of Soviet pilots flying Soviet planes in combat-type situations sharply increase the danger of direct Soviet-Israel confrontation. Moreover, the Soviet buildup of naval forces in the Mediterranean that has occurred over the past several months makes clear Soviet intentions of exercising a greater degree of political influence in the Mediterranean and the countries that surround it.

Installation in the delta and Nile Valley of Russian Sam III missiles to protect against low-level Israel attack appears quite significant. The batteries are reportedly Russian commanded, operated, protected, and supported; and it is said that they virtually insure Alexandria, Cairo, and Egyptian air facilities well south of Cairo against Israeli bombs.

It has been the policy of the United States throughout the post World War II period to seek to insure the security of the State of Israel. This policy was specifically restated by Secretary Rogers on December 9 and in his statement of March 23, at which time the administration deferred a decision on making additional combat aircraft available to Israel. No tangible benefits from this delay are visible. The dangers grow.

While the United States has the responsibility to seek to restrain an unlimited arms race in the Middle East, which I support, we also have a responsibility to insure that Israel has access to the weapons and planes to defend herself. Israel does not ask the United States to defend her. She asks only for the materials with which to defend herself.

Recently, 70-odd of my colleagues have signed a joint letter addressed to the Secretary of State urging that the Government announce its intention to provide additional combat aircraft to the State of Israel. I wish to identify myself with the sentiment and the recommendation expressed in that letter. I preferred to write the Secretary of State to express my own views more precisely. On June 5, 1970, I wrote a letter to President Nixon in which I pointed out some of the factors which I have stated here. The concluding paragraph of my letter to President Nixon is as follows:

Under all these circumstances, and in the absence of some private understanding between yourself and Russia, I respectfully urge your approval of the sale of needed planes to Israel.

Mr. President, reports this morning of events in Jordan reflect a very tense and a very precarious situation. I urge the President and officials of his administration to accord full consideration to this situation on a priority basis, and to make the required planes available to Israel.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has indicated that he wishes to announce his intention to be associated and identified with those who signed the letter recently directed to the President, urging that planes be made available to Israel. On behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) I want to indicate that he, also, wanted it noted in the RECORD today that he wishes to be identified and associated with those who have signed that letter to the President of the United States.

Mr. GORE. I wish so to be recorded, also, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 15, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 15, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate June 12, 1970:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

James D. Hodgson, of California, to be Secretary of Labor.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 12, 1970:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The following-named persons to be Assistant Directors of the National Science Foundation:

Edward C. Creutz, of California.
Lloyd G. Humphreys, of Illinois.
Louis Levin, of Maryland.
Thomas B. Owen, of Washington.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The nominations beginning Arnold B. Barr, to be surgeon, and ending Dennis R. Shipman, to be an assistant health services officer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 15, 1970.

U.S. AIR FORCE

Brig. Gen. Frank A. Bailey, [redacted]FG, Arkansas Air National Guard, for appointment as a Reserve commissioned officer in the U.S. Air Force to the grade of major general, under the provisions of chapters 35 and 837, title 10 of the United States Code.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list, in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. James Dyce Alger, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Andrew Jackson Boyle, [redacted] Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. John Edward Kelly, [redacted], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Charles Wythe Gleaves Rich, [redacted] Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

U.S. NAVY

Adm. Ignatius J. Galantin, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

U.S. ARMY

The nominations beginning Gerald O. Anderson, to be major, and ending Felix D. Winter, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 5, 1970.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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?

DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday before the Subcommittee on Roads we received the testimony of one of America's distinguished public servant's, my dear friend, the Federal Highway Administrator, Hon. Frank C. Turner. He testified in his usual knowledgeable and helpful manner. By coincidence today also marks the beginning of his 42d year as a public servant.

Frank Turner is a great human being, a fine engineer—a real American.

He has served the American people in many parts of the world including Central America, the Philippine Islands, and Alaska. He has been one of the key figures in directing the progress of our interstate highway program.

He is a graduate of that great university, Texas A. & M., which contributed more officers to service in World War II than any other university. He expresses the spirit of that great university in his dedication to duty.

Frank Turner through his public service over the years has contributed immeasurably to the social, economic, and environmental development of our Nation.

I salute him as he begins his 42d year as a public servant. We as a committee need him and his country needs him.

OMBUDSMAN

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, appearing today before the Rotary Club of Houston, Tex., Mr. Clark R. Mollenhoff, who is retiring as special counsel to President Nixon, reviewed some of the problems that confront the Federal Government and our society, and suggested creation of a permanent Office of Ombudsman in the White House.

Prior to his appointment as special counsel to the President, Mr. Mollenhoff was a reporter for the Des Moines Register and Tribune and won many awards for the excellence of his work in bringing to light corruption both in and out of Government.

His books on the subject of his reportorial experiences in Washington are widely read and used as references.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD portions of his remarks to the Houston Rotary Club, as follows:

This nation has gone through a period of disillusionment that is one of the most difficult in our history. Young and old alike have been questioning whether our system of government can deal with the problems that face our society.

Scandals ranging from carelessness to outright fraud have been exposed in connection with the war on poverty and other welfare programs. Evidence indicates that in certain areas, the Mafia has had the tight control over city, county, and state officials. There is even some evidence that the Mafia has had an unhealthy influence on decisions of the IRS and the federal courts.

Congressional investigations of Defense Department contracts demonstrate billions of dollars in cost overruns and indicate a negligence or conspiracy to pad our military spending with excessive profits. There are examples of favoritism in the awarding of contracts at city, county, state, and federal levels of government.

The brutal slaying of Joseph A. (Jock) Yablonski, his wife, Margaret, and their daughter, Charlotte Joanne of Washington, Pennsylvania has reemphasized the brutality that has been a part of the history of the United Mine Workers and many of our large labor organizations.

James R. Hoffa's arrogant domination of the International Teamsters Union was characterized by abuse of power, misuse of union funds, and corruption in the handling of the multi-million dollar pension and welfare programs. Some say he still runs the Teamsters from prison.

Robert G. (Bobby) Baker is still free three years after his conviction of fraud and larceny charges. He has been the symbol of corruption in the highest offices in government. His continued freedom is regarded by many as proof that those with the big money and the big connections need never pay the price of incarceration.

It is easy to see why those who take a brief look at some of these incidents in our society are disillusioned. They question whether it is possible to operate our American democracy as it was intended to operate— in a fair and honest manner.

In the face of problems that have seemed overwhelming, our citizens have reacted in many ways. Some have questioned whether we should expose our scandals. Some go as far as to suggest that we cover them up, so we can give the world a more flattering picture of the United States. Some withdraw into a shell of bitterness and futility and leave the field clear for the active corruptionists.

There are even a few who decide to join the thieves after erroneously concluding that you can't beat them so you might as well join them.

With no answers of their own, many people have rushed to join groups or societies that contend they have the answers. These groups aggressively supply what the confused may regard as easy answers.

The unknowing find it easy to join without thinking and frequently end up as supporters of the Students for Democratic Society or the John Birch Society, the extreme White Citizens groups, or the equally extreme Black Muslims or the Ku Klux Klan.

No amount of warning and reasoning will stop all of the rush of thoughtless citizens who will donate their finances and give their names to extremist groups. A certain amount of this frantic joining can be expected in any free society. However, it is disturbing when large numbers of basically bright college students join the John Birch Society with no real look at what that group stands for.

It is equally disturbing when large numbers of college students rally around the actions of thugs and outlaws who disrupt the educational processes of our universities or take over and destroy college buildings and offices.

I believe there is a special responsibility placed upon the young people in our colleges and universities to analyze what is wrong with our society but to be restrained in their activities until such time as they are absolutely certain that those activities will be helpful in finding solutions to the problems they have found.

And I would be hopeful that the critics of our society and our system of government would not seek to tear it down until such time as they are certain in their own minds that the replacement would represent a better opportunity for fair and honest administration of government.

For more than 25 years I have been involved in investigations of the mismanagement and corruption of government at all levels. With full knowledge of the corruption in our society, I am still certain that it is relatively clean. I say "relatively clean" for in judging we must not judge it alone against some imaginary ideal. We must judge it by comparing it with other societies that exist in the world today. With all of its weaknesses, it is certainly a better society than that of the Communist world where there is no thought of fair play or justice for the individual.

If there is anything wrong with our society, it is not because of our system of government. What is wrong is wrong despite our system of government which gives the people of the country the right to insist upon high standards, and the mechanism for defeating those who do not strive for honest and efficient government.

If there are things that you don't like, don't be among those who rip at our system and blame our American democracy for everything. It is time for each citizen to look at himself and to ask himself if he is contributing to the delinquency. He should also ask himself if there isn't something more he can do to eliminate the evils that will inevitably creep into any system.

I believe I have viewed almost every evil that can creep into our system but I have not lost faith in that system of government. I know that I will never lose faith in it.

In nearly every case, our American democracy has forced a reform as soon as the facts had been clearly relayed to the public through the press. I have seen incompetent and corrupt city officials defeated and corrupt and incompetent county officials indicted, convicted and removed from office.

OMBUDSMAN

Many indictments and convictions followed the exposure of corruption in the Truman Administration. Revelations of conflict of interest in several high offices in the Eisenhower Administration resulted in a rash of resignations and a few indictments. There were indictments and conflicts arising out of scandals in the Kennedy Administration.

I have no doubt that the Nixon Administration will be plagued from time to time with similar problems. We had one major first test in connection with Major General Carl Turner. It was possible to demonstrate the advantage of swift non-partisan action in connection with the Turner matter. We were able to learn of serious problems involving Major General Carl Turner, who had been appointed last March as the Chief United States Marshal. His resignation was obtained within a matter of a few hours after the Administration became aware that he was not worthy of his position. The hearings before the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee demonstrated dramatically that it was important that we came to grips with that issue and removed the man who failed to meet the standards required by this Administration.

The public was understanding because the Administration took action against an appointee of the Administration at the first point at which it was clear that General Turner did not meet the Administration's standard. When Turner was appointed in March, there was no reason to believe he was other than an experienced career military investigator. There was no record of arrests or convictions to mar his record.

The mistake of appointing Carl Turner was the mistake any Administration could make and there was public understanding of this and no editorial criticism. I hope that the swift corrective action in the Turner case will set the tone for this Administration.

I hope that the Nixon Administration will always be able to find the true facts at an early stage and brush away the excuses and rationalizations that are so frequently brought forward to cloud the issue.

I was named presidential ombudsman because President Nixon wanted someone in the White House who would be mainly concerned with the problems of inefficiency, mismanagement, and corruption in the federal government. The jurisdiction was to be roughly that of a government operations committee of the Senate or House.

It is not a role that has carried any direct responsibilities in the political area or in the program policy areas. It stresses government operations.

It has been an effort to establish a mechanism outside the normal chain of command for the administration of government programs for independent fact finding on problem areas that will take advantage of the whole range of government sources, plus a wide range of sources outside of the federal government.

The President and others in his administration have been familiar with "Despoilers of Democracy" and "The Pentagon" which were nonideological and nonpartisan case studies on the problems of dealing with inefficiency, mismanagement and corruption in a wide range of government agencies. The President wanted that approach.

Many of our Presidents have been embarrassed by commenting upon government problems before they were appropriated of the full facts on cases involving inefficiency, mismanagement, and corruption in their administrations. President Truman made errors in his comments and explanations on problems involving the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Internal Revenue Service, and some other agencies. This made it appear that he was condoning questionable activity.

President Eisenhower made similar mistakes in press conference comments on the Dixon Yates case, and in connection with the Adams-Goldfine matter.

President Kennedy made similar mistakes in commenting at press conferences on the Billie Sol Estes case, on the TFX case, and on other matters.

All suffered some major embarrassment because they relied upon the normal administrative chain of command. At a late date they found that men with a stake in the case, from a standpoint of official responsibility or as a result of involvement in questionable activity, had given them inaccurate information.

President Nixon, who had extended experience in dealing with congressional investigations, has realized the hazard of dealing with information that comes through the bureaucratic chain of command. He has wanted to keep the possibility of error down to a minimum.

Serious errors in dealing with the problems of mismanagement or corruption can do irreparable harm to an administration from a standpoint of its credibility on international or domestic matters, and in its dealings with members of the Senate and House.

The many grave problems—domestic and foreign, that must be dealt with today create conditions that make it particularly important that there be a mechanism to protect the President from the errors that can arise from over reliance upon the bureaucratic chain of command.

It is important to establish an effective government-wide follow-through on past problem areas, and to set the tone for what the President expects of his own administration.

SENATOR JOHN WILLIAMS

Arrogant bureaucracy is the greatest obstacle today to proper functioning of the government and has created a sense of frustration from the lowest student up to the presidency. The sense of frustration, dramatized by some of the student protests, is also present among businessmen, city, county, and state political leaders, Senators and Congressmen and federal government officials.

A properly organized and staffed ombudsman office can make the federal government more responsive to the thoughtful complaints of the public and more responsive to the will of the President.

My experience as presidential ombudsman coupled with more than 25 years of experience investigating government mismanagement and corruption at all levels has convinced me that a properly structured and staffed ombudsman office can be the answer to many of our most serious problems. It would provide:

1. A place for citizens to lodge their complaints against arbitrary bureaucratic actions with the hope of having the grievances examined carefully.

2. It would provide the mechanism for thoughtful depth examination of complaints and would force the production of records dealing with government operations and decisions.

3. It would provide a means of separating legitimate complaints from frivolous complaints and would provide periodic publication of the finding of fact and conclusion. Reports published on a semi-annual or annual basis would force government agencies to give greater attention to the necessity of justifying decisions to an independent body and for correcting decisions that are erroneous.

The ombudsman office could be created by the President within the White House or it could be established by law independent of the White House. Essential to the proper functioning of this office are the following:

1. Cabinet rank so there can be no question about the ombudsman authority to obtain records and reports.

2. A man of great experience, stature, and impeccable integrity.

3. Job tenure so that there can be no doubt about the ombudsman's total independence (a law would be required for job tenure).

4. Direct access to the President at all times.

5. An initial staff of 12 to 20 lawyers and accountants with years of experience on investigations of government operations either with congressional committees or with government agencies, or both.

6. Public reports made to the President and to the Senate and the House on an annual or semi-annual basis with provisions for special reports.

7. This job should be devoid of any partisan political authority or responsibility.

The key to the successful operation of the federal ombudsman office is the selection of an ombudsman to head this new structure. This must be a man of great experience in the investigation of government who is recognized by the public for his great stature and his impeccable integrity. Senator John J. Williams, Republican of Delaware, is the only man who comes to mind immediately as having the full credentials necessary to do this job. He will be retiring from the United States Senate at the end of 1970. His conduct as a member of the United States Senate over a period of twenty-four years is recognized by Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives as having been in the highest tradition of public service.

I believe that the establishment of an ombudsman office, headed by Senator John Williams, would do more than any other single act to restore faith in the federal government.

Expensive reorganizations and realignments of government activities have been usually only a slight reshuffle of the same old bureaucratic cliques. John Williams and a small, effective staff could break up the old bureaucratic patterns and restore integrity and fair play in many areas where it has been missing for years.

CRISIS IN HIGHER EDUCATION REQUIRES RECASTING OF RELATIVE ROLES BETWEEN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 12, 1970

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, our national syndrome of bigness has led to the spawning of multiversities, vast educational complexes which have in some instances become unmanageable.

Even our smaller colleges have been caught in the growth race, increasing enrollments and curricula, adding new buildings and faculty—often without design or long-range goals. In some cases, this has resulted in both educational and financial disaster.

Today educational leaders are being forced to reassess the relative roles of universities and colleges. One of the classic definitions is: Colleges teach you how to make a living; universities teach you how to live. In too many instances, universities by their very bigness have become fragmented and parochial, and many small colleges strive unsuccessfully to duplicate the university experience.

Harvard Historian Henry Steele Commager, writing recently in Saturday Review, gave an erudite summation of the higher educational dilemma. He wrote:

> At a time when almost everything, including man, is organized and mechanized and computerized and dehumanized, there is a great deal to be said for colleges that allow room at the joints.

The small private college has very little leeway in allowing room at the joints. Caught in a web of rising operating costs, inflationary borrowing, and growing student demand, these institutions are faced at the same time with dwindling public and private support. Indeed, several of our most revered educational institutions report operating deficits and are being forced to live off endowments and other resources.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD, together with two recent newspaper articles which illustrate the plight of our Nation's small colleges.

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

HAS THE SMALL COLLEGE A FUTURE?

(By Henry Steele Commager)

The college is an American institution, unknown elsewhere in the Western world. In the Old World, higher education has been, and is, assigned to universities; in many countries of the Old World the secondary schools—public schools, *lycées*, and Gymnasia—perform most of the tasks of our colleges and display most of their stigmata.

How did it happen that Americans contrived the college? Creation of the first institution was almost fortuitous, and set a pattern: Harvard College was founded at a moment in English educational history when the Oxford-Cambridge colleges had taken over from the universities, and it was a kind of stepdaughter of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, which was a very special Puritan foundation. But the deeper explanation is simply that the Americans were not prepared to create or maintain universities; indeed, they were not prepared to do so until about a century ago, with the creation of Cornell in the 1860s, the transformation of Harvard under Eliot, the founding of the Johns Hopkins in 1876.

When the Americans finally did create universities, they did not (except briefly at Hopkins) substitute them for colleges, but added them atop the colleges. The two were not integrated—as at Oxbridge, where the colleges provide the tutoring, and the universities the lecturing, the research, and the laboratories—but were made consecutive. This meant that in the United States the university tended to be an enlarged and grown-up college. To be sure, at the better universities such as Harvard, Columbia, and The Hopkins, the graduate and professional faculties took over, but it is mostly the college tail that wags the university dog.

The college is not only indigenous, it is unique. The college emerged in the United States to serve a particular constituency and function in a special way. Note first that the college was designed to be and long supposed to be terminal. It provided all the education the young were going to get—in America, at least—and that was supposed to be quite enough education. In a simple and unsophisticated society, young men with only a college degree (there were few young women with such degrees until the mid-century) could go into teaching, law, architecture, business, and in some states even into medicine. Any additional training as they might need they were expected to get in offices or at work—not altogether a bad idea.

Second, the college was designed to take care of boys rather than young men. It was, in many ways, what the preparatory school is today. In the eighteenth and well into the nineteenth centuries, boys entered college at thirteen or fourteen, and a really bright lad like John Trumbull could pass the entrance examinations for Yale at the age of seven (he had the decency to wait until he was twelve before presenting himself). When in college, they studied pretty much what young men at Exeter, St. Paul's, or Lawrenceville studied half a century ago: Latin and, perhaps, Greek, mathematics, religion, rhetoric, a bit of history, a bit of science.

This youthfulness of students appeared to justify, even require, the perpetuation by the institution of *in loco parentis*, now in full retreat. It was clearly necessary that tutors—and even presidents—take care of the health and morals of the young who had been entrusted to their care by anxious parents. The necessity of careful supervision was not relaxed in the nineteenth century, for though students were older, by then, two additional considerations had emerged: the presence of young ladies on the campus and the growing number of distractions that assailed the young.

The youthfulness of students served as both an inspiration and a justification for what came to be regarded as the chief concern of the college: instruction in morality and the nurture of a Christian character. The purpose of a European (as distinct from English) universities was to train for government service and for the professions; in America it was to mold character. If this were taken care of, all else would take care of itself.

But the college, perhaps inadvertently, served another function: It was an instrument for the prolongation of youth. For a century and a half now, Americans have been bemused by this romantic notion, a notion deeply rooted in history and the national character. Americans pursued happiness more self-consciously and more energetically than other peoples, perhaps because they thought it a natural right, perhaps because they equated it with the things America had to offer, and thus had the satisfaction of a self-fulfilling objective. Certainly, they equated happiness with childhood, an equation that made sense if children did not have to go to work in fields or factories at the age of eight or nine. Those who had not themselves had the opportunity to prolong their youth by going to college instead of to work—and this included most parents up until the 1930s—passionately desired this boon for their children. Let them enjoy four golden years—years of youth, years of freedom from work, from care, from the problems that would soon enough crowd in upon them, freedom, even from dangerous ideas—in some pastoral college where they might pick up as a bonus a smattering of learning, precepts of morality, a gloss of good manners, and maybe a wife or a husband. Who can doubt that one reason the older generation so deeply resents the college rebels of our time is that they are making a mockery of the myth of the four golden years. As education was for long the American religion, the revolt against the college is what the revolt against the church was two generations ago.

During the past quarter-century the sweeping revolution in higher education has shifted the center of gravity from the college to the university. It has deprived the college of many of its traditional functions and some of its uses, and it has raised questions about the validity of the whole collegiate enterprise.

Thus, where the college was for generations terminal, it is now becoming preparatory. Where the college was, for long, the refuge of a kind of social if not intellectual elite, it has now become the haunt of every man and of every woman. And where it traditionally fulfilled a clear and familiar function—moral, social, and educational—its function now is a subject of controversy and of uncertainty, and among students there is a growing suspicion that its function may have disappeared.

For the traditional functions of the college are being usurped—or should we simply say taken over?—by other institutions. It is squeezed from below by the growing maturity of the students, the improvement in secondary education, and the rise of the junior college as an intrinsic part of the public school system. Good students no longer need the old "required courses" that so conveniently filled the first two years of college. We are moving, almost irresistibly, towards the Old World practice of relegating these courses to the secondary schools where they belong, and while this shift has not yet reached the remoter parts of America, it will. And the college is being squeezed at the top by the importunate demands of graduate and professional schools, the military, the custom of early marriage, and the necessity, therefore, of getting on with the job.

If the college is thus pressed inward from both ends, what will be left for it to do? What can it do in the first two years that cannot be done equally well, and at less expense, in a good secondary school, and that is, in fact, done equally well in almost all Western European secondary schools and, perhaps, also in Soviet schools? What can be done in the last two years that might not be better done at a university or professional school, or, as Robert Hutchins has argued, in a law office, a business office, or a library?

It is easier to say what the college should not do than to make clear what it should do. It should not go on teaching elementary courses in such obvious subjects as basic English, repetitive American history, or public speaking, nor such non-college subjects as accounting, basketball coaching, or military training.

It should not compete with the university or the professional school. Colleges must prepare their students for research and professional schools, but the preparation should be qualitative, not quantitative. They must teach mathematics for those who will be involved in science, economics, and philosophy, languages to those who will devote themselves to the humanities and the social sciences. There is nothing new about this: It is the traditional training that the colleges provided in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

It should not—and I tread on controversial ground here—provide introductions or surveys of almost everything, so that the young will have been exposed to "general culture." Surveys like outlines, rot the brain. "Culture" cannot be taught; it is something that the student absorbs from the atmosphere in which he lives—from the tradition of the institutions, from the buildings and the grounds, from well stocked libraries, from great teachers, from fellow students, from exposure to the intangibles "at hand." Nor can we have much confidence in the therapeutic qualities of a nodding acquaintance with world civilization, world literature, and world art. Our generation knows incomparably more about the problems that confront us than our forebears did about theirs, but it is unable to solve any of them. We are incomparably better acquainted with other peoples, nations, and civilizations than our forbears were—every student has been "introduced" to Asia and Africa and Latin America, and he has a name-dropping acquaintance with their great authors. But we are probably more isolationist and certainly more belligerent than we were a century ago.

Are the colleges, then, to return, in principle and even in practice, to the philosophy that animated them in the eighteenth century—that of training character, keeping the young from temptation, and trying to persuade them to learn from the trivium and the quadrivium? Are they—more seriously—to try to provide each generation with a common body of knowledge, a common frame of reference, a common bundle of values? Certainly they cannot now undertake these tasks in any simplistic fashion.

Students are no longer children prone to having their morals supervised or their characters molded, and they resent the suggestion that they should have their minds disciplined. To try to provide a really common body of knowledge about the contemporary world would lead the colleges down just those dangerous paths of surveys and smatterings that lead nowhere except to boredom. And important as it is for each generation to have a common body of references and allusions, this is a task for the elementary school and the high school, the home, the church, and society.

What then may we expect to be the character and function of the college of the future? How can this institution so deeply rooted in American soil and connected by a thousand filaments with our sentiments, our culture, and our philosophy best serve students, the commonwealth, and the community of learning?

First, one thing the liberal arts college may be able to do is stay small, simple, and relatively unorganized. At a time when almost everything, including man, is organized and mechanized and computerized and dehumanized there is a great deal to be said for colleges that allow room at the joints.

Much of student discontent has been aggravated by, and directed against, the great, impersonal multiversity that appears to treat students as interchangeable parts in a giant educational machine. What is not sufficiently appreciated—by the public anyway—is that much of the faculty demoralization is rooted in the same problem. The situation for faculty is more complex: On the one hand, most scholars want to teach and carry on research at institutions with large faculties, elaborate laboratories, well-stocked libraries, and numerous graduate students; on the other hand, they yearn for the satisfactions of an intimate intellectual community located preferably in a small town. Oxford and Cambridge testify that it is possible to have both, but it is not certain that their experience is relevant to America. Efforts to transplant the Oxbridge pattern are more successful for students than for faculty. At present—and until American ingenuity devises some method of combining the advantages of size with the delights of intimacy—most scholars must choose whether they will take the one or the other.

The college can, in this situation, make sure that it does indeed offer the traditional advantages—a genuine community, an easy-going relationship between trustees and administration on the one side, students and faculty on the other, amid tranquillity and freedom from secular pressures. Such a situation does not develop spontaneously. It requires in trustees and administration a sophisticated readiness to see education through faculty eyes, while from the faculty, a sense of pride in the institution that makes it, rather than the profession, the object of habitual interest and loyalty. It places somewhat more emphasis on intangibles than is customary in larger universities: tradition, the beauty of the campus, housing, hospitality, social intercourse, and the avoidance of ostentatious efficiency.

Colleges, certainly, can forgo some of the advantages of efficiency—advantages usually counterbalanced by costs. The college no more needs to be overtly efficient that literature, art, music, or the family needs to be efficient. As it can forgo size, so it can forgo an elaborate administration: Almost every American college is over-administrated. It can even forgo the comforts of a business vocabulary and stop calling teaching a "load" or academic studies "offices." And if it launches itself on comparative cost anaylses for, let us say, Greek and business administration, it is on the road to ruin. If the financial pressures force colleges to cut down on courses—as almost all of them should—then clearly they should cut not the difficult courses that require skilled guidance, but the popular courses, such as American history or journalism, where students can learn what they need to know by going to the library. Administrators, no less than faculty, should take to heart the aphorism of Justice Oliver Wendel Holmes that "life is retaining a picture, not doing a sum."

Second, there is one area in which colleges can indeed be more efficient, and that is in speeding up the process of formal education. Increasing numbers of students come to college better prepared and more mature than they were a generation or two back, and increasing numbers of them go on from college to some form of graduate or professional work. They do not need to spend four years in preparation for such work, nor can they afford to do so. The college should (and I think will) contract to three years—the normal university period abroad. This would have one immense advantage. It would enable the colleges to educate one-fourth more students at no extra cost in facility or resources—or to society.

Third, greater maturity in students and increased concentration on preparation for graduate and professional schools or public service careers should permit the college to dispense with the burden of *in loco parentis*. Perhaps this is flogging a dead horse; the young are no longer willing to linger *in statu pupillari;* faculties are no longer prepared to act *in loco parentis*. Students will no longer tolerate supervision of their housing arrangements, or their social or sexual activities, but most students still demand of their colleges a good deal of parental care. They take for granted services that are not provided by universities abroad: housing, dining and social facilities, gymnasiums and swimming pools, libraries that stay open until midnight, and a score of other services that are not generally found outside the United States. They take for granted immunity from the ordinary processes of the law that affect all others in society. Perhaps if students are to be liberated from the inconveniences and embarrassments of parietal rules, they will have to accept a greater degree of maturity and independence in other nonacademic arrangements. This would have the double advantage of encouraging maturity in the students and saving money for the college.

Fourth, the relaxation, or abandonment, of parietal rules is merely the negative side of what should be a positive program: that of encouraging a larger degree of student participation in the life of the college and in the life of the community of which the college is a part. Participation by students in some aspects of the governance of the college is now well under way: some institutions have even embraced student representation on boards of trustees. What we have here is something new to America, but very old in the history of the University. In the late Middle Ages, academic freedom emerged, not as a freedom for scholars, but precisely as a freedom for students—freedom to choose their own teachers, whom they paid, to live where and as they pleased, and to move at will from one university to another. Because we think in parochial terms we are puzzled, or shocked, by the strident insistence of American undergraduates on what they consider academic freedom; we should be puzzled only that the demand has come so late. The college should confront the "demands" of the students for a larger role in the life and governance of the institution with patience and equanimity.

It should also, however, recognize that many if not most student "demands" on colleges today are misguided or positively harmful, and should resist them. This situation is largely the fault of colleges, and of society, which has put the emphasis on the wrong things and persisted in the wrong methods. Thus, students want more and more courses in more and more subjects. This demand must be resisted not only on financial grounds—if persisted in here it will surely bankrupt many of our institutions—but on academic grounds. Because colleges grew out of high schools, because they were terminal, because American students were, by Old World standards, young and unsophisticated, and because parents preferred to keep them that way, colleges carried over from the high school the complex apparatus of required courses, majors, minors, attendance, credits, and course examinations. They embraced quite uncritically the American notion that nothing can be learned unless it is formally taught in some "course." The corruption of courses is the major corruption in American higher education; even those who do not accept this verdict recognize that it is a major threat to fiscal survival. Almost all colleges teach too much, a habit acquired in that twilight period when the colleges ceased to be concerned primarily with training character and took on the miscellaneous tasks of professional and university training. Colleges should be content to be colleges, and not try to be universities.

Just as colleges should resist the demand for more courses, they should resist the demand for "relevance," as undergraduates commonly understand that term. Almost the whole of our society and economy—and, alas, much of our educational enterprise—is engaged in a kind of conspiracy to persuade the young that nothing is really relevant unless it happened yesterday, and unless it can be reported in the newspaper and filmed by television. It is the business of these and other media to be relevant; it is not the business of the college or university to be relevant. The academy has other relevancies. It must be relevant to the past and to the future, to our own society and to very different societies. It must be as relevant to art and music and philosophy as it is to urban problems or race relations, confident that neither urban problems nor race relations can be understood except through philosophy and history.

What the college can do—more effectively than the university, if for no other reason than that it has younger students—is to provide a place, a time, an atmosphere in which the young can find out what is relevant to them.

A generation ago it would have been superfluous to say this. Today both teaching and libraries are threatened by the dehumanizing force of audiovisual and computer technology. If we substitute the radio or television for the seminar or the lecture, and information retrieval systems for the browsing room of the library, the chance that students in the future will discover what is most relevant to them will be seriously diminished.

The college can encourage the young to discover what may be meaningful to them by providing opportunities for active participation in nonacademic activities: the Peace Corps, Head Start, VISTA, Upward Bound, Crossroads to Africa, or—in less formal fashion—work in hospitals or institutions for backward or wayward children, or participation in local or national politics. Most of these activities are now regarded as outside the educational program. They should be, where possible, incorporated into that program, supervised by scholars on or outside the faculty, and accepted as legitimate independent study.

Fifth, there is one obligation, peculiar to the college, that is only now receiving the recognition it has long deserved. The obligation to involve students in the creative arts. It is a safe prophecy that the arts that for so long have been a kind of icing on the academic cake will become in the near future an essential ingredient in that cake—perhaps the yeast that will make the whole thing rise. If we are prepared to spend millions on laboratories, why not on centers of creative art? Sophisticated colleges are already doing this: for example, Dartmouth, Brandeis, Smith, Goucher, Franklin and Marshall, Oberlin, Sarah Lawrence, and Amherst.

Here it can be fairly said that, if students are not vouchsafed the opportunity of playing a musical instrument, painting a landscape, designing a building, acting in a theater while in college, they may never have the chance. The demands of graduate and professional work, and of subsequent careers, provide little opportunity and encouragement for these experiences. Yet, as we enter an era when one of the major problems of society is leisure, how vastly important it is to permit the young to discover for themselves the delights of the arts and of artistic expression.

A word, finally, about the isolation of many of our colleges, particularly those not attached to great universities. Colleges tend to be ingrown, and this tendency is aggravated by geographic isolation. The notion that universities and colleges should be located in some rural retreat is strictly American; from the days of the founding of universities at Bologna and Padua, Paris and Salamanca, Leipzig and Prague, universities were located in large cities. The American preference for the pastoral scene was in part accommodation to the fact that there were few urban centers, in part response to the demands of society for an education that would remove the young from distraction and temptation. Today we retain—and cherish—the image of the little country college, though three-fourths of our students attend college in cities. Colleges attached to great universities have no problem here. Their students share the life of the university.

But the small college is still, for the most part, rural. That is how it stays small. One way for it to become less parochial is to grow in size and in scope until it ceases to be a college and becomes a university: That is what is happening throughout the country. Another way, and a better one, is to establish, within itself, some institute, museum, library, public service, or scientific enterprise that will keep students and faculty in touch with scholarship and public service. A good many colleges have already done this: for example, Brandeis, Oberlin, Wesleyan, Dartmouth, Dickinson, the Claremont colleges, and the new Hampshire College.

Colleges distant from great cities should try to drive a "gulf stream" of intellectual or artistic activity or of public service through their campuses. The more isolated they are, the more important this is—and, of course, the more difficult. Students should be permitted to see ever before them the spectacle of scholars or artists, scientists or public servants, going about their business. Perhaps the most important thing that any institution of learning can do is keep before the young the spectacle of greatness and dedication. This cannot be done if the college is limited to its own resources. No college is rich enough to develop such resources in every realm, and that is not necessary. The student does not need to be provided with elaborate fare: It is quality that counts, not quantity. The college should make it impossible for a student wholly to escape the spectacle of the dignity, the excitement, and the beauty of scholarly and artistic work. Every institution of learning should say to its students what Pericles said of Athens to his fellow Athenians: "Let your eyes dwell upon her from day to day until love of her fills your hearts, and her greatness shall break upon you."

[From the Washington Post, May 30, 1970]

CRISIS HITS PRIVATE COLLEGES: BIG AND SMALL, THEY FEEL FINANCIAL SQUEEZE

(By Erie Wentworth)

DENNISON, IOWA.—On May 1, the day after President Nixon announced he was sending U.S. troops into Cambodia, the Midwestern College faculty here showed up as usual for their salary checks and were told the college lacked the cash to pay them.

In the days that followed, students and professors all over the country launched a wave of antiwar protests in which classes were suspended, academic calendars hastily changed and scores of institutions brought to a near standstill.

During those same days, a majority of Midwestern's 625 students, 32 faculty members and other supporters began instead a desperate fund-raising campaign to save their shaky little college from total financial collapse. Their efforts have been energetic, imaginative but so far short of the mark.

By most conventional standards of institutional strength and quality, coeducational Midwestern is almost a caricature. The four-year liberal arts college is unaccredited, underfinanced, understaffed, underbuilt, underequipped, and underattended by students despite an "open door" admissions policy.

Midwestern's fiscal plight is obviously extreme, and reflects special factors as well as the national economic squeeze. But as a brand-new school without stable financing, endowment or well-heeled alumni, it only illustrates in a more dramatic way the troubles that countless older private and church-linked institutions are facing.

Some of the nation's top schools are in trouble. Columbia University expects it operating deficit to soar to $15 million next year. Stanford's current-year deficit has swelled above $2 million.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, while denying it has an actual deficit, concedes that for the first time in years it has been forced to divert $2 million in gifts, grants and other unearmarked income to balance its books.

Reed College in Portland, Ore., reports a net operating deficit this year of about $175,000. Reed has postponed a building project and held line on faculty salaries, and will soon decided whether to pare enrollment from 1,100 to possibly 900 in part for economy's sake.

THE $4.2 MILLION

Numerous Catholic institutions report they are in the red, including Boston College with a $4.2 million deficit this year and Marquette University with $275,000.

Each troubled school has its own special problems. Most, however, are feeling the impact of inflation on their operating costs, of tight credit on their borrowing schemes, and of a plummeting stock market on their own endowment income and private giving. They expect that donors who give stock to avoid capital gains taxes will prove less generous when they have no gains.

In addition, the institutions generally are being pinched by reduced federal aid for students, research and a variety of special programs.

The influx of low-income students is also proving costly. They require not only financial aid but more counseling and sometimes special courses or tutoring.

Campus protests are costing money in property damage, lost worktime and sharply higher insurance rates. Stanford reckons its protest losses this year at more than $500,000. Harvey Brooks, dean of engineering and applied physics at Harvard, estimates the student strike there last spring cost $100,000 in lost computer time alone.

Some academic money-minders also fear that alumni, irate about protests, may cut back donations.

PLEADING VAINLY

Individually and collectively, hard-pressed institutions have been pleading vainly with the Nixon administration and Congress for relief. Recently, for example, a newly-formed Coalition for Aid to Higher Education sent 90 students and administrators representing 26 Massachusetts campuses to Washington seeking help.

"Lakeland College and hundreds of other small colleges like it are dying," John B. Morland, president of the Sheboygan, Wis., United Church of Christ school, told a House subcommittee May 5. "Sudden death is shocking . . . A slow death, as we are experiencing, goes practically unnoticed. This is part of our problem."

Without major new funds from some source, at least a few of the weaker institutions being wedged into the fiscal vise may well be crushed. One small new college, Mackinac, is already closing for lack of funds.

Others will survive only at a price. New programs, new building, new equipment may have to be shelved. Needed maintenance may have to be deferred. Putting a lid on faculty salaries may drive top men elsewhere. Teacher-student ratios may widen. The quest for excellence may be compromised in countless little ways.

ALMOST ROUTINE

Colleges and universities all over the country have been trying to stay out of the red by what have become routine boosts in tuition. But already this approach is turning students away, especially those in middle-income brackets who don't qualify for special aid. Institutions that plunge into deficit despite higher tuition are being forced to dip into their endowments, which many can ill-afford, or borrow if they can at today's formidable interest rates.

"This country has got to wake up," warns Howard R. Bowen, new president of the Claremont University Center in California, "to the fact that a crisis is on its way. As a society, we cannot stand by and let these institutions go down the drain."

Whether Midwestern College will survive is an open question at this point. The current fund drive, touched off by the unmet May 1 payroll, is aimed at meeting immediate expenses, although the quest for longer-range financing has also intensified.

A student-faculty quartet started things rolling with a 119-mile hike to Des Moines to dramatize the college's plight. Later an estimated 450 students, bearing dollar-a-mile pledges from local donors, walked distances up to 30 miles through the surrounding countryside. Some picked up donations from passing motorists along the way.

The students have also washed cars, put on shows, sold sandwiches, punched doorbells and sent out distress calls by phone and mail all over the country. One enterprising pair traveled to Washington seeking federal funds.

FACULTY DONATION

The faculty has donated one-half of a month's salary—they have received some pay since May 1—and the other staff, one-quarter.

Local businessmen, inspired by these efforts, have been doing their bit as well. The Joe-Mart Steak House and a bowling alley each donated one night's receipts. A movie theater and gas station have kicked in some of their revenue.

Denison schoolteachers have pledged $1,000. The hat was passed at the Little League opening game. There have been raffles and a benefit dance.

A major factor in whether Midwestern can balance its books next fall will be enrollment, which nobody seems able to predict at this point. The school has several recruiters on the road. Students customarily receive a $100 tuition bonus for each new student they recruit.

A new scheme calls for dividing the student body into recruiting teams, with the winning group earning a three-day trip to Las Vegas that a local businessman has pledged to underwrite.

THIRD COMMENCEMENT

Those involved in trying to salvage Midwestern don't want last weekend's commencement, the college's third, to be the final one.

By and large, those students who stay say they like the school's small size, with the chance it offers to be a name instead of just a number. They enjoy the close informal ties with teachers and administrators. Some from the urban East find the open, cornbelt environment an intriguing change.

Faculty members, some at least, say they like the challenge of developing a new school. "I think there might be a latent missionary spirit in all of us," says Dean Hackett, assistant professor of psychology.

Despite the financial pressures to admit just about anyone who has tuition money, college supporters say the student body has shown improvement since the first year.

Midwestern is producing a number of teachers, who reportedly find employment in Iowa and several other states. Other students have gone on to graduate schools.

CULTURAL DIVIDENDS

From Denison's standpoint, the college has had an impact beyond local cash registers. Mayor Virgil Nelson praises the faculty's involvement in churches and service clubs, and finds cultural dividends in the new art association.

Denison, a town of about 7,000 people in the corn-hog-cattle country of western Iowa, is still hardly a bastion of culture and sophistication. The first "Nixon" sign one sees driving into town advertises a pig-feed dealer of that name. Among the town's few claims to fame: movie star Donna Reed was born on a nearby farm.

But a few years ago, two major new industries were established: Iowa Beef Packers and Farmbest (now Farmland Foods), a pork-packing concern.

Buoyed by those triumphs, and seeing little hope the state would start a college hereabouts, community leaders decided to launch their own venture in higher learning. They appear to have had mixed motives: educational opportunities for local sons and daughters, prestige, and still another lift for the local economy.

Their inspiration and mentor was Millard G. Roberts, then at the peak of his prominence as the man who built up obscure, anemic Parsons College in Fairfield, Iowa, into a profit-making institution which reached an eventual top enrollment of 5,200 students.

ACCREDITATION LOST

Parsons was to gain national notoriety as "Flunk-Out U.", lose its cherished accreditation in 1967 and promptly fire Roberts. But all that came later.

Roberts helped produce a glowing feasibility study for Denison in 1964. It proposed a $12.4 million building program, to be paid off in seven years largely through tuition from projected enrollments reaching 3,000.

The Roberts formula included avoiding long-term debt, a trimester system for economical year-round operation, a limited curriculum, three-tiered "team teaching" (professors, associates, tutors), intense use of limited physical facilities, good faculty salaries and an open-door admissions policy.

Denison's business and professional men formed a board of trustees, raised more than $300,000 and started building Midwestern on a hogback ridge just east of town.

RECURRENT CRISES

The college has been plagued with recurrent crises ever since. In 1965, its 600 first students found the contractors still at work on the first buildings.

Beyond the over-optimistic planning and occasional lapses in internal management, the increasingly tight national money market has also played a role in Midwestern's financial woes.

"If things had been normal," insists Chairman Thurman C. Aarestad of the board of trustees, "it would surely have worked out. We're a victim of circumstance."

The college's policymakers and supporters today have all but forgotten the rosy vision of "Doc Bob" Roberts. They just want to keep Midwestern afloat. At the same time, they have a standing offer to sell it to the state, but the Iowa Board of Regents is indifferent so far.

Midwestern is surviving at the moment on the patience of most short-term creditors, the enthusiasm of those associated with it, and a stubborn will to live.

Its physical growth has stopped at the administration-classroom building, three dorms (one threatened with receivership), a hotel, four surplus Quonset huts from the Agriculture Department and some weedy playing fields.

LIMITED LIBRARY

Its library holds less than 15,000 volumes causing some students to travel as far as Omaha, Ames and Des Moines in quest of reference books.

The slim library and lack of long-term, stable financing are among the reasons that Midwestern remains a long way from formal accreditation. Lacking that, it attracts little attention from large private foundations that might supply funds and has a harder time luring students.

"This is the dog chasing its tail type of thing," says Edwin Coen, former high school principal and county school superintendent who has taken over as the college's president.

Midwestern is technically eligible for federal aid and receives its share of educational opportunity grants and work-study funds for its students. But it cannot scrape up the local matching money for other federal aid.

According to James R. Lodwick, trustee in charge of fund-raising, the college needs a minimum of about $100,000 in cash to weather the present short-run crisis.

Lodwick reported about $42,000 has been actually collected so far, with an additional $46,401 in sight counting faculty salary donations, some federal student aid money and various other prospects.

Roughly half the faculty is willing to work without pay during the summer semester if necessary. But a number of faculty members, fearing the worst for next fall, have begun shopping around for other employment.

At least one other school that followed the Parsons example, John F. Kennedy College in Wahoo, Neb., is also on the fiscal brink. Lea College in Minnesota is struggling. Parsons itself, accreditation restored this spring, is on a more solid footing, although enrollment is down around 1,300.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Apr. 21, 1970]

PRIVATE EDUCATORS WARN OF STATE COLLEGE MONOPOLY

AUSTIN.—The State of Texas is heading down a road that by 1980 will produce a state monopoly on higher education and completely eliminate private institutions, John D. Moseley, president of Austin College at Sherman, said Monday.

Moseley told the College Coordinating Board the state will have to take action soon to preserve a "plurastic" system of private and public colleges and universities.

He is a member of the advisory committee for private colleges and universities which compiled a report outlining a legislative program to enable private institutions to continue to compete with state schools.

Chairman of the committee is Abner McCall, president of Baylor University.

The report said 19 of 28 independent accredited senior colleges and universities in Texas will have deficits totaling an estimated $5 million at the end of this academic year—a 100 per cent increase in number of institutions reporting deficits two years ago.

During the same two-year span, the percentage of private sector enrollment in the state has declined, while the cost per student has increased 11.5 per cent.

Gifts, grants and income from endowment for private institutions have declined, according to the report, but faculty salaries and other educational costs are on the increase.

Among the committee's recommendations were the following:

Increased tuition in state institutions to help close the "tuition gap" between private institutions (which charge an average of $1,111 per nine-month session).

A state tuition equalization grant program to enable a student in economic need to attend the college of his choice.

State contracts with the independent sector of higher education for the use of educational programs, facilities and services.

A coordinating council composed of representatives of public senior and junior colleges and independent institutions.

Dr. J. M. Moudy, chancellor of TCU, spoke for the committee's recommendations and defined the problem of private institutions as one of pricing.

"The problem is in pricing and only in pricing—not in our lack of ability to offer quality programs or our attractiveness," Moudy told the board. "If public and private institutions charged the same, we'd have no problem."

He advocated legislative approval of higher tuition in state institutions as a "step toward solving the problem."

(The coordinating board later approved recommendations for a 150 per cent tuition increase for state residents attending public colleges and universities.)

Moudy also said a plan for state assistance—either to the private institutions or their students—would cost the state less than if it were to pay for the total education of students now in private institutions.

Board chairman Manuel DeBusk of Dallas said he would name a special subcommittee to study the committee's proposals and to report to the board at a special meeting later.

"I personally am highly in favor of both the public and private sector in higher education," the chairman said. "I think diversity is good for this state."

THE PRICE RISE PINCH

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 12, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, we have all long deplored the fact that price rises are hardest on the low-income members of our society. They have less to spend, and feel the pinch more than more affluent members when inflation hits us.

But now the well-known financial writer, Sylvia Porter, has documented for us the fact that prices are actually rising faster on the items the low-income people buy most often—that they, in effect, are in double economic jeopardy.

Miss Porter points out, for example, that in the last 12 months the price of hamburger has risen proportionately much faster than the price of sirloin steak, that the price of hot dogs are up more percentage points than the price of roast beef.

The same trend has been evident everywhere else, she says, and gives specifics. The price rise in basics has been faster than the price rise in luxuries.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Porter's column entitled "Lower Prices Rising Fastest," published in the Washington Evening Star of May 25, 1970, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Washington Star, May 25, 1970]

LOWER PRICES RISING FASTEST

(By Sylvia Porter)

"Substitution" always has been a key weapon to help cut the cost of living—and since this inflation spiral took off in 1965 a policy of "substitution" for meats and other foods, for non-foods and services wherever feasible, has been widely promoted.

But now, ironically although understandable, adoption of this policy on a mass scale is driving up the prices of the popular substitutions more rapidly than the original higher-priced items. In short, as inflationary price increases drain our pocketbooks, we have fewer and fewer ways to protect ourselves.

To put it succinctly, while hamburger is a fine substitute for steak, cheese and dried beans are scarcely satisfactory substitutes for hamburger.

When the prices of the basics in foods, goods and services climb more rapidly than the prices of luxuries, the danger signals are flying very high.

To illustrate, between the start of 1969 and 1970, the cost of hamburger rose 11.9 percent—more than twice the 5.8 percent rise for sirloin steak. The average price of a pound of hamburger was 66c according to latest official nationwide Bureau of Labor Statistics figures.

Also during this same 12-month period, the price of hot dogs rose 13.6 percent—nearly double the 6.8 percent rise for roast beef. At latest official report, frankfurters cost an average of 83c a pound throughout the United States.

Several times during 1969 it was pointed out how big a bargain turkey was and how one could adapt turkey for year-round meals. Between January and January, though, poultry prices rose 9.6 percent—with the key factor behind this increase a jump of nearly 14 percent for turkey. The BLS now reports the average price for turkey at 56¢ per pound.

And so it has gone: Fresh and frozen fish prices rose 13.3 percent from January to January; pork, another traditionally lower cost beef substitute, rose 17.2 percent overall; beef liver was up close to 12 percent; liverwurst was up nearly 11 percent; sausage, 18; bologna, 13; eggs, 19 percent. As for bacon, this has entered the category of gourmet, condiment foods.

This is in direct contrast to the trend in the previous couple of years, for then, you may recall, the big increases were for sirloin steaks, roast beef, veal cutlets. And it was to beat these increases and still get sufficient protein from high-priced cuts of beef to hamburgers and hot dogs, chicken and fish.

And the same trend is evident elsewhere. Among vegetables, such old standbys as carrots, celery and tomatoes all increased 19 percent or more.

Among home ownership costs, prices are rising rapidly for such necessities as repair of furnaces and washing machines, replacement of sinks, reshingling of roofs.

Among transportation costs, public transit fares are rising more rapidly than any other major category. And traditionally bargain inter-city bus fares are climbing at a rate nearly four times that of new car prices.

Among personal care items, prices for do-it-yourself home permanent refills are increasing faster than prices of cold waves performed at the hairdresser. Among women's apparel costs, casual shoe prices are rising faster than evening slippers. Among alcoholic beverages, wine prices are rising four times as fast as whisky prices. Among health costs, semi-private hospital room rates are rising faster than private room rates.

This 1969–70 period is murderous: Business recession, a stock market crash, climbing unemployment, mounting bankruptcies and now an inflation zeroing in on the basics.

And the most tragic aspect of all is that at the heart of it is a war which everyone says must be ended but which drags on and on endlessly.

STEPHENS AMENDMENT TO H.R. 17548

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS) to increase the funding for water and sewer facilities from the $150 million requested by the administration and recommended by the committee to the full authorization of $500 million.

Back in 1965 Congress passed the Housing and Urban Development Act, which provided for Federal assistance to local communities to install new or replace dilapidated sewage and water lines. Five years later, with the water rustier and the waste piling up, Congress has appropriated only 56 percent of the money authorized in the original legislation.

It is not for lack of applications under the law that we have failed to make money available. At the close of the Johnson administration, the backlog in applications totaled $4 billion. Indeed, the full $500 million funding we are discussing today would barely cover the current backlog in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It would leave unfunded an estimated $1 billion in water and sewer applications on their way to Washington from regional HUD offices. That local municipalities have managed to scrape together $1.5 billion in matching dollars when revenue is in such short supply attests to the urgency of the problem.

I am especially concerned that we fulfill the promise of the 1965 law because people in my district know what it is like to turn on the tap and get a glass of water that looks like it was drawn from the gutter.

The city of Long Beach is a case in point. Well water in Long Beach contains a high percentage of iron that corrodes the water mains linking the wells to homes.

During the 50 years since they were constructed, the treatment plant and most of the connecting pipes have deteriorated so badly that on some days a glass of water looks more like a glass of cloudy tea. One frequently must choose to shower under a fine brown mist or not bathe at all. With higher water consumption in the summer months, the rate of corrosion increases and the water gets darker and darker, staining the laundry and turning the stomach.

Medical authorities have said that the iron content does not yet pose a hazard to health. This assurance does not make brown water attractive, either to drink or to wash in. It is not even much of an assurance since the present iron content is acknowledged to be double the maximum standard set by HUD. What does that standard mean if not that it should not be ignored? Are residents of Long Beach supposed to be twice as resistant to chemical overdoses as residents of other communities?

Furthermore, the continuing corrosion threatens the community's firefighting capacity, because the iron deposits partially choke off the city's water mains. Insurance companies have taken this danger into account, and insurance rates for Long Beach residents are 3 to 7 percent higher as a result, according to the New York Fire Insurance Rating Organization. Lack of funds to renovate this water system is costing Long Beach residents an additional $20,000 to $40,000 a year in insurance.

Mr. Speaker, nearly all of us talk constantly about the need to improve the quality of American life. To listen to speeches here, environment is almost as sacred an item these days as flag and motherhood. But then, when the roll is called up yonder, there are plenty of votes to subsidize more noise from an SST and not enough to construct decent water and sewage facilities. That is not the way to protect the environment or improve the quality of American life.

This amendment is a minimal step, and I cannot believe there are Americans so indifferent to the health of their fellow countrymen that they would begrudge our taking it.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT'S ACTION IN VIETNAM

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 12, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is encouraging to note how well informed so many of our citizens are on the Vietnam war and the Soviet threat. It is a pleasure for me to invite the attention of the Senate to a letter to the editor, written by Mr. Joe H. Watson, councilman, Ward No. 1, Batesburg, S.C., which was published in the Twin-City News, in Batesburg, on May 28, 1970.

Mr. Watson presents a strong case in supporting the President's action in Cambodia. Also, his facts on the increase in the Soviet buildup of strategic weapons reveal that Mr. Watson has made a careful study of our national security. I commend Mr. Watson for his astuteness. Far too many of our citizens lose sight of the fact that it is the Soviet threat that is causing the upheaval in the free world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Watson's letter to the editor be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Twin-City News, May 28, 1970]

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT'S ACTION IN VIETNAM

Dear Fellow Citizen: Our Commander-in-Chief, the President of the United States, has made a difficult and courageous decision to attack and destroy North Vietnamese bases and war supplies along the South Vietnamese border inside Cambodia. His goals are understandable, particularly to military men; (1) to shorten the war, (2) to save American lives, (3) to enable his Vietnamization plan to carry on to a successful conclusion, (4) to permit self-determination of the South Vietnamese to continue to fruition, and (5) minimize the prospects of a disastrous defeat as the strength of our forces in Vietnam grows less during his previously announced withdrawal program.

The order has been given, American military men are now in combat carrying out the Commander-in-Chief's orders, and some are dying in order that a larger number may live.

At home, opponents of the Administration, and the Peace-At-Any-Price advocates, and those who have been persuaded that the United States has only to withdraw its forces from Southeast Asia in order for universal peace to exist throughout the world, are working right now to tie the hands of our President in this endeavor. Many well-meaning supporters of those policies seem to forget the additional jeopardy to which such actions will subject our troops in Vietnam.

President Nixon told some veterans and patriotic organizations, two days before his talk to the Nation, that the action he was soon to order was imperative if we were to escape the probability of total and humiliating defeat in Vietnam. Information from captured enemy documents, prisoner interrogation, aerial reconnaissance and other intelligence sources available to him had convinced him and his military advisors that our position in South Vietnam would soon be untenable, the Vietnamization program destroyed, and a humiliating defeat in Vietnam almost assured unless he ordered immediate and positive action to destroy the forces and massive supplies of arms, ammunition, food and equipment which had been stored in underground shelters in North Vietnamese "sanctuaries" on the Cambodian side of the border along the great length of South Vietnam. These stores were, he said, sufficient to supply several North Vietnamese divisions for six months.

I am convinced that the President had no alternative; to do nothing would almost certainly insure the loss of all that we have been fighting for in support of free peoples everywhere, and the abandonment of the principles for which more than 40,000 American men have died in this war.

The voices of the organized minority are stridently raised against our President's action, giving great comfort and aid to the enemy.

I believe that, as a citizen you will want to add your support to those of us who have for too long been the "Silent Majority" by upholding our Commander-in-Chief in his resolve to bring about an honorable peace, maintain the integrity of this nation, fulfill its commitments to its allies, and honor those who have died in their efforts to preserve freedom for all peoples.

If you agree with the view point I have expressed, I urge you as a private citizen to take immediate and positive action along the lines suggested.

Phone, wire or write your Senators and Congressional representatives and express your support of the President's action.

Write a letter to your local newspaper

editors expressing your feelings on this issue and request that he print your letter.

Request the Editor of your local newspaper and other news media to print or program an editorial setting forth pertinent and important facts upon which the President based his decision.

Request the Program Chairman of Civic and Professional organizations to which you belong to obtain an informed speaker who can factually explain the present military situation in Vietnam and Cambodia to all of your members.

Bring these facts to the attention of educators at all levels, including school boards, college trustees, and your own alma mater.

Talk about this critical situation with your civilian friends and neighbors.

On 28 April 1970 a small group of top officials of organizations which actively support an adequate national defense for the United States met with the President in the White House Cabinet room.

The President talked for more than an hour of the particular problems bearing on our national security. This most unusual, if not unprecedented, talk to a group of mostly retired military and naval personnel, and the frankness with which he expressed his ideas, were positive proof of the trust and confidence our Commander-in-Chief places in those men and women who have given so many years of their lives to insure the security of this nation.

The President commented on trends which appear fashionable today, the viewing of patriotism with scorn, the downgrading of those in the military services, and the efforts to cut back on our national defense. He recognized, as do many military men and civilians, that military forces and military spending are looked upon in some quarters as inherently evil.

He recognized the high motives behind many of those who wish to take money from the defense budget in order to modernize ghettos, rebuild cities and clean our polluted air and water. The President believes that there must be major improvement in those areas, but he said that unless this country has adequate defenses, there may be no environment, at all, to worry about in the years ahead. Therefore, he feels that there must be proper balance between the required security needs of this country and the money spent in improving those areas which must be improved.

I had thought that we were maintaining our deterrent capability and therefore our security. But the sobering, even startling developments of the past few years related by the President, many of the details of which have been released by the Secretary of Defense, indicate that the United States is now very close to the point where its citizens must make a decision whether we are to continue as a first rate world power or be willing to settle for second best.

The President laid the greatest stress on the fact that the Soviet's attitude, as expressed repeatedly, is one of expansion, whereas that of the United States is purely defensive.

Facts which I have learned and which I want to bring to your personal attention are:

1. At the time of the Cuban crisis, the United States had an overall superiority in ICBMs. Now the Soviets are ahead in total numbers and greatly ahead in explosive power.

2. In the older category of multi-megaton ICBMs such as the Titan and comparable Soviet missiles, the Soviets in 1965 had a better than 4-1 advantage and they still maintain that position.

3. In 1965 the United States had 880 operational Minutemen missiles. The Soviet Union had nothing comparable. Today, the Soviets have over 800 such launchers operational and a projected force that could exceed 1,000 within the next two years.

4. In 1965, the Soviets had no operational launcher for its large SS-9 missile, which can carry a 25 megaton load. Today they have 220 operational systems and 60 or more under construction. The United States has no counterpart to this system.

5. The Soviets are continuing work on their anti-ballistic missile (ABM) deployment in the Moscow area and presently have a total of 64 launchers in place. The United States has none.

6. Between September 1, 1969 and April 20, 1970 the Soviets installed 180 additional ICBM sites; the U.S. none.

7. In the past years the Soviets built 8 new nuclear missile capability. We built none. We still have a superiority of almost 2½ to 1 in nuclear submarines capable of delivering nuclear warheads from the sea, but, by 1975, the Soviets will not only have equalled, but at the present rate of construction will have passed our sea-based nuclear delivery capability.

8. In 1965, neither a depressed trajectory ICBM nor a Fractional Orbital Bombardment System existed in either the Soviet or U.S. inventory. Today, the Soviets have tested both configurations and may have an operations version ready for deployment. The United States has developed nothing comparable to these systems.

9. In 1965, there was no development underway of a so-called Undersea Long-Range Missile System (ULMS) by either the United States or the Soviet Union. Today, the United States is spending relatively small sums in research and development of such a system. The Soviet Union is testing a new, long-range missile for possible Naval use.

10. In 1965, the Soviet heavy bomber force consisted of slightly over 200 aircraft. The U.S. heavy bomber force strength was about 780. Today, the Soviet heavy bomber force is slightly under 200; U.S. heavy bomber strength had declined to about 550.

These were sobering statements; in fact startling to me in both frankness and facts. At one time figures and statements such as these were "Top Secret." This new policy of the present Administration of disclosing such facts to the American people is worthy of the attention and commendation of all of our citizens. It may be possible that a potential enemy will gain some additional knowledge, but the probability is that these facts are known to his intelligence agencies already. They should, therefore, properly be known by all Americans. Only if each citizen is aware of the threats to our security can he support with confidence a defense adequate to guarantee our continuing security.

Sincerely,

JOEL H. WATSON,
Councilman, Ward No. 1.

BATESBURG, S.C.

ARKANSAS CITY, KANS., JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Arkansas City, Kans., Junior Chamber of Commerce have been very active in public affairs. This chapter, the second oldest one in the world, is located in my district.

Recently the members passed a resolution supporting the President's action in Southeast Asia and opposing the Cooper-Church amendment.

Because this fine young group represents the thinking of many young people in my district, I would like to share the thoughts of this Jaycee chapter with my colleagues:

ARKANSAS CITY JAYCEES, SECOND OLDEST CHAPTER IN THE WORLD, ARKANSAS CITY, KANS.

Whereas the Arkansas City Jaycees are deeply concerned with the pending legislation in Washington concerning the responsibilities of the President of the United States and his role as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces;

And, whereas the Arkansas City Jaycees believe that government should be of laws rather than men; and whereas the Cooper-Church amendment does limit the constitutional powers of the President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Arkansas City Jaycees do hereby support the President of these United States concerning his actions in Southeast Asia and do also support the President's stand that when American lives are being endangered, he as Commander in Chief must have the power to protect those American citizens with that portion of our military strength as is deemed necessary.

Unanimously adopted May 27, 1970.

W. L. BROWN,
President, Arkansas City Jaycees.

CAMP PICKETT: A REAL GEM

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 12, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled, "Camp Pickett: A Real Gem," published in the Courier Record, Blackstone, Va., on May 7, 1970.

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

[From the Courier Record, May 7, 1970]

CAMP PICKETT: A REAL GEM

Blackstone town council and a few visitors Monday night were provided a real treat when Camp Pickett's commanding officer, Col. William C. McMullian, gave a briefing on what would be going on at the post in the coming months. The arrival of some 20,000 Reserve and National Guard troops, as pointed out by the Colonel, is not the important thing, although the potential asset to the community of 20,000 visitors should not be overlooked. The facts presented by Col. McMullian painted a picture of Camp Pickett which should be seen by every resident of this area, especially every businessman. As Col. McMullian said, Camp Pickett is truly a pearl in our midst.

The great worth of Camp Pickett to this area can readily be seen in its $1,830,000 civilian payroll. This is greater than any other industry, actually equal to about two of our major industries. Add to this the permanent military payroll of $1,392,000 annually, plus another $4,900,000 paid to reserve troops in the summer and you should have no trouble getting the picture. Just how beneficial Camp Pickett is to our economy can probably not be realized, but you can be sure if it were suddenly taken away the results would be catastrophic.

What Col. McMullian was saying Monday night was not that area citizens should be thankful for Camp Pickett and its payrolls but that local businessmen should be trying harder to keep more of the money in this area, if not also trying to make Pickett a more polished pearl than it already is. He was saying something that all of us should be more aware of, that Blackstone, more than other communities, is not capitalizing as it should on Camp Pickett. He was telling us that the great bulk of almost $5,000,000 is getting out of this area with hardly a dent because the citizen-soldiers are not being concentrated upon as the real potential buyers that they are. Did you know that last summer the demand for children's toys could not be met by exchanges on the post? Would you believe that two-week soldiers actually look for things to take home to their families; not junk but items for the household and their children? Are you aware that many wives follow their husbands to summer camp and they offer a potential that is not being explored as it should?

And what about the potential of Camp Pickett as a recreation spot? Did you know that 24,000 sportsmen used the post last year. Do you have any idea how much money hunters and anglers spend? With this in mind do you think it would be a good idea to have a fishing or hunting contest with prizes given away for the largest fish, the largest deer head or perhaps just a drawing with visitors to the community eligible for a sizable prize? What is Blackstone doing to cause residents of other areas, other states to visit here and enjoy what Camp Pickett has to offer? Very little, if anything.

Blackstone and the surrounding area has benefited greatly because of Camp Pickett and because men like Col. McMullian have the interest to make the post what it is today. It would be easier for the commanding officer and his staff to discourage visitors and let the post dry-up. They get the same pay whether it has 50,000 visitors a year or 500. This is not true, however, with those of us who have to sell goods to make a living.

Hopefully town officials and the Chamber of Commerce, with the help of all businessmen, will begin to scratch their heads and come up with ideas to make Blackstone a more attractive place for Pickett visitors to shop. Possibly there are goods and services which would be attractive to the summer visitors which could be provided. Maybe by realizing that we need to shape up and make a better presentation to our military visitors others will find Blackstone more attractive. Soldiers, the professional, as well as the summer two-weekers, are mostly like you and me. They put their pants on the same way every morning and they have families and homes too. Chances are if they like Blackstone so will others from all walks of life. The benefits to the community could be unlimited.

Thanks, Colonel McMullian, for taking the time and interest to make some very important points.

INHUMANE TREATMENT OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa State Legislature has approved the following resolution concerning the inhumane treatment of American prisoners of war. I call particular attention to the fact that neither the Government of North Vietnam nor the National Liberation Front has complied with the requirements of the Geneva accord regarding prisoners, despite a stern reminder by the vice president of the International Committee of the Red Cross in 1965.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 135, STATE OF IOWA

Whereas, approximately 1,350 American servicemen, including four Iowans who are known to be prisoners in North Vietnam; and

Whereas, twenty to thirty Iowans who are reported missing and may be held as prisoners in North Vietnam; and

Whereas, the government of North Vietnam has refused to release the names of all the prisoners it holds; and

Whereas, some of these American prisoners have been held captive for as long as five years; and

Whereas, the government of North Vietnam acceded to the Geneva Convention on June 28, 1957, the government of South Vietnam acceded to the Convention on November 14, 1953, and the government of the United States acceded to the Convention on August 2, 1955; and

Whereas, the government of the United States and the government of South Vietnam have continuously honored the requirements of the Geneva Convention; and

Whereas, no pretense of compliance has been advanced by the government of North Vietnam or the National Liberation Front despite the reminder to do so on June 11, 1965, by M. Jacques Freymond, Vice President of the International Committee of the Red Cross; and

Whereas, the provisions of the Geneva Convention require that every prisoner of war be enabled to write to his family; that every prisoner remain in communication with his family and with an international or state organization which has assumed the obligation of safeguarding the rights of the prisoner; that every prisoner has the right to receive mail and packages; that minimum humane standards of detention, hygiene, diet, recreation, and employment be complied with; that the detaining power accept a neutral party to the conflict or a respected international organization, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, as a protecting power for the prisoners; that seriously injured or ill prisoners be repatriated as soon as they are able to travel; and that the detaining power provide the names of the prisoners it holds to families as well as to the protecting power, or the Red Cross, to pass on to their country of origin; Now therefore,

Be is resolved by the House, the Senate concurring, That the General Assembly of the State of Iowa urges the General Assembly of the United Nations to intercede on behalf of the American servicemen being held as prisoners of war by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front by insuring that the tenets of fair and humane treatment, as expressed in the Geneva Convention of 1949, are complied with by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the Secretary General of the United Nations, to each of the 124 delegates to the United Nations representing the 124 member nations, the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and to each member of the Congress from the State of Iowa.

We, William H. Harbor, Speaker of the House of Iowa, and Roger W. Jepsen, President of the Senate, hereby certify that the above and foregoing Resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Sixty-third General Assembly, Second Session.

WILLIAM H. HARBOR,
Speaker of the House.
ROGER W. JEPSEN,
President of the Senate.

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA EAGLES—GRAND SLAM

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, an event will take place tonight in my congressional district, that can be considered a milestone in the history of the Boy Scouts of America. Four brothers, sons of Mr. and Mrs. Roland Reich of Tracy, Calif., are scheduled to receive the Boy Scouts of America Eagle Award at the same time. No one in the National Boy Scouts Headquarters can recall if four brothers received this coveted and highest scouting award at the same court of honor. In a special court of honor ceremony, this evening, Ronald, Harold, Gary, and David Reich will receive the Eagle Award and until there is evidence to the contrary, this can be considered a "first" in scouting history.

These boys deserve all the accolades they are soon to receive. However, I believe they would be the first to agree with me and others who have had Scouts in the family that their mother and father made substantial contributions to assist the boys in attaining such high rank in Scouting. Roland and Arvella Reich have shared the successes and disappointments equally with their sons and have a long history of work in the scouting program.

Truly an all-American Scouting family, both Mr. and Mrs. Reich have long been active in the movement. They started out in the Cub program with Mrs. Reich serving as den mother. Mr. Reich later served as scoutmaster and presently is an adviser for the Order of the Arrow Award. It is with these thoughts in mind, that I ask the boys to join with me in a salute to Mr. and Mrs. Reich on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a brief historical synopsis of the boys:

Roland, 18 years old, came up from the Cubs, advancing through the ranks, before joining the Boy Scouts in August 1955. Later as a first-class Scout, he earned five merit badges and received the rank of Star in September 1966. He was chosen "Boy Scout of the Year" by the Mount Oso District, receiving a medal and trophy for this honor. Interested in music, he played cornet in elementary school and high school. Active in 4-H and FFA, his projects included lamb, beef, woodworking, electricity, and nut tree crops. Roland plans to attend Cal-Poly and to major in agriculture.

Harold, 17 years old, has an impressive record in Scouting, joined in the band playing the French horn, and spent 3 years in 4-H, raising animals. Interested in community projects, he served as a delegate to the Scout leadership conference and organized the planting of 500 trees in a new park in Tracy. In 1967, he received the Boy Scout of the Year Award and graduated from junior high school as valedictorian of his class. In high school, he has been active in sports, public speaking and the marching band. Soon to be a senior and already elected vice president of the student body, Harold's ambition is to become a doctor of medicine.

Gary, 16 years old, fast completed all the ranks of Cubbing as soon as age would permit. Also interested in music, he started early in his elementary school band. Active in 4-H, his projects included lamb raising, cooking, and woodworking. He has participated in school sports and plays. With a diligent interest in community service, Gary, as patrol leader, cleaned several miles of roadways of trash and cans. As a Star Scout, he was tapped out at a camporee as a member of the Order of the Arrow. He served as president of an Explorer Post, and now a member of the Police Cadets Explorer Post No. 504. Still an active member of his church, Gary will work with the Tracy Recreation Department and plans to become a police officer.

David, 15 years old, with his older brothers as teachers, came along fast to catch up with them for tonight's ceremony. He also has been active in 4-H. His projects have been cooking, lamb raising, and hog production. He was in advanced band and also played in the band in elementary school. This kept him busy, but he still had time for flag football, basketball, and baseball. He was soon ready for his Star rank which he received in 1968. Six months later he received his Life Scout Award. In high school, he joined the marching band and went to work after school for his brother, Gary, so that Gary could go out for football. This was a sacrifice on David's part for he would have liked to have gone out for football also. Instead David went out for basketball and track. He received a fourth place medal for the mile run and set a new freshman record. David has been attending church and Sunday school regularly and is planning to coach a peewee league baseball team this summer with his brother.

THE MASSACHUSETTS "STATE SCIENTIST OF THE YEAR"

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in pointing out that Leonard D. Pagnotto, of Taunton, Mass., has been honored for his contributions to the science of industrial hygiene by his selection as the Massachusetts "State Scientist of the Year."

He was chosen for this honor by the Massachusetts State Scientists Association. Mr. Pagnotto is chief of laboratory of the division of occupational hygiene of the Massachusetts Department of Labor and Industries. In his specialized work, he has made many studies of industrial health hazards. I believe that the following article from the Taunton Gazette will make clear his many outstanding accomplishments in his field and with professional organizations.

Mr. Pagnotto, I think, deserves this high award as a distinguished scientist and an outstanding citizen of my district. I congratulate him, and am pleased to insert the following article:

PAGNOTTO "SCIENTIST OF THE YEAR"

Leonard D. Pagnotto of 22 Whittenton St., has been named "State Scientist of the Year" it was announced today by the Massachusetts State Scientists Association. The award was made in honor of his contributions to the science of industrial hygiene.

Pagnotto is chief of laboratory of the Division of Occupational Hygiene, Massachusetts Department of Labor and Industries; past president of the New England section of the American Industrial Hygiene Association, chairman of the American Industrial Hygiene Association Biochemical Assays Committee, and a member of the Analytical Methods Committee of the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists.

He has had over 20 papers relating to industrial exposures of workers to toxic chemiical substances published in scientific journals, and has co-authored a chapter on industrial health hazards for a book on industrial chemistry soon to be released by Interscience Publishing Co.

He is married to the former Irene Lacerte and has two daughters, Janet and Cynthia, who attend the Immaculate Conception School.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions during recent years it has been my great privilege to serve as a member of the congressional advisory group to the U.S. delegates to the International Labor Organization Conferences in Geneva. We have subsequently held hearings and issued reports to the House summarizing the work of these important international conferences. The most recent such hearings was held last month by our task force on the International Labor Organization of the Education and Labor Committee, reviewing the deliberations of the 53d ILO Conference, attended by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) and myself from the majority side and by the two gentlemen from Ohio (Mr. AYRES and Mr. ASHBROOK) from the minority side.

This year's conference of the ILO will be particularly important to the United States and the world. After 22 years of distinguished service, Mr. David Morse—the ILO Executive Director—has just resigned and a successor is being chosen. Much important work is on the conference agenda, dealing with working conditions and standards, employment programs, and other issues affecting the welfare of many millions of people throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the legislative schedule for this month is such that it will not be possible for me to serve this year as one of the House Members in our delegation to Geneva. I do, however, strongly feel that we should be represented at this important upcoming conference. I appreciate the timely action by the Rules Committee and the leadership in presenting this resolution today.

VIETNAM

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, as one of the earliest opponents of our Nation's military involvment in Vietnam, I strongly objected to the President's unilateral decision to send American ground combat troops into neutralist Cambodia.

So I was encouraged to read this week a very thoughtful editorial from the June 7 Los Angeles Times supporting early U.S. withdrawal from the Indochina conflict.

The editorial represents a significant change in the policy of the Los Angeles Times, concluding:

The Times believes the United States has discharged all the responsibilities it has in Vietnam. The Times believes this nation has—bravely and honorably—done everything, and more, that could reasonably have been expected of it. . . . Short of permanent occupation, there is no more America can reasonably be expected to do for Vietnam.

The Times then called on the President to "publicly set a deadline for removing not only the remaining combat troops but all American forces, combat and support, according to a swift and orderly schedule.

They continued:

Let him begin to hasten the removal of combat troops this summer. It ought to be possible to bring about a total and orderly withdrawal in the next year and a half at the longest.

The full text of the Los Angeles Times editorial follows:

GET OUT OF VIETNAM NOW

The time has come for the United States to leave Vietnam, to leave it swiftly, wholly, and without equivocation.

The President still has in his hands the opportunity to effect such an exit. He should seize the chance now as it presents itself, for it may not come so readily again.

That the war must be ended, all are agreed. That, as the President said last week, "peace is the goal that unites us," all are also agreed.

Long ago, when we began to help the anti-Communist Vietnamese against the Communist Vietnamese, it seemed a worthwhile thing to do. It seemed cheap, first in dollars, then in men. No need now to trace the melancholy history of how, bit by bit, decision by decision, it became extravagantly expensive of money, of human lives, of the tranquillity of this country, of our reputation abroad.

The President said recently he would not have this nation become a "pitiful helpless giant" in the eyes of the world. We are not entirely pitiful, and not yet helpless. But we are like a giant lunging about with one foot in a trap, a spectacle that is disconcerting to our friends and comforting to our enemies.

NOT THE CENTER RING

Our great adversary is now, and will remain, the Soviet Union.

All questions of American foreign policy are subordinate to the central one, which is to prevent nuclear war between the two super-powers. We shall be engaged against the Communist world one way or another all our lives; but in Southeast Asia we are engaged on the periphery of that world in a battle obscured by the elements of civil war and Vietnamese nationalism.

Our response ought to be commensurate with the challenge: as it was over Berlin, in the Cuban missile crisis, as it may yet have to be in the Middle East. But we have so overresponded in Indochina that it may be harder for us to respond as we ought should a greater and more direct challenge arise.

No need now either to delineate at length the consequences in our own country of the Indochina war:

The war is not the sole cause of strife between parents and children, yet it has inflamed that strife.

The war is not the cause of conflict between the races, but it has made that conflict more bitter.

The war is not the only reason for our present economic distress, but it has rendered that distress harder to treat.

The war alone did not create the illness afflicting our public and private institutions, but it has brought that illness to the crisis point.

Like a small wound the war has festered until its infection has appeared in every organ of this Republic. Its ache is felt in every limb; its pain clouds the national judgment. The country is losing heart.

"Peace," therefore, "is the goal that unites us."

As the President said, our national debate is not about the goal of peace, but about "the best means" to achieve it.

JOB CAN BE BETTER DONE

The President has better means at hand than he is using.

He has promised a withdrawal of American combat troops—another 150,000 by next May 1—but the withdrawal in these summer months has been reduced and after the 150,000 leave there will still be 284,000 troops left in Vietnam. If Mr. Nixon has a private schedule for their withdrawal he has not revealed it.

He has declared that his goal is the total withdrawal of all Americans from Vietnam, but by making open-ended threats of counter-action should the enemy attack, he has made it necessary to make good on those threats. Thus he has given to the enemy a large measure of decision over our own rate of withdrawal.

By the President's move into Cambodia, and by his encouragement of the Vietnamese and Thai operations there after we leave, he has entwined American prestige with the fate of that unhappy but unimportant little country.

In declaring that the credibility of American promises elsewhere in the world hangs on our achieving "a just peace" in Vietnam, he is making it harder for us to make with credibility those compromises which everyone, including the Administration, believes will eventually have to be made.

The President, in sum, is pursuing, for reasons which of course he deems excellent, an ambiguous and contradictory policy—a policy of which the stated purpose is to leave Indochina, but in which it is implied that it may be necessary to stay in Indochina.

The Times believes the United States has discharged all the responsibilities it has in Vietnam. The Times believes this nation has—bravely and honorably—done everything, and more, that could reasonably have been expected of it.

American men prevented Communist forces from precipitantly seizing South Vietnam. American men, at an enormous cost in lives, have secured for the South Vietnamese a reasonable length of time for improvement of their army and consolidation of their country and government. Short of permanent occupation, there is no more America can reasonably be expected to do for Vietnam.

The President said last week that the Cambodian venture "eliminated an immediate danger to the security of the remaining American troops" and "won precious time" for the South Vietnamese army.

This, then, is the opportunity for the President to accelerate the withdrawal.

THE TIME IS NOW

Let him now publicly set a deadline for removing not only the remaining combat troops but all American forces, combat and support, according to a swift and orderly schedule. Let him begin to hasten the removal of combat troops this summer. It ought to be possible to bring about a total and orderly withdrawal in the next year and a half at the longest.

Such a program of withdrawal would of course be hazardous. But it would be much less hazardous than the policy the President is presently pursuing.

The South Vietnamese would be firmly on notice that their future is where it belongs—in their hands. The United States could continue to support them with arms and money, should they choose to keep on seeking a military solution; more likely they would feel impelled to put their own political house in order pending that day when they will come to the political compromise that is the inevitable outcome in Indochina.

American troops would be in some danger, but they are certainly in some danger now, and the faster they leave, the sooner they will be in no danger at all.

IMMEDIATE DEPARTURE

We shall not argue, as some do, that rapid American withdrawal would induce the North Vietnamese to negotiate; but it is certain they are not inclined to negotiate now. On the contrary, the longer we stay in Vietnam the more inclined the North Vietnamese will be not to negotiate, and the readier they may be to mount attacks on our forces in hope of pushing us out.

Let the President, therefore, remove all foreign and domestic doubts about our intentions by announcing a speedy departure from Vietnam.

The President said last week he was determined to end the war in a way that would "promote peace rather than conflict throughout the world... and bring an era of reconciliation to our people—and not a period of furious recrimination."

The Times believes that the program of withdrawal we suggest would bring about the kind of peace Mr. Nixon spoke of. The policy suggested here would hasten the end of one war and put the United States on a better footing to prevent other more dangerous conflicts.

The policy suggested here would certainly be met with recrimination from some in this country. But we firmly believe that this policy would be thankfully approved by the great majority of our people as an honorable conclusion to this terribly long war.

CONGRESS, THE DISTRICT, AND MONEY, FISCAL YEAR 1971

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest the lead editorial in the Washington Post for Sunday, June 7, 1970, discussing the question of Congress, the District, and money.

While I do not agree with much of what is contained in the editorial, I do find listed therein certain statements and statistics which the Post captions as "facts" and which should be of interest not only to the residents of the District of Columbia but to the Members of Congress as well.

The editorial states that in the Post's opinion the burden on the District of Columbia residents from major taxes in the District of Columbia is about average when compared with other major cities. The Post editorial also concludes that the charge that Congress is "stingy" with money for the District is no longer true. It is particularly interesting to note that the editorial states that the charges against Representative NATCHER of "starving the District financially" do not square with the facts. I trust that what the Post means is that Representative NATCHER has at all times attempted to be fiscally responsible in his dealings regarding District appropriations.

There are several other matters discussed in the Post editorial relating to District spending, District welfare costs, and the amount spent on District schools in recent years. It is interesting to note, for instance, that the editorial states:

> In Fiscal 1969, the District spent more per pupil on operating the elementary and secondary schools than did 13 of the other 15 cities in the 500,000 to 1,000,000 population group.

In recent years, the revenue hearings and consideration of the revenue bills proposed by the District of Columbia Government have been given serious and prolonged consideration by the House District Committee. The members have spent considerable time in determining exactly what the needs are for the District of Columbia and in justifying those needs in terms of revenue authorizations. It has not been an easy job and it is not one which can be completed quickly lest it be done poorly and inadequately. In my opinion, the District Committee has been fiscally responsible as well as responsive to the District needs in conducting such hearings in the past.

Recently, the House and Senate conferees reached agreement on the police, firemen and teachers' pay bills. This particular conference agreement is an interesting one because of the fiscally stable features it contains. It appears that the conferees have provided therein an authorized Federal payment and an increase in District income taxes to provide nearly all the funds needed to take care of the salary increases. I wish to compliment my fellow conferees on the fiscally sound approach they demonstrated in resolving the issues on these bills. While it may not be the usual procedure we have always employed, that is, to provide adequate revenue provisions or payment authorizations to cover the costs of bills, it is certainly a financially sound way to deal with such measures. It was perhaps particularly appropriate in this instance since the District of Columbia appropriations bill for 1971 had already passed the House and since no hearings have been scheduled to date on any District of Columbia revenue bill for the forthcoming year. If there are to be such revenue hearings and a revenue bill, then it is well that we anticipate that as early as we can.

If I understand the ranking minority member of the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. DAVIS, correctly, the Appropriations Committee has held the door open for an appropriations increase in H.R. 17168 if, prior to the time the conferees have taken final action on that bill, additional revenue measures are authorized by the House. I hope that before final action is taken on the District of Columbia appropriations bill, this House will have taken action to authorize additional revenue for the District of Columbia or an increase in the Federal payment if such requests can be adequately supported by the District Government. If the District can make such a showing, then I would hope there would be no hesitation in this body to give it the additional funds. I gather from the debate on H.R. 17168 last week that this is the general feeling, not only of the members of the Appropriations Subcommitttee, but most of those who were present in the House during that debate.

I also hope that within a short time this body will have the opportunity to vote up or down my little Hoover Commission bill which I introduced in the first session of this Congress. As we have taken up the pay bill for the various District employees—teachers, firemen, and so forth—and considered the District of Columbia appropriations bill for 1971, it generally seemed to me that we were reminded at every turn that what we need for the District of Columbia is to have a study of its operations by a blue-ribbon commission that would report back to this body with recommendations for streamlining the District government.

I would hope that the recommendations are such that, if adopted, would save money, make the local government more responsible to its resident citizens, make it more efficient, and make it easier for both the District government and the Congress to determine exactly what the needs are for the District of Columbia and how they can best be met in a way that is beneficial to the Congress, the District government, the local residents, and the country as a whole. I believe this would be helpful to the Mayor who is certainly as interested as any of us in operating and maintaining the best city government in the Nation.

I include the text of the Post editorial at this point in my remarks:

CONGRESS, THE DISTRICT—AND MONEY

Every year about this time, the District of Columbia government goes through its fandango with Congress about taxes, federal payments and appropriations. This year the specifics involve the deficit in the current budget caused by a congressional-enacted pay increase and the city proposals for a new budget of $825 million, an increased federal payment, and increases in income, property and gasoline taxes. As usual, the arguments about these specifics rest on a series of broad assumptions—generally summed up on one side by the conclusion that the District taxes and spends too much and on the other by the conclusion that Congress starves the District. Some of these assumptions are valid but many are not. So perhaps it might clarify the arguments over the specifics a little if we can clear out some of the false assumptions.

TAXES

Assumption.—Taxes in the District are terribly high. They drive residents to the suburbs and they repell potential residents from other cities.

Facts.—In major taxes—income, real estate, and sales—District residents generally pay 20 to 30 per cent less than do Maryland suburban residents and about 10 per cent more than do Virginia suburban residents. When all charges for government services are included—water, sewer, trash, auto tags, etc.—all of the suburban jurisdictions except Arlington are more expensive than the District to live in. As far as other cities are concerned, the burden on residents from major taxes in the District is about average—substantially less than that in such places as New York City, Boston, Baltimore, Buffalo and Milwaukee and substantially more than such places as Dallas, Houston, New Orleans, San Francisco and Seattle.

Assumption.—The tax on real estate in the District is much higher than it is elsewhere.

Facts.—Based on true value, the property tax in the District averages about 15 per cent more than it does in the Virginia suburbs and 15 to 30 per cent less than it does in the Maryland suburbs. On a national basis, the property tax here is lower than it is in 15 of the 20 other cities with a population over 500,000.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Assumption.—Congress has been so stingy with money that the District government is financially starved.

Facts.—This was true a few years ago but it no longer is. Since 1965, the money available to the District has skyrocketed (Representative Natcher hardly deserves his reputation as a skinflint). Appropriations have doubled since 1964 and tripled since 1960. Including grants from various federal agencies, the amount of money available to the District doubled between 1966 and 1970.

Assumption.—The largess of the federal government—in raising the federal payment from $30 million in 1963 to $105 million in 1970 and in providing other grants estimated to total about $199 million in 1971—has been overwhelming.

Facts.—As recently as 1966, the federal government was paying a greater share of the local-state government bills in seven states than it was paying in the District of Columbia. In 1968, the last year for which figures are available, the federal government put up 35 per cent of the money spent by the District government. In that same year, the federal government provided more than 25 per cent of all the money spent by state and local governments in Alaska, Arkansas, Kentucky, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia and Wyoming. Some of that money both here and elsewhere was for highways. But it is not at all clear that the present federal payments of $105 million is overly generous *in terms of the federal interest in this city.*

SPENDING

Assumption.—The District government spends more money than does the government of any city of comparable size in the country.

Facts.—That's true. Only New York City, Chicago and Los Angeles have larger local budgets. However, some programs paid for by the city here are financed elsewhere by the states. Los Angeles, for example, spends nothing on education and almost nothing on health and welfare while half of the District's money goes into those three areas. Because of such differences, city by city comparisons are meaningless, unless you combine all the *state-run* programs inside a city with its local budget. In fact, more money is spent per capita by non-federal governments in six states—Alaska, California, Hawaii, Nevada, New York and Wyoming—than is spent per capital in the District.

Assumption.—Compared to other cities, the District's welfare costs are stupendous.

Facts.—A Census Bureau report shows that eight states spend more per capita on welfare than does the District. A recent survey by the District Government shows that Baltimore, Boston and San Francisco—cities in our population bracket—spend more money and more dollars per capita, on welfare than does the District.

Assumptions.—Compared with other places, the District severely shortchanges its public school system.

Facts.—In fiscal 1969, the District spent more per pupil in operating the elementary and secondary schools than did 13 of the 15 other cities in the 500,000 to 1,000,000 population group. Similarly, the District spent more per pupil in operating costs than did Prince George's or Fairfax counties and about 94 per cent of that spent by Montgomery County.

When you cut through all these assumptions, you have some facts that can be applied to the specific problems now facing Congress and the city. These facts lead us to urge:

That the City Council approve promptly the increase in real and personal property taxes asked by Mayor Washington. The taxpayers can afford it, the city needs the funds and prompt action would be an earnest to Congress.

That Congress approve the increases in income and gasoline taxes asked by the city government. These will not place the city out of line with its suburbs or with other cities in the tax burden on local citizens.

That Congress adopt the 30 per cent federal payment formula which would do away with the barter system for federal aid that distorts the city's fiscal situation each year.

That Congress approve the increases in the local budget asked by the city government. Despite today's level of government spending here, particularly in the schools, the city has a long way to go to make up for the years of neglect prior to 1965; catching up is expensive.

That Congress face the fact that it has an obligation to pay for the retroactive pay increases it is about to grant and rather than try to shove part of the burden of inflation back on a city which doesn't have the money and can't afford to divert it from the urgent needs.

Beyond this, if Congress readily wants the District government to economize—and its members talk about that every year—it must give the city power to reorganize and to control its own administration. The waste in the city budget (and there is waste) cannot be eliminated as long as a 19th century administrative system designed to give individual congressmen extraordinary and inordinate power over our affairs blocks any effort to eliminate programs that are no longer useful or to transfer funds from less urgent to more urgent programs.

To put it very mildly, the financial situation in this city is not good. But, with the single exception of the property tax, it is a situation that Congress—and only Congress—can improve.

A PETITION BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION TO REQUIRE OPEN DATING OF PACKAGED FOODS

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined with the District of Columbia Democratic Central Committee in filing a petition with the Federal Trade Commission to require the open dating of packaged foods.

The petition asks the FTC to require the final date a food can safely be kept on a grocer's shelves to appear on the label of all perishable foods. In addition, it also requests the prohibiting of food repackaging or product redating.

Last November, I introduced legislation which now has 58 cosponsors which would accomplish much the same objective.

The petition is based on surveys conducted by my staff and the District of Columbia Central Committee in April of this year, which found large amounts of State food being sold in District supermarkets. Such abuses, unfortunately are not unique to the District, but are found in almost every part of the country.

Food coding is an unfair and deceptive practice, the sole purpose of which is to conceal information from the housewife. There is no reason to require consumers to be cryptographers in order to protect their families from food poisoning.

It is time to end the paternalism by which businessmen decree that the American consumer for his supposed own benefit, should be denied information to make an intelligent decision.

Favorable action on this petition will give the newly reorganized FTC the opportunity to demonstrate that it is, indeed, taking its role as institutional consumer advocate seriously.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of the petition and supporting exhibits:

PETITION FOR RULEMAKING

1. Pursuant to Section 45 of Title 15 of the United States Code and pursuant to Sections 1.12(a), 1.12(b), and 1.3(a) of Title 16 of the Code of Federal Regulations, the Democratic Consumer Action Committee of the Democratic Central Committee of the District of Columbia (hereinafter the Committee) and Congressman Leonard Farbstein ask that the Commission adopt, as part of its Rules and Regulations, standards—

(1) To require all stores selling groceries to place on each perishable item either:

(a) A clearly marked expiration date after which the item should not be sold, or

(b) A clearly marked packing date and a statement setting forth the length of the shelf life of the item from the packing date.

(2) To forbid repacking of any perishable item and placing on it a new expiration or packing date.

The need for such a rule is clearly indicated by the results of studies conducted in the District of Columbia by the Committee and by the staff of Congressman Leonard Farbstein, copies of which are attached as Exhibits A and B, respectively.

2. It is a common practice for supermarkets to stamp milk, eggs, cheese, bread, meats, and other perishable goods with a coding system, generally a group of letters or numbers. When decoded, the group represents a date, which is usually either the packing date of the product or the date on which it should, in the judgment of the store management, be removed from the store shelf.

The codes are extremely varied and complex. Different combinations of digits and/or letters are used. Each supermarket chain uses a different method for coding, and codes are generally different for each line of goods. As a practical matter, therefore, the codes are intelligible only to store personnel.

The studies found that (a) perishable items were often left on the shelves long after they should have been removed, even under the supermarket's own code;[1] (b) the perishable items are sometimes repacked, recoded with a new date, and replaced on the shelves; and (c) supermarkets continue to sell perishable goods, particularly meats, which have begun to discolor and go bad. These abuses obviously involve serious danger to the health of consumers.

3. The use of a coding system, rather than a uniform intelligible system of product dating, is a deceptive and unfair trade practice under Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act since it prevents the housewife from knowing how long the product has been on the shelf. The code conceals information from the housewife which she needs in order to make intelligent decisions concerning the product she buys. The Commission should determine that the concealment of this information is unfair.

The use of a dating system indicates that supermarkets recognize the need for a system that reveals the time the perishable item has been on the shelf. However, the coding system prevents the housewife from knowing whether the supermarket's own standards of shelf life have been violated. As a result, the company's own personnel have sole responsibility for determining whether the standards have been violated. This results in numerous instances where supermarkets continue to sell products beyond the time where the supermarket itself believes that they should no longer be sold and where the consumption of these products may endanger the health of the consumer. An intelligible system of dating would allow housewives to police the dates established by the supermarkets, for determining when products should be removed from the shelves, and to report such violations to the manager or simply refuse to buy products after that date. The Commission should determine that the sale of products beyond the store's own standard of shelf life is unfair and deceptive and should require an intelligible system of product dating to end such abuses.

The health of consumers may be endangered not only by the violation of the store's own standard of shelf life but by the use of unreasonably lax standards by the markets. The housewife is entitled to have reasonable shelf-life standards for perishable products established by the Commission, or otherwise to have markets prohibited from using unreasonable shelf-life standards. However, in no event should adherence to established shelf-life standards or use of uncoded dating be a defense to the sale by a market of unfit or unsafe food.

4. The practice of repacking and redating coded items so that they are marked with a coded date that indicates a product life longer than that introduced by the market is misleading even to a person who has deciphered the code or a store employee who is told the code. This amounts to a specific false representation as to when the product should no longer be sold. We submit that this practice is a clearly deceptive practice under Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

5. The sole purpose of the coding system is to conceal information from the housewife. An intelligible system of coding would place no additional burden on supermarkets since they already have placed dates on perishable goods in the form of a code. Indeed, some states now require that the shelf date be placed on certain perishable items, and we are informed that many American supermarket chains now place intelligible dates on perishable goods sold in their European stores. We know of no information that these practices placed any undue burden on the supermarkets.

It is sometimes said that, if housewives are given this information, prices will rise because they will only buy the most recent items and leave the others to spoil. However, stores can overcome this possible problem by better inventory practices which result in goods being sold more quickly after they are put on the shelf and by not mixing goods of significantly different ages on the same shelf. When some goods are not sold promptly, they can and should be reduced in price to allow housewives to decide whether they are willing to purchase slightly older but still fresh goods at lower prices.

6. In any event, the housewife is entitled to all the information necessary to make her own decision. It is time to end the paternalism by which businessmen decide that the American consumer, for his supposed own benefit, should be denied information to make an intelligent decision. Just as we have had Truth-in-Lending and Truth-in-Packaging, it is time for Truth-in-Dating.

We believe that the Commission has the responsibility to take action to afford better protection to the consumer and to help insure that the products he purchases are fit for consumption. In view of the widespread abuses which exist, including serious danger to the health of consumers and the refusal of supermarket chains to take action, we believe that the Commission should act immediately and expedite consideration of this petition.

Respectfully submitted,

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE,

Congressman LEONARD FARBSTEIN,

ARTHUR E. STROUT.

---

[1] In a visit to one of the stores after the date of the original survey, all the bologna had "pull dates" which had expired, some almost a month previously.

STATEMENT OF DEMOCRATIC CONSUMER ACTION COMMITTEE OF THE DISTRICT DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE, APRIL 8, 1970

The Democratic Consumer Action Committee of the District of Columbia Democratic Central Committee was established in response to the widespread recognition that consumers are often victimized and even defrauded. The Committee will investigate and expose consumer abuses and propose specific programs whereby the federal and District governments can remedy these serious problems. Today, the Committee announces the results of its first investigation—the deliberate effort of supermarkets to conceal from housewives the date when their perishable products should be taken off the supermarket shelves.

The Committee received numerous complaints that supermarkets in the District of Columbia often sell "out of date" foods at regular retail prices. Preliminary investigation showed that each perishable packaged food is stamped with a code, signifying either the date the item was packaged or the date after which the item should not be sold. If a manufacturer uses a "packing" date code, the store manager is also advised of the "shelf life" of the product. In either event, these codes advise the store personnel of the date after which those items should be removed from the shelf.

The Committee conducted a limited survey on Tuesday, March 31, Thursday, April 2, and Monday, April 6, to determine whether the supermarkets comply with their own codes. A representative number of each of the three largest food chains serving the District of Columbia was surveyed—Safeway (12), Giant (3), A & P (3). The individual stores selected were located in various parts of the city, from predominantly white Northwest to all black Anacostia. The survey was conducted by 12 two-person teams, most of whom were housewives. Each team was provided with a survey sheet describing the several items to be examined, the probable types of codes, and a code sheet on which to record their findings. Ten product lines were surveyed, and except for one national brand of sausage, each product line was the store's own brand. These included milk, eggs, cottage cheese, ground beef, pork chops, chicken, bologna, hot dogs, and bread. When the survey was completed, each team was instructed to identify itself to the store manager (or other appropriate personnel) and ask him for an explanation of the codes.

THE CODES

An inspection of almost any of the subject items reveals several combinations of digits and/or letters, sometimes reflecting not only the "pull" date or the "packing" date, but also the identity of the employee who packed the item. Thus, it was important first to distinguish the "code" from all other symbols on the item and then to ascertain exactly what was meant. This was done by interviews with store personnel which produced the following results:

SAFEWAY

Item	Examples of codes found	Interpretation
Milk	406	4th month 6th day; April 6 pull date.
Eggs	Exp. 43	Expires Apr. 3—pull date.
Cottage cheese.	406	Apr. 6—pull date.
Ground beef.	0044	Add 1st and last number to get month, middle number is day Apr. 4—pull date.
Pork chops	25	2 equals date packed, equals Apr. 2; 5 equals scale number.
	021	02 equals pull date—Apr. 2; 1 equal packer's number.
	041	1 equals good until 1st of month; 4 equals packed at 4 p.m.
Chicken	See pork	
Bologna	3121	Apr. 21—pull date (see ground beef).
Hotdogs	2172	Apr. 17—pull date (see ground beef).
National brand sausages.	1242	Mar. 24 equals packing date; 12-day shelf life.
Bread	1	Date stamped on end of loaf.[1]

GIANT

Item	Examples of codes found	Interpretation
Milk	402	Apr. 2 equals pull date.
Eggs	Mar. 30	Packing date—7-day shelf life.
Cottage cheese.	406	Apr. 6 equals pull date.
Ground beef	31	Mar. 31—date packed.
Pork	31	Do.
Chicken	31	Do.
Bologna	3181	Apr. 18—pull date.
Hotdogs	2202	Apr. 20—pull date.
National brand sausage.	1312	Mar. 31—date packaged.
Bread	Color ties	Red—Monday, Thursday;[1] White—Tuesday, Friday; Blue—Wednesday, Saturday.

A & P

Item	Examples of codes found	Interpretation
Milk	0402	Apr. 2 equals pull date.
Eggs	Exp. Apr. 1	Apr. 1 equals pull date.
Cottage cheese.	0405	Apr. 5 equals pull date.
Ground beef	2X	1 equals Monday, 2 equals Tuesday, X equals packer's number. Tuesday equals date packed.
Pork chops	2X	Do.
Chicken	2X	Do.
Bologna	4029	9 equals packer's number, 402 equals Apr. 2 equals pull date.
Hotdogs	0331	Mar. 31 equals pull date.
National brand sausage.	Not in stock	
Bread	Tuesday, or date stamped on card-board close.	Day it goes on shelf.

[1] Contrary to consumers' popular belief that bread is delivered fresh in morning and sold by evening, it was learned that bread is considered a 2-day item, and that bread delivered any morning is considered fresh until close of business the following day.

The codes are extremely complex. They are clearly designed to prevent the ordinary housewife from ascertaining when products should have been removed from the shelf. For the same information could be conveyed to store employees more easily by simply providing the date after which the item should not be sold.

FINDINGS

Of the 18 stores surveyed, only 3 had no "out of date" items. Seven stores had one product line with one or more "out of date" items, and eight stores had from 2 to 5 product lines with one or more "out of date" items. In 15 out of 18 stores, therefore, from 1 to 5 of the 10 basic product lines surveyed had one or more out of date items. More specifically, the chart below shows the percentages of the stores within each of the three chains in which the survey found product lines with one or more "out of date" items.

	Percent Safeway	Percent Giant	Percent A. & P.
Milk	8⅓	0	0
Eggs	50	33⅓	⅓
Cottage cheese	8⅓	33⅓	
Ground beef	33⅓	0	33⅓
Pork chops	8	0	33⅓
Chicken		0	0
Bologna	0	33⅓	66⅔
Hot dogs	0	33⅓	66⅔
National brand sausage[1]	33⅓	0	0
Bread	0	0	0

[1] It is supposedly the responsibility of the brand salesman, on his regular rounds of the individual stores, to pull "out of date" items from stock.

In other words, 20% of the product lines in A & P stores, 13% of the product lines in Giant stores, and 16% of the product lines in the Safeway stores had one or more items which should have been removed from the shelf.

MEAT AND POULTRY

The above analysis understates the supermarkets' failure to follow their own codes. For, in the case of meat and poultry, their "shelf life" is generally determined subjectively by the individual meat managers.

Safeway. All chickens are received from the packing plant with a coded date on the label. (These "fresh" chickens can be identified by a red USDA seal on the label). At the store the chickens are re-weighed for water loss, re-packed, re-priced to reflect new weight, and often re-coded. After this point in time there is little unanimity among meat personnel as to their proper shelf life. Most personnel interviewed stated that they assessed the chicken's freshness thereafter by observation.

When survey teams inquired as to the shelf life of pork, they were told: a) pork could not be coded because it was difficult to determine how long the meat was in the store before it was cut; therefore, the manager inspected it daily to determine if it was still fresh; or b) pork was good for 2 days after it was packaged; or c) pork was good for 3 days after it was packaged; or d) pork was good up to 4 days after it was packaged.

The survey teams received similar responses when they inquired into ground meat. Most were told that ground meat (not the prepackaged variety) is good for one day only. One survey team, however, was told that it is good for 3 days; when the color turns the manager knows it is bad—then it goes on sale.

A & P. All meat and poultry codes reflect the day the item was packed (or re-packed) and put on the shelf.

One manager, referring to all types of meat, stated that he daily looks at the meat and pulls whatever does not look good. When his attention was called to some greenish tinted meat, he admitted to not having inspected the meat that day. This same manager stated that he did not reduce the price of ground beef—if he thinks it is bad he pulls it out of the case, re-works it, and re-packages it. "If it's too bad" he throws it away.

Giant. All meat and poultry codes reflect the day the item was packed (or re-packed) and put on the shelf.

One surveyor was told that poultry is removed from the shelf when it begins to smell, or when it turns yellow or reddish, or when little growths appear.

General remarks

A survey team was told by a Safeway store manager that a local poverty organization had taken a code survey within the last two months. The manager also stated that the survey was discussed at a managers' meeting, and all managers were cautioned to keep their stock up to date. Thus, there is reason to believe that the Committee's survey was conducted under artificial conditions favorable to the supermarkets.

The personnel in all the stores, with one exception, were polite, courteous and cooperative. That one exception occurred in a Giant, where the surveyor was stopped by the manager and informed that he would need permission before he could continue his survey.

At least with respect to Safeway, the salaries both of the store managers and of the department heads are predicated upon their achieving a certain quota of sales. If they exceed that quota, they received a bonus. According to Safeway personnel, department heads can not return items to the warehouse for credit. Perishable items not sold are discarded at a loss to the particular department manager. It is therefore to the manager's advantage to sell at items in his inventory, regardless of expiration date.

One store in each chain was located in an upper middle class, predominantly white neighborhood. Out of these three stores, one had no "out of date" items, one had 1 product line with one or more "out of date" items, and one had two "out of date" items. The remainder of the stores (15) were in either integrated or all black neighborhoods.

There was no clear pattern to the abuses found. There were abuses in the stores in white upper-middle class as well as poor black neighborhoods. There were abuses in the older, smaller, less well-maintained stores as well as in the larger, more modern ones. Two of the stores, located in a predominantly black area, had no "out of date" items.[1] However, the three stores with the worst abuses were in Anacostia and Cardoza.

CONCLUSIONS

This survey was not meant to be an exhaustive study of coding practices. It did demonstrate, however, that supermarkets deliberately attempt to conceal information from the housewife which she needs in order to make intelligent decisions concerning the products she buys. The survey further found that the chain supermarkets in the District of Columbia frequently fail to remove items from the shelves according to their own estimate when these items should be removed. The staleness of perishable foods—particularly meats and dairy products—concerns not just the quality and taste of these products but the health of adults and children. The abuses uncovered in this survey therefore endanger the health of District residents throughout the city.

The Committee strongly recommends that the practice of coding be abolished. In its place, we recommend that the store place on each perishable item either (1) a clearly stamped expiration date after which the item should not be sold or (2) a clearly marked packing date and the shelf life of the product starting from this packing date.

[1] At the time of the survey, one store was sold out of 2 items (sausage & bread).

If our recommendations are adopted, housewives will have the information they need to make intelligent decisions. Furthermore, housewives themselves could police the dates set by the supermarkets when products should be removed from the shelf by simply refusing to buy products after that date. This would ensure that store managers would stop either deliberately or negligently trying to sell products when they should no longer be sold.

It is sometimes said that, if housewives are given this information, prices will rise because they will only buy the most recent items and leave the others to spoil. However, stores can overcome this possibility by better inventory practices which result in goods being sold more quickly after they are put on the shelf and by not mixing goods of significantly different ages on the same shelf. When some goods are not sold promptly, they can and should be reduced in price to allow housewives to decide whether they are willing to purchase slightly older but still fresh goods at lower cost.

In any event, the housewife is entitled to all the information to make her own decision. It is time to end the paternalism by which businessmen decide that the American consumer, for his supposed own benefit should be denied information to make an intelligent decision. Just as we have had Truth-in-Lending and Truth-in-Packaging, it is time for Truth-in-Dating.

We therefore urge the supermarkets to replace their codes immediately with clear, readable dates. But it is also essential that the government act to ensure that all supermarkets comply. We urge that the Federal Trade Commission prohibit, under its present powers, coding as a deceptive and unfair trade practice (we intend to present a petition to the Commission in the near future seeking a regulation to this effect); that Congress pass a statute for the entire country requiring that the date for removing perishable goods from the shelf be clearly marked on the package; and that the City Council ascertain whether it has the power to adopt such a regulation for the District of Columbia.

EXHIBIT B

SURVEY CONDUCTED BY THE STAFF OF CONGRESSMAN FARBSTEIN

The survey conducted by the staff of Congressman Leonard Farbstein concentrated on a five week study of food-coding practices in a single Safeway store operated in a middle-income area of Washington. A store of the same chain, operated in a low-income area was also surveyed on one of the same dates as the middle-income store. In addition, a more comprehensive follow-up survey of an A & P store, located in a low-income area, previously found by the D.C. Central Committee to be particularly bad was also conducted.

The surveys of the middle-income area store were conducted every Saturday during the period from February 28 to April 4. The items surveyed included bread, eggs, milk, cheese, yogurt, ground beef, pork, pork sausage, sea food, cold cuts, chicken, and potato and corn chips. Items in these twelve categories were examined every week by the same person. To ensure that the code or the meaning of the code had not changed during the period of the survey, all samples of a product on the shelves were examined for their code dates.

MIDDLE-INCOME AREA SAFEWAY

The survey turned up food being sold beyond the "pull date" on each visit, although the number varied significantly. On one date, only out-dated yogurt was found. But on March 28 over $40 (retail price) in outdated food was found; and on April 4, the figure rose to over $60. A list of some of the items found follows for these two dates:

Date and item	Examples of codes found	Code meaning	Investigator's remarks
Mar. 28, 1970:			
Lobster	250	25—pull date Mar. 25; 0—Packer's number.	
Perch	260	26—pull date Mar. 26	
	302 [1]	30—pull date Mar. 30	
Veal sweetbreads	245	24—pull date Mar. 24	
Pork sausage:			
1 lb	1252	Mar. 25 pull date	Brown color.
1 lb	1262	Mar. 26 pull date	Do.
2 lb	1083 [1]	Apr. 3 pull date	Red color.
National brand pork sausage.	1132	Mar. 13 package date	12-day shelf life, old Mar. 25.
	1202 [1]	Mar. 20 package date	
Pork rib chops	275	27—pull date Mar. 27	
Apr. 4, 1970:			
Eggs	Exp. 4 3	Expires Apr. 3, pull date	
	Exp. 4 4 [1]	Expires Apr. 4, pull date	
	Exp. 4 7 [1]	Expires Apr. 7, pull date	
	Exp. 4 10 [1]	Expires Apr. 10, pull date	
Corn chips	03 31 MD	Mar. 31 pull date	
	04 92 MD [1]	Apr. 29 pull date	
	05 05 MD [1]	May 5 pull date	
Cooked scallops	285	28—pull date Mar. 28	
	305	30—pull date Mar. 30	
Other sea foods	105 [1]	10—pull date Apr. 10	
	115 [1]	11—pull date Apr. 11	
National brand "Smokies" sausage.	1262	Mar. 26 pull date	On top.
	2092 [1]	Apr. 9 pull date	On bottom.
Kosher sliced bologna.	2032	Apr. 3 pull date	
	2152 [1]	Apr. 15 pull date	
Ground beef:			
1 lb	0283	Mar. 28 pull date	Purchased.
	0444 [1]	Apr. 4 pull date	
	0084 [1]	Apr. 8 pull date	
2 lb	0104 [1]	Apr. 10 pull date	

[1] Food not out-of-date of survey.

The bakery goods, all of which were dated, were generally found to be fresh. However, on one occasion rolls were found to be out-dated and on another samples of bread were found which carried one of three separate dates, the current date, two days previous and two days in advance. The most significant finding, however, was that during the course of the survey, the store appeared to change its bread-coding policy and began to date bread two days in advance. The consumer could thus not tell if he were purchasing fresh or day old bread, and the consumer purchasing "day-old-bread" was actually getting two day old bread.

Dairy products were also generally fresh. The milk was dated 6 days ahead and generally the milk found on the shelves of this stores was 5 or 6 days ahead. Similarly cheese and yogurt were generally fresh, with cheese being dated a month or two ahead. On the shelf at any one time, one could find American cheese samples with as much as two months difference in freshness. Examples of outdated yogurt and cheese were found.

The greatest abuses were found in the meat, fish and cold-cuts. This chain store dates most of its meat and fish two days ahead. At any one time, one could find labels with that day's date on them, and the dates for the two days following. The survey found out-dated lobster, perch, veal, veal patties and meat loaf, as well as consistently old examples of pork and/or pork sausage, and chicken. Many of the older items were observed to have been placed on top of the fresher ones. This chain store also dated ground beef 6 days ahead. Half the one pound ground beef for April 4 was found to be 7 days beyond the expiration date. When the surveyor required the meat attendant to remove the out-of-date ground beef, she refused, indicating that that was the responsibility of the store manager. A second attendant did remove the out-dated meat.

While this store is located in a middle-income area, and includes among its customers many Members of Congress, it also serves a significant number of low-income persons. Many of the types of out-dated meats and cold cuts observed were those generally purchased by low-income persons. A good illustration of this was found one week when red meat was being sold at half price because it was old. Examination of the code revealed it to be one day past due. Located in the next bin were several kinds of pork as much as 4 or 5 days old and being sold at full price!

LOW-INCOME AREA SAFEWAY

The survey of the low-income Safeway store conducted on the same date as one of the Saturday surveys of the middle-income store uncovered a large number of out-dated food. It also uncovered some differences in coding practices.

Included in the out-dated foods were milk, pickle and pimento loaf, onion loaf, ham, chicken breast rolls, pork steak, fudge and milk. In many of the cases, the older out-dated samples were found on top or in front of the fresher samples. The store was unswept and dirty and much of the food smelled and looked terrible.

The most flagrant abuse was found in connection with the milk. A number of cartons were found to have pull dates that had expired one or two days earlier. One had a pull date that was eight days old.

Even more interesting than the presence of the out-dated milk, was the shelving policy. All of the half-gallon vitamin D milk, except for that which was out-of-date had a zero shelf life. The shelf life expired with that date. The freshly crated milk delivery, sitting in the store aisles in violation of District of Columbia food regulations against keeping food unrefrigerated, also had the same date. The rest of the milk, the chocolate, and full gallon cartons had later dates.

This contrasts with the practice found in the middle-income store, where milk was generally sold which was dated six days ahead. Thus, milk that was six days older than what was being sold in the middle-income store was being sold in this low-income store.

Bakery goods were generally fresh although bread was dated with the next day's date (rather than the current date) which was the practice at the other store at that time. Meat was also dated one day farther ahead—up to four days ahead—although no meat with that day's date or the following day's date appeared on the shelves. The surveyor found this most curious; for in the middle-income stores, meat with all three possible dates was generally observable.

LOW-INCOME A & P

A visit to the low-income A & P reported by the D.C. Central Committee to be among the worst in the city, turned up what was probably more than $100 worth of out-of-date cold cuts and milk alone, and possibly as much as $200 worth of out-dated meat and poultry.

In contrast with the low-income Safeway, almost all the slower moving milk (chocolate, full gallons, et al.) was out of date, while the half gallon vitamin D milk was dated 6 or 7 days ahead. This was true not only for the chain brand milk, but for the national brand as well.

A similar pattern emerged with the meats. Assuming the practices followed in the middle-income Safeway for length of time meat should be left on the shelves, the large 20 pound turkeys and 7 pound capons were all out-of-date, while the red meat was fresh. As in the middle-income Safeway, much of the pork was out-of-date; slab bacon, pigs feet, hot sausage, polish sausage, smoke pork hocks, national brand sausage and national brand hot sausage. Among the cold cuts, the store stocked over 216 individual chain brand sliced bologna packages. A large number in the front and on top of the display were up to an entire month beyond the pull date, as was the chain brand meat pickle loaf, which sported one example of a package *two months* beyond the pull dated. The chain brand peppered loaf was a lot fresher, although some was a week beyond the pull date.

All of the bakery products appeared fresh, stamped with the next day's date. In contrast to the low-income Safeway, this store was well kept and looked modern from the outside.

JETS FOR ISRAEL

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, more than 200 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and more than 70 Members of the Senate have written to the President within the past 2 weeks urging him to approve the sale of supersonic military jet aircraft requested by Israel in order to help restore the balance of power in the Middle East, and offset a dangerous and growing threat to world peace caused by the recent appearance of highly sophisticated Soviet weapons and thousands of Russian military and technical personnel in Egypt and other Arab States.

I have joined with my fellow Members of the Congress in this effort to persuade the President to act quickly in this critical situation.

In addition, I have also urged withdrawal of Soviet Mig-21 fighter pilots and Russian troops manning newly installed SAM-3 antiaircraft missile sites in the United Arab Republic—as a major step toward establishing the basis for a stable peace settlement in the Middle East.

It was indeed gratifying, therefore, to read an outstanding editorial in the Los Angeles Evening Citizen News, entitled, "Warplanes for Israel—Why Are We Stalling?" which fully supports our congressional effort to end the delay in this vital matter; and obtain immediate approval to negotiate an agreement with the Government of Israel for the sale of the military jets necessary for her national security.

As the Citizen News editorial states:

The situation in the Middle East is deteriorating rapidly and the White House must cease the procrastination and make the move it wants to make—approve the sale of the planes.

Mr. Speaker, I include this fine editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

WARPLANES FOR ISRAEL—WHY ARE WE STALLING?

The Administration now has some strong support to make a move regarding Israel's request for 125 warplanes.

More than 70 senators have signed a letter urging sale of the planes.

Despite the political ploy by Sen. Hugh Scott in making a news spectacular out of the letter presentation, it does put the Administration in a better and more comfortable position.

Israel needs the jets and we want them to have them.

The situation in the Middle East is deteriorating rapidly and the White House must cease the procrastination and make the move it wants to make—approve the sale of the planes.

With the majority of the Senate now on record as favoring such a move there should be no obstacles.

We have heard much about maintaining the balance of power while the Soviet Union carried out a massive military buildup.

We are obviously vacillating at the wrong time.

Consideration of bilateral agreements with the USSR and cumbersome meetings toward that end are merely waste of time.

Is it not obvious that the Russians have moved upward from a Mideast protector to a Mideast participant?

This fact alone puts us in a position to explain to Moscow and to Cairo that the sale of the planes to Israel is politically expedient. If indeed such an explanation must be made.

Simply stated, the Israeli requests and the Senate's obvious agreement need not be the basis for our granting the 125 planes. The recent Russian action could suffice.

If there is a burning question at this time that deserves a public answer it is this:

Why did we move so rapidly into Cambodia with no open debate and yet we delay an obvious decision in the Israeli issue?

A PENETRATING LOOK AT SOVIET LIFE

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in writing about his recent visit to the Soviet Union, Philip L. Schwartz, a college student from Fall River, Mass., in my district, has provided us with an altogether remarkable and penetrating look at Soviet life. I have seldom read a more perceptive description of the life of the Soviet man in the street.

An enthusiastic traveler and keen observer, Philip Schwartz attended Pace College, in New York City. He wrote this account of his trip to the Soviet Union for the Pace Press, a weekly student publication. Philip, who graduated on June 7, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. David Schwartz, of 420 Valentine Street, Fall River. He has majored in marketing at Pace and plans to pursue graduate studies.

I think his article is of exceptional interest, and I urge my colleagues to read the article, which follows:

FALL RIVER STUDENT REPORTS

With a light snow falling, I toured Red Square with its famous red and white Spassky Tower and the Kremlin with its majestic golden domes and bell towers. The bright colors add gaiety while the gently falling snow and quiet isolation suggest a fairy-tale land. Despite the serenity of these two landmark attractions, the visitor becomes aware of another less pleasurable world that lies only moments away.

On the northeast side of Red Square stands Gosudarstvenny University Magazin, or GUM as it is called. This is the largest department store in Moscow, and, being so close to the tourist areas as well as to the heart of the country, one would assume that GUM would be a showplace for the workability of a socialist state. Just the opposite is true; it only demonstrates the negative aspects of the present form of socialism.

A massive structure built of stone walls and several arched glass roofs that cover the two-block long corridors, GUM caters to the entire population of Moscow and its suburbs. Housewives may travel an hour or more to have the opportunity to shop at GUM's.

Walking down one of the corridors on the three shopping floors, a shopper chooses a particular "store" or department to enter. The department, often one-third the size of a single-car garage, specializes in one certain type of product only. In the glass and chinaware department, the quantity for sale was less than what was needed to fill the display shelves, not to mention the limited selection of styles. In the ladies ready-to-wear department, up to 200 women would wait in line for a chance to buy a drab, styleless housedress. Dresses and other items are not always available when the customer wants them, but it is hoped that, in time, the minimum requirements of supply will be met by the system.

The process of buying any product in Russia is both long and complicated. First the item is chosen. Then, a slip is drawn up with the price scrawled on it, which is then taken to the cashier where the bill is paid. You are then given a receipt which is to be taken to the sales clerk, who will finally present you with the item that was purchased.

Modern supermarkets, although springing up here and there, are still a rarity. Here, each item must be purchased in a separate store—meat, bread, fruit, fish, etc. And with each purchase, the shopper must contend with the above system of bill-paying.

The Russians are not a poor people in terms of monetary wealth. Although their income is below that of the average American (a Russian worker in a large city may earn $125 a month), large sums of money are useless in a society that discourages conspicuous consumption. Most of a worker's paycheck goes for staple goods such as food, clothing, and other essentials. Luxury items are rarely found on the Russian market, but caviar and sturgeon, now becoming expensive, are purchased by most Russians on special occasions.

The storage of consumer goods is evident on the streets of any Russian city. Although the number of cars increases yearly, a traffic jam is a rare occurrence. For the jaywalker Russia is the ultimate in freedom of movement and complete disregard for street corners and traffic lights. Not having been conditioned to fear the automobile, Russians cross the street when and where they want.

Although tiping is frowned upon (a reminder of capitalism) the Russian, being in constant need of goods, will accept small gifts such as chewing gum in exchange for better service. (Preceding me through customs, a couple had tempted the inspectors with two packs of Wrigley's chewing gum, and were thusly whisked through the formalities with nary a bag being checked.)

APARTMENTS AND SUBWAYS

Rent, mostly subsidized by the government, is only $3.33 per month. However, there are many disadvantages to this system. First, the apartment supplied you by the government cannot be easily changed. Months and years may be spent on a waiting list if a new apartment is needed, and, even if your name does come up, the choice of the apartment is still not yours. The apartment buildings are large impersonal structures with small crowded rooms. Repairs are not made, stairways and corridors are filthy, and the apartments deteriorate while the inhabitants are on the waiting list for a new one. Within 10 years the apartment buildings take on a slum-like appearance.

A visitor to Moscow or Leningrad will probably be amazed at the regimentary organization of their snow removal system. Unlike most United States cities where snow clearance begins after the snow has fallen, Russia has a continuous operation of snow removal. The streets are plowed, the snow is pushed into piles and then carried away. The remaining snow and ice is chipped away constantly by heavily clothed women working in freezing temperatures.

Any New York subway ride would readily appreciate the Moscow and Leningrad subway systems. For six cents a passenger descends via a speedy escalator to a spanking clean and artistically decorated waiting platform. Within minutes the train arrives. Sitting in large, soft leather seats, the passenger is quickly transported to his destination without having to endure the bumping, squealing, and screeching that is characteristic of the New York system.

Although the Russian does not have to tolerate trains that are dirty and operate irregularly, he likewise must endure the ordeal of rush hour. Unlike his American counterpart who will tactfully force himself in and out of a crowded bus or subway car, the Russian has a more decisive method. He simply rolls his hand into a fist and punches anything and everything in his way. When a society is composed of such aggressive people, there is little that will prevent it from achieving desired goals.

FOOD AND DRINK

Although the stereotype image of the fat, red-faced undistinguished looking Russian is not far removed from reality, the Russians could have a country of handsome people. This is especially evident in the younger teenagers and children, who are often quite handsome at early age, but, because of the Russian diet, become fat, red-faced and undistinguished looking in the later years.

If you wish to try Russian food, this writer suggests you try it in New York. A meal in Russia is fuel for the day, and is to be looked upon as a means for survival only. A Russian saying goes: "You eat all of your breakfast, you give some of your lunch to a friend, and you give your dinner to an enemy."

Russian drink, however, is seen in a different light and is meant to be enjoyed. Straight unadorned vodka, without orange or tomato juice, is the national drink of Russia. On a cold night, which most are, straight vodka downed in one gulp will warm not only your heart, but your toes, teeth and hair. Russian champagne is also good, although not in the class of vintage French.

Since a large number of Russians can be considered "serious" drinkers, alcoholism has become a major problem, with many factories reporting an increase in absenteeism due to the "morning after." The government supplies "sobering up" stations where the intoxicated may undress and sleep until they return to a normal state.

ARTS AND RELIGION

The arts in Russia are justifiably renowned throughout the world. The Bolshoi Ballet, Kirov Theatre, Grand Opera and Ballet Company make Moscow-Leningrad the cultural center of the East. Tickets for Russian productions are difficult to come by.

For anyone interested in the work of the masters, the Hermitage Museum in Leningrad may be well worth the trip to Russia. Housing 2,300,000 exhibits, the Hermitage ranks as one of the three finest museums in the world, and would take months to be really seen.

Although Russia is a formally declared atheist state, the magnificent churches still stand and are being presently restored for artistic and historical purposes. (Those who still practice formal religion find themselves under the constant, disapproving eyes of the government.) A visit to a synagogue revealed that the temple was not only in need of money, but was lacking in the basic tools for worship including prayer books. Existing in poverty under a government that makes every effort to retard growth and progress, Russian Jews endure a life shrouded in bleakness and uncertainty.

Religion can be seen in a particular museum in Moscow devoted to this subject. As in most Russian museums, children are present to absorb all of the governmental propaganda. This museum, for example, features a display of religion throughout the ages, and attempts to equate religion with all of the death, destruction, famine and disease that has taken place on earth. Pictures of the wealthy church are juxtaposed with pictures of starving children in Biafra; every negative aspect of the church is magnified, while any positive function is ignored. On a separate floor there can be found a photographic collage featuring a photo of a United States President, the Pope, a U.S. tank, and starving children in Vietnam in a syllogistic display of "the world's evils."

The people of Russia, possessing the inherent need to turn to someone for inspiration and guidance, focus their worship toward Lenin, who has been supplied by the government as a substitute for the deity. For hours, they stand in the sub zero temperatures of Moscow waiting to view the embalmed body of Lenin. With deathlike silence and the somberness of the final judgment, men, women and children proceed quietly through the tomb under the scrutiny of the guards.

The Lenin Museum in Moscow is a must viewing for all school aged children and parents as well. There can be found displays of Lenin's papers, books that he may have read, and such revered items as his drinking glass, his fork, and his knife. This museum serves as the first step toward indoctrination to Leninism. To support the government's belief that Lenin was the only Russian leader worthy of respect, the names of Trotsky, Stalin and Khrushchev are never spoken in the museum, and every effort is made to minimize the roles they played in the formation of Russian history.

IVAN AND NICK

While touring Russia, I had the pleasure of meeting two students who lead somewhat different lives. The more intelligent and well-informed of the two was a young man named Ivan, whom I met in a cocktail lounge. Since all of the tables were full, I asked Ivan and his girl friend to join our group. Although he hesitated and seemed unsure, he did consent, and while sitting down he carefully avoided showing his hands. When I asked him about this, he told me that he was a mechanic and an international race car driver, and because of his profession he believed that he was below us and should not be sharing the same table.

Russians are cautious with whom they speak; they do not wish to offend those above them nor embarrass those beneath them. One who works with his hands is considered beneath most other occupations.

Ivan was well-informed of the 1968 U.S. presidential election and would have preferred Hubert Humphrey. He knew that many students were working for the election of Gene McCarthy, and for this reason he opposed McCarthy's candidacy. Students, he believes, do not possess the required knowledge and mature judgment that is required in such important matters. Contrary to the American youth-oriented society, Russians believe that wisdom comes with age, and that the more mature must have complete control.

Ivan was guarded in his answers to my questions, and I sensed that the reason for his reluctance to reply was fear and not ignorance. When I asked his opinion on the feeling of Russians toward Khrushchev, he did not answer. "In America," I told him, "Khrushchev was becoming well-liked before his ouster." Ivan waited and then replied, "Well, people in our two continents are really alike." I assumed that this meant that Khrushchev's liberalism was appreciated in his own country.

Ivan's English was excellent. He was well-informed and possessed a thorough knowledge of world affairs. A Russian affairs expert suggested later that Ivan might have been a member of the underground, a small organization with access to outside information and whose members enjoy talking with Americans. I made plans to meet with Ivan the following night, but he did not arrive.

My other acquaintance was a 20-year-old trade school student named Nick. He works in a hotel gift shop, attends school, and studies English, which leaves little time for his own enjoyment. When Nick is not working or studying, he likes to listen to rock music and rehearse with his small combo. An uncle was able to bring the Beatles' "Abbey Road" album into the country, and Nick likes it very much.

Although he wants to attend the more prestigious University of Moscow (the only university), he has not yet been able to meet the requirements. In addition to qualifying one for draft exemption, a university education is really the only way for one to advance in Russia. But Nick desires more than being just a worker for the benefit of the state.

Something beyond a friendship developed in the two days I spent with Nick. Perhaps it was an awareness of the fact that although we were both students and similar in many ways, we were, nevertheless, citizens of countries that are not only different politically, but profess to be adversaries. Perhaps to Nick I was a link to the outside world that he never sees. Perhaps I was just a friend to a lonely boy. We said goodbye in the center of the majestic Kremlin. He presented me with a badge as a symbol of our brief friendship. As I left, his eyes filled with tears—a captive in his own country. We will never meet again.

PALME—DEFENDER OF SMALL NATIONS, SO LONG AS NOT ANTI-COMMUNIST

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Sweden's Socialist "Crown Prince" Olaf Palme, recently attempted to dodge his hate-everything about the United States—

except our money policy—by criticizing U.S. containment of Communist aggression in Southeast Asia.

Interestingly enough, Palme always defends his pro-Soviet apology with the explanation that it is the great power versus small countries.

He was quoted this week in Washington as having said:

> A great power went into a small nation without the explicit request and consent of the government of the country in question. . . . We are really only asserting our own right to exist as a small country.

When it comes to small countries under attack by great powers, whoever recalls Prime Minister Palme speaking out on the sophisticated warfare being waged against little Rhodesia, Portugal, or Southwest Africa? Such atrocities against these small countries are not only by great powers but by the international power of the United Nations organization.

As for small countries in Southeast Asia, one wonders who Mr. Palme feels extended an invitation to the powerful Russian Bear or the Red Chinese to invade South Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, or for that matter, South Korea?

Perhaps it is well to remember Sweden's geography. Sweden is close enough to Russia to have been taught a lesson of Czechoslovakia and other nearby small countries. Silence was Mr. Palme's contribution to international peace on that aggression also.

I have never visited Sweden and my knowledge of that country and its people is solely based upon its history and from the miserable mistakes of its socialist laboratory of the present day.

During my European days of World War II, a visit to Sweden would have been unpatriotic. At present she harbors deserters and draft dodgers and her socialist leaders by word and deed, aid, and abet the Communist enemy.

Sweden's controlled press and TV are biased and distorted, giving shoddy reporting of everything American but glorifying everything Russian, Chinese, North Vietnamese, and Cuban.

The only reason that I can offer for knowing of the international intimidation by brainwashing, sex, liquor, and gimmicks in Sweden is by comparing her spokesman and leaders with the grand Americans of Swedish descent who we know in America.

For surely, none of our Swedish Americans would tolerate for one moment the calloused and weak-kneed refusal of their government leaders to go to the assistance of captured fighting men held prisoner by the band of outlaws who call themselves the Government of Vietnam. This is but another quisling front of the Soviets which has been politically expedient for Palme to recognize as a Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I include several newsclippings:

[From The Evening Star, June 11, 1970]

SWEDES LEAD VACILLATORS ON PRISONER ISSUE

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

The lethargy of a selfrighteous international community to bring any pressure to bear on North Vietnam in its treatment of American prisoners of war will not be quickly forgotten in this country.

This has nothing to do with whose side a nation or a government might be on. Many of the governments which most oppose the American defense of South Vietnam are solemnly obligated to do everything they can to assure the humane treatment of American war prisoners in North Vietnam. And in point of fact none of them has done much of anything at all.

It is altogether an unusually shabby performance. Sweden's Prime Minister Olof Palme, during his recent visit to the United States, was asked on many occasions what his government was doing about the American prisoners. His reply was invariably that Sweden, out of traditional humanitarian considerations, had tried to get the names of some 60 prisoners and had received confirmation on 14, most of whom were already known to be held in North Vietnam.

The humanitarian bit is not easily swallowed. Sweden is formally bound to take all measures, not only to get the names of prisoners, but also to prevent the mistreatment of the men being held by Hanoi. Since Sweden maintains diplomatic relations with North Vietnam, since the National Liberation Front has permanent headquarters in Stockholm, and since the Swedish government has announced a relief program for North Vietnam, to be administered by their Red Cross, Palme is in a better position than most people to do something about the prisoner problem.

The obligations are not in dispute. North Vietnam has signed the Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners of war drawn up in Stockholm in 1949, as has the United States, South Vietnam, and of course, Sweden. Last year in Istanbul at the 21st International Conference of the Red Cross, Sweden was a cosponsor of a resolution which called on "each party to the convention (which includes Sweden) to take all appropriate measures to ensure humane treatment and prevent all violations of the Convention."

Two legalistic arguments are advanced by North Vietnam (and echoed by Sweden) for not carrying out the provisions of the Geneva Convention. The first is that the war in Vietnam is not a declared war. The second is that American prisoners in North Vietnam are war criminals and therefore not protected by the terms of the Convention.

Both of these arguments are utterly without foundation.

Article 2 of the Convention itself provides that the rules shall apply to "any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the High Contracting Parties, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them." In the Istanbul resolution of 1969, it was spelled out that "the Convention applies to each armed conflict between two or more parties to the Convention without regard to how the conflict may be characterized."

As for the war criminal gambit, Article 85 of the Geneva Convention specifies that "Prisoners of war prosecuted under the laws of the Detaining Power for acts committed prior to capture shall retain, even if convicted, the benefits of the present convention."

Some Communist powers, including North Vietnam, noted reservations to this provision in signing the Convention. In Hanoi's view, the exception was defined as follows:

"The Democratic Republic of Viet Nam declares that prisoners of war prosecuted and convicted for war crimes or for crimes against humanity, in accordance with the principles laid down by the Nuremburg Court of Justice, shall not benefit from the present Convention as specified in Article 85."

No American prisoner of war has ever been prosecuted, much less convicted, as a war criminal by the Hanoi regime.

In short, there is no excuse whatever for any of the signatories of the 1949 convention not doing everything in their power to insure humane treatment of American war prisoners. No excuse, that is, except political expediency which all-too-often seems to stand in the way of the most solemn international undertakings.

[From the Evening Star, June 9, 1970]

VICTORY OR DEFEAT?

(By Joy Billington)

The prime Minister of Sweden, Olaf Palme, here on a private visit designed to repair fractured U.S.-Swedish relations, was asked questions about Cambodia, the treatment of the U.S. ambassador in Sweden, the longshoremen protest against him at Kenyon College, Ohio, last week, and his appearance in the film "I Am Curious (Yellow)"—when he was guest speaker at the Woman's National Democratic Club yesterday.

This was after his prepared address, "The Emancipation of Man."

Emphasizing that he did not wish to "abuse hospitality" or intervene in national affairs, Palme nevertheless expressed what he described as his honest reaction to the news of Presidnt Nixon's "invasion" of Cambodia.

"When I received the news, I felt that even if it were a military victory, it would be a moral defeat for the U.S."

This was for two reasons, Palme explained. It meant an extension of the war. It meant that "a great power went into a small nation without the explicit request and consent of the government of the country in question."

In protesting such action, Palme said, "we are really only asserting our own right to exist, as a small country."

American deserters given sanctuary in Sweden, he said, are in a long tradition of men fleeing from many wars.

"We have not encouraged them," he emphasized.

Some of them are quiet and adjust to Swedish life, he said. Some of them are active, "and call me a lackey of Nixon." Others are drug addicts who are in trouble with the law there for criminal offenses connected with drugs.

Their presence, however, is a reflection of Sweden's traditional laws protecting the individual. "The U.S. has the same laws. If the situation were reversed, our people would benefit in the same way by your laws."

Asked by a questioner about the treatment of the U.S. Ambassador Jerome Holland, whether there was any racism, Palme said that being a Negro would make Holland more popular with Swedes. The vast majority of Swedes are pro-American, he insisted. They are also anti-war, but they still wish to maintain good relations. Only a tiny minority have behaved badly, the Prime Minister said.

Concerning the demonstration against him and his country on Saturday at Kenyon College, Ohio, Palme said he was sad to seee that many of the protestors did not know much about the slogans written on their signs.

"And they didn't want to listen, just to howl. They didn't hear that I was actually making a speech about the equal distribution of wealth and the need for strong unions," he said with irony. "They looked very angrily at the Reverend who was to give the invocation, because he looked much more prime ministerial than me."

PIXIELIKE

The pixielike Swede, asked about "I am Curious (Yellow)" in which he appears in a documentary sequence (being interviewed as the Minister of Communications he then was) said he was "conned" into it by the director.

"I haven't seen it. I'm not curious enough. The director didn't tell me he was doing his documentary on another area of human endeavor!"

His major address, delivered to a room packed with women, including his wife, Lisbeth and his press secretary, Berit Rollen, a woman, was a serious explanation of developments in Sweden towards freeing men and women from their traditional sex roles.

"We have talked too long about the emancipation of women and the problem of woman's role in society. It is human beings we shall emancipate." The greatest gain of increased equality will be the end of predetermined roles on account of sex, he said.

At school and through TV, boys got an exaggerated picture "of what it means to be a man," tough, hardboiled, wild-west hero supermen and soldiers. "The boys compensate their lack of contact with kind, everyday men by looking upon mass media men as their ideal."

The new way to combat this in Sweden is for both parents to work part-time, or full-time with day-care facilities.

"If a politician today should declare that women ought to have a different role than the man, that it is 'natural' she devotes more time to children, he would be regarded as something out of the Stone Age."

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times recently printed an excellent editorial entitled "A Worthy Social Security Bill," commending the House of Representatives for its example of active congressional leadership in meeting the challenges of the country's urgent domestic needs by passing the 5-percent across-the-board social security benefit increase bill with the automatic cost-of-living escalator provision—to offer at least a measure of financial protection for the Nation's 26 million elderly citizens against the effects of rampant inflation in today's economy.

Because of the importance of this subject, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the Los Angeles Times editorial:

A WORTHY SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

Issue.—Is Mr. Nixon right in urging the Senate to approve the House-passed Social Security bill without substantial change?

The U.S. House of Representatives has voted a substantially sound package of Social Security legislation. The question now is whether the measure will get through the Senate without too much tampering.

Under terms of the bill approved by the House, the nation's 26.2 million Social Security beneficiaries would get a 5% raise in their monthly checks beginning next January. This means that the average retired single person would get $121 a month instead of $116, and the average couple $205.80 instead of $196.

In addition, the amount which retired persons can earn without any loss of Social Security benefits would be increased from $1,680 to $2,000. Beyond that, up to a cutoff point of $3,200, they would still lose only $1 in benefits for every $2 of earnings.

As President Nixon said in urging the Senate to go along with the House version of the bill, the increased benefits are urgently needed to help the elderly and the disabled "make ends meet" in this period of rising living costs.

All good things have a price, of course, and liberalized Social Security benefits are no exception.

The House-passed bill would pay for the added benefits by raising from $7,800 to $9,000 the wage base on which Social Security payroll deductions are imposed. Thus, for workers earnings $9,000 a year or more, deductions would go from the current $374.40 a year to $468 in 1971 and more in later years.

One of the most praiseworthy portions of the bill is the provision, added on the House floor, which would guarantee automatic increases in Social Security benefits in the future, in accordance with rises in the cost of living index.

The automatic escalator, which for years has been urged by Republican leaders on Capitol Hill, should help to end the congressional ritual of moving to increase Social Security benefits in every election year—by amounts which may or may not correspond to the cost of living.

A lot of lawmakers, of course, are loath to abandon the ritual because of the political mileage it gives them among "grateful" old folk.

There is speculation that such sentiment will be sufficiently strong in the Senate to kill the escalator provision.

This would be unfortunate. Elderly retirees should have the psychological security of knowing that their benefits will be adjusted to keep pace with inflation, without regard to the whims of Congress.

President Nixon accurately described the House-passed bill as a "major milestone on the road to reform" of the Social Security system. It deserves Senate approval—with the automatic escalator principle intact.