solution and I intend to work together with the State Department and the Postmaster General to insure that this experiment becomes a model for

effective governmental response to legitimate citizen demands. If successful in Connecticut the program will be extended to the post offices of all the States.

In addition to the existing passport offices in Connecticut which will continue to accept passport applications, starting July 1, first class post offices in

Waterbury, New Haven, Hartford, Stamford, Greenwich, New London, Willimantic, and Bridgeport will also process applications.

SENATE—Friday, June 12, 1970

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

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

O God, who art known to the pure in heart, help us in these troubled days and changing times, to hold fast to our faith in Thee. When knowledge is confused and judgment uncertain, lose not care of us though we lose sight of Thee. When thoughts of Thee grow dim or pressing duties consume our time, still hold us fast and lead us unconsciously to do Thy will. Reassure us that Thou abidest beyond all change and art always better than our highest hopes, greater than our noblest dreams.

Bless this Nation which Thou hast given us that discerning and doing Thy will we may fitly serve Thee and all mankind.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 12, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 11, 1970, be dispensed with.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now transact routine morning business with statements limited to 3 minutes.

CRIME LEGISLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, according to the press, radio, and television reports, President Nixon found fault with Congress on yesterday for failing

to pass 13 pending anticrime bills, some of which are highly controversial.

According to the news reports, he said:

We will do a better job with more legislation, but let us remember where the responsibility lies. It is right down there in the Congress. They need to provide those tools for us and then we will do the job. I think perhaps the major failure of this Congress has been its failure to act on any of the crime legislation which has been before them for 18 months.

This failure—

He asserted—

will be something that the people will remember.

Mr. President, at the same time, the distinguished Vice President of the United States, the constitutionally prescribed Presiding Officer of this body, who is very much aware of what goes on in this Chamber, said:

Unfortunately, the Vice President continued, the legislation needed to effectuate the President's anticrime program has not been provided.

May I say that the Senate has already passed 13 major crime proposals advocated by the administration. The total number of anticrime proposals advocated by the administration is 20. The full list of anticrime measures are as follows, by bill number and title:

S. 2022, illegal gambling control.
S. 2637, drug bill—S. 3246.
S. 2657, included in drug bill.
S. 2601, District of Columbia court reorganization.

S. 2602, public defender, District of Columbia.

S. 2869, criminal law revision, District of Columbia.

S. 2981, Juvenile Code, revision, District of Columbia.

S. 3036, increase penalties, Sherman Antitrust Act.

Obscenity: S. 2073, obscene mail to minors; S. 2074, prurient advertising; and H.R. 10877, obscene mail, title II of postal rates bill.

S. 2600, bail reform.

S. 3132, criminal appeals.

S. 952, omnibus judgeship bill.

S. 2122, Federal immunity of witnesses.

S. 2292, sources of evidence.

S. 1861, Corrupt Organizations Act.

S. 30, Organized Crime Control Act of 1969.

S. 1624, Wagering tax amendments.

S. 1461, Criminal Justice Act amendments.

In addition, there is the Mansfield bill, which provides an additional penalty if a gun is used in the perpetration of a crime. In other words, if anyone uses a gun in committing a crime, he will be subjected to an additional severe penalty over and above the penalty prescribed for the basic offense.

The sentence for a first offense will be

an additional 2 to 10 years, for a second offense the additional penalty for carrying a gun in the perpetration of a crime will be a 25-year sentence. The sentences will not run concurrently but consecutively. This proposal—which passed the Senate unanimously—raises the total anticrime measures to 21.

The full list of the other 20 anticrime proposals advocated by the Nixon administration and the action already taken or contemplated by the Senate is as follows, by bill number, title, and status:

S. 2022, illegal gambling control: Passed Senate—S. 30—January 23, 1970.

S. 2637, drug bill—S. 3246: Passed Senate January 28, 1970.

S. 2657, included in drug bill: Passed Senate January 28, 1970, included in S. 3246.

S. 2601, District of Columbia court reorganization: Passed Senate September 19, 1969.

S. 2602, public defender, District of Columbia: Passed Senate November 21, 1969.

S. 2869, criminal law revision, District of Columbia: Passed Senate December 5, 1969.

S. 2981, Juvenile Code, revision, District of Columbia: Passed Senate December 22, 1969.

S. 3036, increase penalties, Sherman Antitrust Act: Definite passage this session. Consent Calendar item, no controversy.

Obscenity: S. 2073, obscene mail to minors and S. 2074, prurient advertising: Reported to full committee; H.R. 10877, obscene mail, title II of postal rates bill.

S. 2600, bail reform: Hearings underway; administration had requested postponement until March 1970 when it completed its study of constitutional questions raised by preventive detention.

S. 3132, criminal appeals: Senate hearings completed.

CRIME BILLS SUPPORTED BY ADMINISTRATION, ORIGINATED IN SENATE

S. 952, omnibus judgeship bill: Passed Senate June 23, 1969.

S. 2122, Federal immunity of witnesses: Passed Senate January 23, 1970.

S. 2292, sources of evidence: Passed Senate January 23, 1970.

S. 1861, Corrupt Organizations Act: Passed Senate January 23, 1970.

S. 30, Organized Crime Control Act of 1969: Passed Senate January 23, 1970.

S. 1623, wagering tax amendments: Definite Senate passage this session.

S. 1461, Criminal Justice Act amendments: Passed Senate April 30, 1970.

Thus, the only two significant crime recommendations that the Senate has not yet acted upon are: First, the difficult area of pornography; and second, bail reform—containing the issue of preventive detention.