

403. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the State of Illinois, relative to amending the Social Security Act regarding rehabilitation sites for the mentally ill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

404. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to amending the Social Security Act to provide certain treatment for the mentally ill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

405. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the

State of Illinois, relative certain benefits for the mentally ill under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

508. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Gushikawa City Assembly, Okinawa, Ryu-

kyu Islands, relative to removal of poison-gas weapons from the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

509. Also, petition of the Gushikawa City Assembly, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands, relative to U.S. military personnel stationed on Okinawa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

510. Also, petition of the board of commissioners, Newport, Ky., relative to exempting the *Delta Queen* from the provisions of the safety-at-sea law; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### BREAKTHROUGH IN CANCER RESEARCH

#### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable scientists of our time, a man who may be on the verge of a breakthrough in cancer research, is 76-year-old Dr. Leonell Strong, who among his own peers is hailed as an unsung hero of medicine.

Six years ago, Dr. Strong retired after many years as a geneticist at the Yale School of Medicine and later as head of the animal experimental laboratory at Roswell Park Institute in New York State, the oldest cancer research lab in the world.

He came to La Jolla to join the Salk Institute for Biological Studies, had a falling out with Dr. Salk, and a couple of years ago became involved in a lawsuit in which Dr. Strong won damages.

He then established his own laboratory in Sorrento Valley under auspices of a nonprofit foundation, pouring all of his life savings into the lab in order to continue research with mice for which he has become world famous.

During a half century's research, Dr. Strong has become acknowledged as the world's foremost authority in the study of cancer through the use of inbred strains of mice. His colonies of mice have been the source of such animals used in labs throughout the world. His first major contribution to cancer research was development of a unique strain of mice in which tumors grew spontaneously, rather than being transplanted—mice in which cancer was conveyed from one generation to the next.

Now he has developed a liver extract which when applied to mice, has resulted in virtually 100 percent elimination of cancerous tumors in nine generations of mice. Clinical experiments with human beings at Roswell Park Institute may be the next step after scientists there isolate the active ingredient in the liver extract. The reason we are calling attention to Dr. Strong's work tonight is that it is on the verge of being shut down completely for lack of financial support at the very moment when this distinguished scientist may be on the threshold of an important discovery in the battle against cancer, right here in San Diego County.

Up to now, Dr. Strong has struggled to maintain his laboratory with modest

Federal Government funding; his own life savings, now exhausted; and public contributions of more than \$25,000 raised when his financial plight was publicized primarily in the San Diego Independent.

But the financial well is running dry, the Government has refused another grant, and he has just enough to keep going through June, after which he will have to phase out the lab in Sorrento Valley, kill the 13,000 mice, and close the book on a lifetime of dedicated research.

Desperate attempts are being made by San Diego friends of Dr. Strong to convince the National Institute of Health to continue its support of his lab for at least another 12 to 18 months—the time Dr. Strong, still mentally vigorous at 76, believes he needs for positive proof of immunity against cancer provided by the liver extract. But unless a miracle occurs, the Leonell Strong Laboratory appears doomed to shut down. It would be a sad culmination of a distinguished career during which—and few people know of this—Dr. Strong was nominated for a Noble Prize in Medicine, though he did not win the award.

The miracle has happened to keep alive the remarkable cancer research by Dr. Leonell Strong, the distinguished scientist whose laboratory in Sorrento Valley, near Del Mar, has been threatened repeatedly with shutdown.

During the last 2 nights on these commentaries, I have told of the world-renowned studies by Dr. Strong of malignant tumors in mice—studies that now may be reaching a breakthrough that could unlock some of the mysteries of cancer.

A liver extract which Dr. Strong has been injecting into some of the 13,000 mice at his laboratory has demonstrated the capability of inhibiting the growth of tumors from one generation to the next, to the point of complete elimination in the ninth generation.

The liver extract is now being evaluated in the world's oldest cancer research laboratory, the Roswell Park Institute in Buffalo, N.Y., for possible clinical use on human beings. Meanwhile, Dr. Strong must continue his experiments for the most complete scientific confirmation.

Although Dr. Strong's research has been supported in the past by the American Cancer Society and the National Institutes of Health, a cutback in availability of research funds has dried up these sources. He has exhausted his own life savings to keep his laboratory open. With financial aid no longer available, he faced a complete shutdown, and extermination of the thousands of spe-

cially inbred mice by the end of June. And now, the miracle.

Five minutes after I mentioned this last night, a Coronado woman called to offer \$5,000—enough to keep the lab open through July, another full month. But Dr. Strong must maintain his laboratory for several more months, to insure the fullest exploration of what appears to be a significant attack on cancer. If you feel that you would like to help Dr. Strong in this endeavor, you may send whatever donation you can afford to Leonell C. Strong Research Foundation, 10457 Roselle Street, San Diego, 92121.

There have been many disappointments in the fight against cancer; this may be another one, but can we afford not to give it the fullest chance to succeed?

#### POSTAL REFORM

#### HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of all my colleagues, especially in view of the business schedule for tomorrow, a commentary by Nicholas von Hoffman in today's issue, June 15, of the Washington Post. This article is one of the most cogent I have seen on the subject of postal reform and gives some of the background information as to how this so-called reform has been lobbied to the floor of this House. I hope every one of my colleagues will read it carefully before the House begins its consideration of the so-called postal reform bill.

The article follows:

#### POSTAL "REFORM"

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

The pressure is rising to pass the Post Office Reform Bill. People support anything called reform, especially these days when action of any kind is beyond our enfeebled representatives.

One of the main arguments for this bill is that it will "take the Post Office Department out of politics." Politicians and politics being held in the high regard they are, any proposition to get rid of them always wins near unanimous assent.

Alas, experience teaches us that it is impossible to get politics out of anything, not merely because politicians are tenacious fellows and like to hang in there close to the boodle, but also because politics, realistically defined, is the business of deciding and carrying out policy, and you can't run anything without doing that. What this bill

actually does is transfer some of Congress' power over the Post Office Department to a board of directors who're supposed to be nonpartisan and operate the mail in a businesslike and efficient manner.

This isn't a new idea in American life. We've been reorganizing things to get the politics out of them for a long time. That was the idea behind civil service, appointed school boards, urban renewal commissions and such internationally famous fiascos as the Port of New York Authority. Sometimes, commissions and authorities can introduce economies in the operation, but a new bureaucracy is established which is unamenable to the needs and desires of people we aptly call "the small man." Nothing has proved as unresponsive to the individual citizen as "nonpolitical" appointive commissions run by experts, distinguished citizens and representatives of the public.

Most reforms that set out to make things nonpolitical are actually engaged in transferring the political power from elected politicians to the nonelective, silent and secret politicians with much smaller constituencies, often referred to as lobbyists, bagmen, etc. In that light, let's see who put up the money to lobby and propagandize this reform through the Congress. Who was it that backed the Citizens' Committee for Postal Reform?

The Congressional Record, Volume 115, part 22, page 29322 tells us that the names of some of these citizens who contributed \$5,000 apiece were: The Bank of America, Scott Paper Co., Standard Oil of New Jersey, Time, Inc., the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, Pan American World Airways, Montgomery Ward, J. C. Penney Co., Boys Town of the Desert, I. E. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Kimberly-Clarke Corp., Sears, Roebuck & Co., General Electric, American Express, Goodyear Tire & Rubber, Ford, and the Bechtel Corp. Weighing in for contributions of less than \$5,000 were, among others, the following citizens: Litton Publications, Inc., the Conde Nast Publications, Cowles Communications, Inc., Newsweek, B. F. Goodrich, and Hon. C. Douglas Dillon.

Right-thinking readers will understand that the afore-mentioned citizens made this contribution out of unselfish zeal for reform. Cynics will remark that many of these citizens are publications and other institutions that use the mail at favored rates, that others sell the publications large amounts of paper, that others are contractors who might build the reformed and modernized post office buildings, that others might sell this new system automated equipment or mail trucks, or tires for the trucks.

There are other putative beneficiaries of reform. One of them is Mr. George Meany and his AFL-CIO. The deal Mr. Meany and his agent worked out with the administration is that in return for his embracing reform, only seven AFL-CIO unions would be recognized as bargaining agents for the Post Office employees. A reactionary, Republican administration not only traded away its cherished right-to-work principle but the right of the employees to choose their collective-bargaining representative through elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board.

This, in labor-union parlance, comes close to being a yellow-dog contract. Mr. Meany, however, says it's historic, and he's certainly right.

Under the terms of this deal, the third largest union of Post Office employees will be excluded forever from the bargaining table. This is the 80,000-man National Postal Union, which isn't a member of the AFL-CIO. This independent union representing something like 10 per cent of all Post Office employees has its membership concentrated in the big cities. Twenty-six thousand of its members are in the Bronx and Manhattan,

where they have already demonstrated what they can do to national postal service when they decide not to report for work.

And that's what they're going to decide if reform in its present design goes through. "Our members won't stand for it," says Phil Seligman, the executive vice-president of the Bronx-Manhattan local. "If this goes through, there'll never be labor peace. We're not going to stand by and be legislated out of existence."

It's been the big city postal workers, the men and women who live in the high cost-of-living areas who've been unhappiest about wages. They need collective bargaining representation the most.

Instead, the President and many members of Congress are turning them over to George Meany who, in lieu of getting them a living wage, can perhaps persuade them to join the hard hats and satisfy the frustration of their bellies by beating up long-haired young persons.

Under this version of reform, the predominantly black National Alliance of Postal Employees with 37,000 members (the fourth largest Post Office union) will also be denied the right to bargain collectively.

President Nixon has repeatedly said that he believes in local control, in pushing decision making out of Washington. He has done this in the South when white parents haven't wanted black children in their schools.

This principle, which he applied even at the expense of black children's rights, is now violated because it's convenient for the President to have Mr. Meany hailing him as the 30-day conqueror of Cambodia; because it's profitable for the corporate citizens.

But building a new and more remote super organization, reinforcing the rigid inertia of big labor, contradicting the need for structural change that the President himself has enunciated, is worse than inconsistent, it will increase wildcat strikes, augment the universal feeling of personal impotence and hasten the spread of black and student disruption into mill and factory.

IN SUPPORT OF MR. JUSTICE  
WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a letter sent to the distinguished Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee written by a close friend and distinguished professor of law at New York University School of Law, Norman Dorsen.

The letter very succinctly sets forth the reason why each of us in this House should oppose the impeachment of Mr. Justice William O. Douglas. I am setting forth the letter with the thought it would be of interest to our colleagues:

MAY 18, 1970.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,  
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee,  
House of Representatives, Wash-  
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: I write in regard to the pending impeachment resolution of Justice William O. Douglas. Apart from my interest as a citizen, I am professionally concerned in view of my long connection with the Supreme Court. I served as law clerk to Mr. Justice John Marshall Harlan in the October Term 1957, I have participated in numerous

cases before the Court, and I have taught constitutional law at New York University School of Law for nine years.

In my judgment no information that has so far come to light warrants the impeachment of Justice Douglas. The charges that have been made by Mr. Ford and others seem patently insufficient to invoke the ultimate remedy against a sitting judge. For example, the relationship of Justice Douglas to the Parvin Foundation and the Center for Democratic Studies have not, as far as I am aware, been shown to involve any impropriety. Moreover, the widely quoted excerpt from Justice Douglas' recent book, *Excerpts of Rebellion*, is not only ambiguous but plainly protected by the First Amendment.

Perhaps out of a recognition that the above charges do not constitute the "high crime and Misdemeanor" that the Constitution requires for impeachment, Mr. Wyman's resolution attempted—for the first time in our history, I believe—to base impeachment on the alleged fact that Justice Douglas has "failed to be . . . good behavior." If this constitutional standard is adopted, it will be a serious blow at the independence of the judiciary, fully apart from the effect on the matter pending before your committee. The net result would be, as Mr. Ford candidly told the House, that "an impeachment offense is whatever a majority of the House . . . considers it to be at a given moment in history." Such a rule would not only jeopardize judicial independence, but would be deeply ironic in view of the expressed concern for judicial precedent and the rule of law on the part of the sponsors of the impeachment resolution.

I urge you to oppose the impeachment of Justice Douglas.

Sincerely,

NORMAN DORSEN,  
Professor of Law.

THE YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL  
CONCEPT

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER  
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the Jefferson County, Ky., Board of Education has been doing some very interesting work on the year-around school concept.

For those interested in bold, new, and innovative ideas in elementary education, I am pleased to make available the recent comments of the Honorable Richard Van Hoose, superintendent of the Jefferson County Public Schools.

The remarks follow:

YEAR-AROUND SCHOOL AND THE JEFFERSON COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

On May 25, 1970, the Jefferson County Board of Education made a landmark decision. In effect, they said "this is where we stand on the year-around school concept, and this is what we propose to do about it." This decision was announced to the nation and to the world through press reports, and reaction has been swift and widespread. Members of the Board of Education and staff have heard from students, teachers, superintendents, researchers, business men, college professors, school board members, and others. Inquiries have come in from 17 states, and the mail continues to bring requests for more information.

The Associated Press put the story on the wire and literally sent it around the world. Because of this we have received inquiries



from London, England; Santa Barbara, California; Ann Arbor, Michigan; Hudson, New Hampshire; Gregory, Texas; Vienna, Virginia, and other far-away places too numerous to list. The "Today Show" carried our announcement as a news feature. Television stations in Philadelphia and Miami gave the story special treatment. Education writers from the *New York Times*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, and the Washington Scripps-Howard newspapers have been in touch with us. A newspaper in Orlando, Florida wrote a strong editorial endorsement of our Board's position.

No other action by the Jefferson County Board of Education in my twenty years as superintendent has created such a wave of interest. Why? The reason is obvious. School systems everywhere are becoming aware that the September-to-June calendar no longer meets the needs of this nation.

In the fall of 1968 the Board of Education authorized the superintendent and staff to make an in-depth study of the current thinking on year-round school. An ad hoc committee was established with representatives from all walks of life. Business leaders, state legislators, PTA leaders, ministers, labor leaders, and newspapermen were included, as were professional personnel from the County, City and Catholic school systems, from the University of Louisville, and from the State Department of Education.

As the staff and the committee reviewed the literature on this subject, listened to consultants, and visited systems where innovation of this kind is in progress, it became evident that isolating one plan for utilizing schools all year around was a difficult task. Each suggested schedule was reviewed in the light of five factors:

1. Potential for improving the curriculum.
2. Effect of the plan upon community life.
3. Potential for improving teacher status.
4. Improved building use.
5. Economy.

After more than a year of intensive study, the committee joined the staff in recommending the Continuing Four Quarter Plan as the one with the greatest potential. This plan provides for four seasonal quarters of 60 days of instruction each. Choice of attendance at any three quarters is up to the child, and no pupil would be required to attend more than three quarters a year.

A child who is mentally and physically capable of attending all four quarters for three years could accelerate if this seemed to be desirable. If enough students choose to attend the summer quarter to spread attendance evenly over the year, a saving of 25% will be possible in housing, saving millions of dollars in capital outlay.

It will be necessary to ask the 1972 Kentucky General Assembly to make some changes in school attendance law and in the way Minimum Foundation funds are distributed. Other legal changes may be necessary. With the best of luck in needed legal action and in finding a source of financial support to initiate this venture, the 1972-73 school year could be the year the Continuing Four Quarter Plan is adopted in Jefferson County Schools.

The following advantages would be obtained:

1. Flexibility in course offerings. Sixty to seventy percent of all subject matter can be handled in a non-sequential manner.
2. More entry and withdrawal dates each year. Illness or injury would not mean the loss of an entire school year.
3. Improved opportunity for temporary employment. The summer job rush would be more evenly distributed throughout the year.
4. Reduction of vandalism which now occurs when buildings are idle.
5. Opportunity for curriculum revision which would make courses and subject matter more relevant to the present.

6. Better utilization of professional personnel, and more flexibility in the use of teachers. Some might choose to teach a full year; others with family responsibilities might choose to teach one quarter only and thus keep up their skills.

7. Flexibility in choice of vacation periods.

8. Reduction in number of drop-outs because pupils would have wider choice of subjects and would not feel "locked in" to a course they disliked for a full year.

Perhaps the most exciting aspect of the entire proposal is the fact that every course offering will have to be rewritten. We do not plan to cut up what we now cover in one year into three quarters. Rather, we plan to turn each course out on the table as you would a bucket of nuts and bolts and examine the contents. We will discard everything that is not relevant and introduce new material. The 60 day period makes it possible to plan minicourses relating to current needs such as drug abuse, human relations, local government, and vocational experiences.

We have discussed with Dr. George Brodschi of the U. of L. International Center the possibility of summer courses that will begin and end in Jefferson County, with most of the course time spent in a foreign country. The most effective way to learn a foreign language is to visit the country where you must use the language. Geography and history are best learned at first hand.

The present economic picture emphasizes the timely decision which has been reached by our board of education. Rising construction costs, higher interest rates, and diminishing tax resources affect planning for the future in housing of all kinds, and particularly in school housing. The Jefferson County Board is interested in exploring ways to make better use of the facilities we have. The fact that more than 600 other school systems across the nation are also interested underlines the urgency of the problem.

Practical businessmen realize that school facilities are available throughout the year, fully equipped and ready for use. Most overhead costs are the same whether schools are open or closed during the summer. Fixed charges such as insurance and interest remain constant. A teaching staff is already employed, and many teachers would prefer a full year of employment. Finally, most children in metropolitan areas are without constructive direction during much of the summer.

Our community has become interested in the advantages offered by the Continuing Four Quarter Plan. There is a great deal of interest in implementing change in the present school calendar. We believe the time has come to establish a real beachhead for improved public education. We believe we can set up an effective continuing four-quarter schedule and make it work.

cated in many other active communities in America and they are known as vigorous, enterprising, rugged, outdoor individuals who are made of very stern stuff.

I cherish many Basque friends today and wish to pay them tribute by the insertion of the following editorial to their credit, reprinted from the Reno Evening Gazette of May 25, 1970, which tells of the continuous progress and achievement of these American citizens:

[From the Reno Evening Gazette, May 25, 1970]

#### A FESTIVAL OF NOTE

It was something over a century ago when the first Basque miners and shepherds began drifting into Nevada from California and the old country.

The migration of these enterprising people was one of the best things that could happen to a developing state.

The Basques had to learn to be resourceful to live in their homeland. It is a tortuous country high in the Pyrenees Mountains and along a strip of the coast between Spain and France, where it took good thinking and willing hands to survive.

Nevada fell heir to these attributes as pioneer Basques sought to nurse a livelihood from this state's harsh and reluctant wilderness.

Today, the tongue-twisting Basque names are associated with some of the biggest businesses and the most illustrious professions in the state, and they appear in unusual numbers.

The big livestock spreads around Elko, Winnemucca, Gardnerville, Lovelock, Eureka and Ely are operated by families of Basque origin, or were before the prosperous owners sold out.

Our governor, Paul Laxalt, is a second generation Basque. Quite a number of lawyers, teachers and doctors, some known as outstanding practitioners, answer to Basque names.

The nationality is prominent, too, in Nevada's casino business, as well as in scores of sundry small businesses scattered throughout the state.

These people have contributed so much to the state, that the University of Nevada has seen fit to institute a center for Basque Studies on the Reno-Stead campus.

A hearty, sociable and fun-loving folk, the Basques of Nevada will gather for a festival in Elko early in July. It's a national festival, and Basques from all around the country are expected to be there.

It's open to the public, too, of course, and that's a lucky thing. It's an event that Basque admirers and lovers of good food and frolic won't want to miss.

#### APPROPRIATIONS HEARINGS VOLUMES RELEASED

**HON. GEORGE H. MAHON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations in recent days has released the following committee hearings volumes:

Military construction bill, part 3, defense agencies and so forth, released Monday, June 8.

Labor-HEW, part 2, Food and Drug Administration and health items, released Friday, June 12.

#### PATRIOTIC BASQUES PICK INDEPENDENCE DAY FOR FESTIVAL

**HON. WALTER S. BARING**

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, an annual festival is again being planned in Nevada in honor of some of the heartiest pioneers who helped settle many parts of the United States.

This is the Basque Festival to be held July 4, 1970, in Elko, Nev. These are the fine folks who make up a large portion of Nevada residents. Basques also are lo-

During the current week, the committee expects to release three additional volumes—two relating to the Public Works-AEC appropriation bill and one relating to the Labor-HEW appropriation bill.

When released, copies are available to Members and others at the committee room, H-218, Capitol Building, extension 2771.

#### LOUD MILITANTS GET THE ANSWER AT MSU

### HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, Reserve Officers Training Corps programs and facilities have been one of the main objects of protest and violence on college campuses across the Nation. The militants have left little doubt about what they want, but what has remained largely unknown are the views of the vast majority of other students. On May 15, Michigan State University conducted a campuswide referendum which showed that 85 percent of the students voting favored retention of their ROTC programs in some form. While this peaceful and orderly event did not attract front page headlines around the country, it clearly has broad significance for understanding the true feelings of all our students.

In a timely and plain-speaking editorial on June 12, 1970, the State Journal of Lansing discusses the meaning of this referendum and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the State Journal, June 12, 1970]

#### LOUD MILITANTS GET THE ANSWER AT MSU

Now that the smoke and furor has simmered down a bit concerning the Reserve Officers Training Corps at Michigan State University, it's a good time for students, faculty and indeed all Michigan residents to take a good second look at events of the past few weeks.

Throughout the nation determined bands of militants this year and in past years has regularly started anti-ROTC crusades on the various campuses. MSU has been no exception.

During April such a group started the campaign at the East Lansing campus demanding that ROTC be abolished at MSU. On May 1, a mob of youths, estimated at about 200, and some of whom were not students at MSU, went on a rampage, causing extensive damage to Demonstration Hall, headquarters of ROTC on campus, as well as a number of other buildings. Several MSU police officers were injured trying to bring the roaming vandals under control.

On May 15 a campus-wide referendum was held to determine views of students, faculty and administrators and clerical staff at MSU on the ROTC question and some other issues.

The result of that referendum showed that 85 percent of the more than 8,700 students who voted favored retention of the ROTC program at MSU in one form or another. The percentage of faculty, administrators and clerical workers (4,600) who voted favorably on ROTC was even higher.

The student vote was divided on the question of whether ROTC should be continued with academic credit and those opposed to academic credit had a slim majority.

Students were also divided on whether ROTC should have partial financing or no financing from the university. Those opposed to partial financing had a larger majority.

But the combined vote of students, faculty, administrators and clerical workers at the university showed that the total majority favored retention of ROTC with academic credit as it is now offered. The majority also indicated they did not favor partial financing by MSU.

After the referendum results were determined, MSU's Academic Council, the faculty governing body, passed a resolution supporting ROTC in its present status (with credit) and recommending full federal funding of the program which now costs MSU about \$60,000 a year.

In short, the students, faculty, administration and other workers at MSU, through the traditional democratic process, gave their stamp of approval to the ROTC on campus in spite of the storming, irrational and sometimes violent intimidation of a militant few.

It should also be kept in mind that in a survey conducted a year ago at MSU, a majority of the students and faculty voted in favor of retaining ROTC with some modifications. And some changes have been made in curriculum during the past year. The ROTC program has been entirely voluntary at MSU since 1962.

Retention on campus—and particularly the continuance of credit courses—is important for the ROTC program which provides a large percentage of the officers for the U.S. armed forces. Since its beginning, the ROTC has provided an invaluable service to the nation in supplying the backbone for citizen-officer leadership of the armed forces.

A few firebrands have made it clear they are out to undermine this leadership with anti-ROTC activities and at a time when the leadership provided through the program is urgently needed.

They failed at MSU in spite of the noise and intimidation. The majority made its opinion known. It is good for all Michigan residents to know this and remember it.

The militants will be back again to continue to demonstrate their contempt for majority opinion, the democratic process or anyone who disagrees with them.

#### STATEMENT IN HONOR OF THE LATE HONORABLE CLIFFORD DAVIS

### HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Clifford Davis was a great American and a loyal and effective representative of the interests of Memphis, Tenn., and of all the people who live and work in the Mississippi Valley. He was a poor boy born in the State of Mississippi who worked his way through college and eventually earned a law degree from Memphis State University. He practiced law in Memphis, becoming a municipal court judge and then vice mayor and public safety commissioner before he was elected to Congress in a special election in 1940. He ably served in the House of Representatives for 25 years. He was a member of the House Committee on Public Works and the Armed Services Committee. Especially in the former capacity, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood

Control, he left his mark upon the laws of this country. He strengthened and amplified the TVA program and sponsored other legislation relating to the general welfare of people living throughout the Mississippi Valley; he shepherded through the House the Appalachian Regional Development Act during the early period of the Johnson administration.

Cliff Davis was a courageous man who carried on his body the scars of the gunfire that burst out in the gallery of this House back in 1954, when Puerto Rican anarchists attacked our Members. But this did not embitter Cliff Davis. The center aisle of this House was never a wall to this Member, and he crossed it and recrossed it time and again, doing favors for those with whom he served. His interest was, simply enough, the welfare of the American people which he had given his oath to uphold, and he always fought openly and lovingly for that.

I knew Cliff Davis well and grieve at his passing. He was my friend, both as a public servant and as man. My wife and I, together, I am sure, with all the Members of this House, would like to convey to Mrs. Davis and all those who loved Clifford Davis, our deep sense of loss and grief.

#### A WASHINGTON STAR EDITORIAL ON PRESIDENT NIXON

### HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star supported President Nixon in the 1968 campaign and has approved of most of his actions since he was elected to office. It is for that reason that its lead editorial in yesterday's newspaper, which is entitled "Who Was Planning To Bring Us Together?" is all the more significant.

This editorial, which openly questions the methods the President is using—or even more importantly—not using, to unite the American people, should be read by everyone. It shows, not that the President is being repudiated by his own supporters, but that many of those supporters feel he is not taking the proper path toward "bringing us together."

I believe the mood in the Nation at this time is one of anticipation; anticipation of the President's response to the growing polarization of the population. The great majority of the people are not radicals of either the right or left, but continued ovations to the radical right will drive many moderates into the folds of a radical disfavored and growing segment.

The President must realize that the right to dissent must be one of our most cherished freedoms. Some have questioned his acceptance of this tenet. Now that his own supporters are publicly questioning or, at least, thinking aloud in doubtful tones about his actions, the President must begin to realize that the majority of the dissenters, like his sup-



porters, do not wish to destroy this country, but rather to make it better.

The open questioning by the Star represents a significant development in the political history of the current administration.

The editorial follows:

**WHO WAS PLANNING TO BRING US TOGETHER?**  
The country is moving rapidly into serious domestic danger, and President Nixon's response will determine the quality of our society for a very long time.

There cannot be much doubt as to the source of the threat. It is not the lunatic left, not the radical fringe of campus revolutionaries. Much as they would like to tear things apart, great as the damage they are doing us may be, the United States will not in our time succumb to their sort of revolution.

The trouble today may be coming from the left, but the danger is on the right. A nation like ours will allow itself to be frustrated just so far, and no further, by a dissident minority. There are signs that this limit is being fast approached. If the people on the left push too hard, they will certainly be put down. They know it—indeed, they expect and welcome the inevitable repression, because it is out of such reaction, and the accompanying loss of faith in the capacity of free men to govern themselves, that real revolutions grow.

The backlash, of course, is already underway. Club-swinging hard-hats, George Wallace's vote, literal and widespread hatred of college troublemakers revealed in the polls—these are outriders, the banners and trumpet blasts, of a powerful political force waiting to move. And the confrontation that is developing is not merely between the extreme right and the extreme left. The moderate center, on which every functioning society depends, is being forced to choose sides as the pressure mounts. Every excess on either side produces an escalated response on the other.

In short, the divisiveness of the country today is reaching intolerable levels. We are not too far from tearing ourselves apart, and it will take skillful, sensitive and effective leadership to prevent us from doing so.

What is the likelihood that the country will get that leadership from Mr. Nixon?

The performance of his administration up to now—we say it sadly—does not offer much encouragement. We supported Mr. Nixon in his election. In our view he is dealing rationally with most of the specific problems confronting him. He is trying to get us out of Vietnam as quickly as possible, without leaving behind a shambles; he is moving in a generally reasonable way to bring the economy under control; he is wisely concentrating on an effort to make effective a host of existing social programs, rather than plunging into new, blue-sky experiments. Many of his problems are intractable. He is dealing with them, we think, as well as could reasonably be expected of anyone occupying the office.

But the key goal that Mr. Nixon set himself when he took over the government in 1968 was to bring us together. The question today is not whether he has succeeded in doing that. Obviously he has not. The question is whether he has tried.

The record, so far, is a dismal one. The issue here is not the so-called Southern strategy. It is not the President's reported desire to govern on the basis of a moderate-majority consensus, avoiding entanglement with minorities. Such leanings are well within the ethical ballpark and are not inconsistent with his expressed determination to unify the nation. No—the issue, quite simply, is the extent to which this administration shows itself tempted, not to resist a polarization of public opinion, but instead

to foster it, to seek political profit in the ugly mood of a frightened, conservative electorate. The administration has yielded to this temptation in a number of ways, and that fact is the blackest mark on its current report card and an evil omen for the future.

It is wrong for Mr. Nixon to have permitted his Vice President, in one demagogic outburst after another, to hammer dividing wedges ever deeper between the poor and the comfortable, the young and the old, the intellectuals and the yahoos, the disaffected and the true red-white-and-blue believers. True, the President himself has refrained from making such speeches, but that is not good enough. Spiro Agnew has taken over as the voice of the administration in this most sensitive area, and Mr. Nixon's silence is implied approval.

It is wrong for Mr. Nixon to entertain construction workers in the Oval Room shortly after construction workers have roughed up dissenting students—and to accept one of their symbolic hard hats for his own head. The President need not, of course, repudiate supporters of his position. What is he trying to tell us, however, when he singles out this particular type of support for publicized favors?

It is wrong for Mr. Nixon, at a time of growing unrest, to sound off against the "bums" on college campuses. Of course, there are bums in the colleges, and no doubt they account for much campus violence. But Mr. Nixon's rambling, extemporaneous outburst seemed to make bums out of college students in general.

These may seem trivial examples. Perhaps they are. But the sum of the indictment is that it is wrong for this administration, in the critical situation that is developing, to fish for votes in the troubled waters of what Stewart Alsop calls the "rancid right." And no one who has watched the Washington scene closely during the past year or so can doubt that some important elements of the administration have been doing precisely that.

The moral tone of American society is greatly influenced by the White House, above all by the style of the President himself. Mr. Nixon will bear heavy personal responsibility for the way the American people handle themselves in the next few years—for whether our society pulls itself together or tears apart at the seams. He must see to it that his administration stops catering to our darker political instincts; that it stops scratching the itches of frustration and impatience already inflaming those who agree with him, while it simultaneously reinforces the alienation of those who do not agree.

But Mr. Nixon must do more than that. A President must lead—and the greater the danger and difficulty of the times, the stronger must his leadership be. Mr. Nixon himself must speak out to re-establish an atmosphere of tolerance and mutual faith in the country. He must find a way to bring to his public appearances the intelligent concern that informs his private talk. He must appeal to the belief that most Americans retain, and all can develop, in the workability of our democratic system and its unique adaptability to peaceful change. He must prove to the dissenters that their voices are heard; that their ideals and conscientious yearnings are understood and are incorporated in the national aspiration for a better tomorrow. He must remind his not-so-silent majority friends that these outrageous people with their new, impractical ideas are their children and brothers; that the American system made them what they are. He must restore the confidence of all of us in our ability, together, to work our way through these hard times.

It will be difficult for Mr. Nixon to set himself this course. No doubt he is getting plenty of advice to the contrary, and the polls indicating his present popularity make such

advice easy to follow. At the same time, there are a good many sound and thoughtful men around the President who are urging him to take the high road at the crossing just ahead. The signs are that a major debate on this entire strategic issue is taking place in the White House, and that Mr. Nixon understands the problem and recognizes its importance.

Who can say what his decision will be? His detractors, in the inner-ear of their imagination, think they hear echoes of something called the "old Nixon," and expect him in the crunch to "revert to type" and opt for short-term political expediency.

We expect something else of the President. We hope and believe he will move, soon and forcefully, to a strategy of national unity which will secure for him a respected place in history. All of us—politicians, especially, perhaps—have episodes in our past, which, as we grow older and humbler, we want to live down. Mr. Nixon can have no further ambition than to be a good President. He must know that there is only one way a good President can answer the question that confronts him now.

#### ACCENTUATE THE POSITIVE

#### HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, if we were to listen to, and heed, some of the cynics of today's society, it would be easy to slip into a mood of pessimism and gloom. Quite the contrary, however, I believe there is just too much that is good about our people, and wonderful about our great country, to accept a tale of woe and pessimism. I refuse to accept the view that America is chronically sick and unsound.

I am confident that the American society has the vitality, the purpose, and the courage to resolve this time of troubles—and, out of adversity, forge a stronger nation, even more responsive to the needs and aspirations of people everywhere.

The thoughts expressed in the following graduation day speech by Eric A. Walker, president of Pennsylvania State University, are appropriate reflections for us today. I believe this is a good example of how to accentuate the positive.

The speech follows:

#### TO THE 1970 GRADUATES

Ladies and Gentlemen of the graduating class, no one has more pride in your accomplishment than the elder generation. But I am not going to tell that older generation how bright you are. Nor am I going to say we have made a mess of things and that you are the hope of mankind.

I would like to reverse the process. For if you will look over into the bleachers, I will re-introduce you to some of the most remarkable people ever to walk the earth, people you might want to thank on this graduation day—your parents and grandparents.

Let me tell you about them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

While they have done all these things, they have had some failures. They have not yet found an alternative for war, nor for racial hate.

Perhaps you, the members of this graduating class, will perfect the social mechanisms by which all men may follow their ambitions without the threat of force—so that the earth will no longer need police to enforce the laws, nor armies to prevent some men from trespassing against others.

But they—these older generations—made more progress by the sweat of their brows than in any previous era, and don't you forget it. If your generation can make as much progress in as many areas as these two generations have, you should be able to solve a good many of the world's remaining ills.

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

But it won't be easy. And you won't do it by negative thoughts, nor by tearing down or belittling.

You may and can do it by hard work, humility, hope and faith in mankind.

Try it.

#### ENERGY—A KEY TO KNOWLEDGE

**HON. JOHN WOLD**

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, much has been made in the past few years of the

point that man's knowledge of himself has progressed at a snail's pace in comparison to his knowledge of the physical universe.

As a result there has been a trend to downgrade technology and science. We have shifted away from investment in basic research at all levels. This policy is a shortsighted one based on bad reasoning and even worse arguments.

The study of man is the product of wealth and leisure. In times when man's total energy and time was devoted to the basics of survival he had no effective capacity for abstract thought. It was only when his productive capacity increased to the point where a surplus was possible that he could develop cities and care for philosophers.

If we do not heed the lesson of history we may very shortly find ourselves in a situation where all our time and energy is again devoted to simple survival—at least by the scale we use to measure necessities.

Energy consumption has been the key to the high productivity of Americans. It accounts for our abundant standard of living and ample amounts of leisure time.

Yet our commitment to supply the energy needs of the future is diminishing at the very time when it is needed most—when we need to further increase our productivity.

Our attention to the pollution of our environment is also threatening the Nation's capability to meet power needs. The pollution of our air, water, and land is a serious problem. It is a pressing problem.

But I contend that improving the quality of our environment and supplying adequate power to the Nation's consumers are not at odds. Science and technology offer us the tools and means to attack the problems of our environment while assuring us of continuing high standards of living.

In considering which energy resources should be used to furnish low-cost energy, we must not neglect national security. Yet that is what we are doing when we substitute foreign low sulfur residual fuel oil for domestic energy resources. We have plentiful domestic power resources. My district, the State of Wyoming, has more than enough coal and petroleum in the form of oil and oil shale to supply the Nation's energy needs for decades and even hundreds of years.

It must, however, be developed. It can only be developed through an expansion of research and development.

I think it is time we reorient our priorities and our values. I think we can have both a healthy environment and adequate supplies of low-cost energy.

But to do so will require a fundamental shift of many of our values. Shifting to new values will require enlightened leadership—a quality too often lacking among our leaders today.

One aspect of the problem I have outlined is very well defined in an editorial in the April 1970 issue of *Coal Age*. Written by Alfred E. Flowers, the publication's editor, the article gives a penetrating analysis of the problem and makes a compelling argument for expanding the level of research so we can more fully utilize the vast coal resources

of the Nation. I believe it would be very educational for all who would read it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial in the *RECORD* at this point:

#### ENERGY PROBLEM

An unprecedented demand for low-cost energy is sweeping our country and satisfying that demand already is imposing great responsibility on our energy resources—coal, oil, gas and nuclear. Since coal reserves make up our Nation's primary energy source—at least twice the recoverable reserves of all other fuels combined—major research should now be under way to insure that our coal reserves are used most effectively, including their conversion into gaseous and liquid fuels.

The difficulty of meeting our energy needs in the years ahead is compounded by the growing concern about pollution. Every large metropolitan area has set standards limiting sulfur oxides emissions and most of them are being tightened. Very little of the coal mined east of the Mississippi River can meet the present standards and when the tighter regulations go into effect, virtually none of this coal will be suitable for power generation.

As a result of the stringent sulfur standards, utilities along the East Coast have accelerated their switch to gas and low-sulfur residual oil. Some 85% of the residual oil consumed along the East Coast comes from overseas and an increasing volume from the eastern hemisphere. Thus our highly industrialized Northeast is rapidly becoming dependent on the eastern hemisphere for energy—and at the risk of our national security. News reports emphasize the trouble that could erupt in that area.

The switch to other fuels does not solve the long-range energy problem, it only shifts it to other fuels. Domestic supplies of gas are limited and steps already have been taken to import large volumes of liquefied natural gas. Also, the supply of low-sulfur foreign oil can be cut off in a national emergency. Further, it is not good business to burn residual oil at 45¢ per million Btu when coal is available at 24 to 26¢ at many cities in the interior.

As a long-range solution to the energy problem, it would be logical to divert funds to the perfection of sulfur-removed processes now being tested or under development for power plants, and to the development of the magnetohydrodynamics method of generating electricity. Aside from offering the potential of more efficient generation, this method has great potential in pollution control and also requires a minimum of water. Development of the MHD method would add great flexibility in locating new generating stations.

Federal funds for research and development in the energy industry is greatly out of balance now. The level of research in coal utilization, for example, is far below that for nuclear power. A realignment of funds could contribute greatly to the development of new technology that would insure the most effective use of our vast coal resources and at the same time enhance our national security.

#### BALTIC STATES FREEDOM DAY

**HON. JAMES J. HOWARD**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, we are today, once again reminded of those who have been subjugated by the Soviet Union into positions of slavery. Today is Baltic



Nations Freedom Day, the 30th anniversary of the deportation of thousands of citizens of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, by the Soviets in an effort to destroy these three independent nations, which had so briefly tasted the joys of true freedom.

These efforts to destroy the sense of nationality, of cultural and ethnic unity of these nations continues to this day. Under the circumstances, I believe it is appropriate that we be reminded to these struggles, and renew our efforts and hopes that these three small nations will once again have the freedom they so richly deserve, and so earnestly desire.

I am inserting, in an effort to bring this to the attention of my colleagues, House Concurrent Resolution 416, which was passed without dissenting vote in both the House and Senate during the 89th Congress. I believe it is appropriate today to reaffirm our belief in the goals of this legislation. The text follows:

H. CON. RES. 416

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Passed the House of Representatives June 21, 1965.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,  
Clerk.

PRESIDENT NIXON NAMES A STUDENT TO THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND AMERICA'S FUTURE

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker on June 4, President Nixon an-

nounced the membership of the Commission on Population Growth and America's Future. I believe that this Commission can and will be one of the most significant in our history. For the first time we have given a Government agency responsibility for providing the information necessary to develop a much needed national growth policy.

Because of the importance of this Commission, I am particularly pleased that the President has appointed an outstanding college student to the Commission. Certainly, youth should be represented in a body whose study and recommendations are likely to have a far-reaching impact on American life in coming decades.

As chairman of the House Republican Conference, I take particular pride in the appointment of Stephen L. Salyer of Cincinnati, a sophomore at Davidson College, to the Commission. Steve Salyer served with distinction last summer as an intern with the House Republican Conference and the House Republican Research Committee, chaired by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TAFT). Those of us who worked with him are confident that he will be a productive and thoughtful Commission member.

Clearly, President Nixon recognizes the contribution our youth can make to important policymaking bodies and I commend him for the excellent selections he has made to the Commission on Population Growth and America's Future.

HEROIC POLICE OFFICER

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an heroic deed of a police officer in my hometown of Valparaiso, Ind.

Last month, Officer Richard A. Hanaway, 25, suffered injuries, but saved several bystanders from possible injury when he drove his squad car between a truck that was out of control and a group of people.

The officer had been pursuing a truck that was driven by an escapee from the Indiana Reformatory.

This brave action on the part of this young officer is to be commended and saluted, and I wish to congratulate him on his courage as an officer and his concern for the safety of the people in his community.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert a newspaper article that appeared in the Vidette-Messenger of May 18, 1970, describing the event:

POLICEMAN INJURED AS HE HALTS ESCAPEE

A Valparaiso police officer, injured Saturday in a collision, is credited with saving several by-standers from possible injury when he drove his squad car between an erratically driven truck and a group of people.

Officer Richard A. Hanaway, 25, of 1904 Chicago, suffered chest and arm injuries and was in fair condition today at Porter Memorial hospital.

Driver of the truck was Paul Miller, 21,

North Judson, an escapee from the Chain of Lakes Youth Camp at Albion, who was being pursued by state police when the collision occurred in the parking lot of Miller's Mart, East Lincolnway.

The truck driver before striking the squad car collided with a car driven by Robert O'Dell, 23, Dyer, and struck three guard rails.

O'Dell, his passenger, Patricia A. Connell, 19, Lankenau Hall, and Miller were all treated at PMH for minor injuries and released, police said.

Miller escaped from the youth camp about 3:30 p.m. Saturday and stole a 1969 truck at Albion, state police said.

Sgt Richard Block observed Miller driving left of center on U.S. 421, south of Westville and attempted to halt the vehicle.

Miller did not stop and turned west at the LaPorte-Porter county line on CR 800S and traveled to Ind. 2 in Porter county. He ran one roadblock on Ind. 2 and hit the O'Dell vehicle head-on, went through the guard posts into Miller's parking lot and hit the squad car.

Officer Hanaway, on patrol in the area observed the speeding truck traveling on Ind. 2. He pulled the squad car into the parking lot, observed several by-standers and realizing the truck was out of control, headed for the group of people. The officer drove the squad car between the truck and the crowd.

Chief Lee E. Miller said the officer's action saved someone from possible death by the careening truck.

The escapee was serving a sentence at the camp for second degree burglary in North Judson, police said.

The escapee will probably be returned to the camp, according to reports. He was being held in Porter County jail this morning.

Damages were set at \$3,450, police said.

THE ALTERNATIVE

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, amid the bedlam of student protest raised against the brutality and insensitivity of the establishment, especially law-enforcement officials, it is refreshing to hear a quiet voice of dissent from the dissenters. A student who represents a different point of view wrote the following letter to the Daily Iowan, newspaper of the University of Iowa, to register his protest against the common misunderstanding of police actions and the popular distrust of the police themselves.

The letter follows:

THE ALTERNATIVE

A new wave of hatred against law enforcement officials has arisen in the past few weeks. The death of the four Kent students was indeed tragic. But has anyone stopped to consider what might have happened if the police had not fired?

Let us remember that a large crowd was advancing upon a small group of guardsmen and throwing rocks, bricks and other lethal weapons. There are unconfirmed reports of sniper fire; medical evidence indicates that at least one of the four was slain by other than a military rifle; and confiscated weapons indicated that a sizeable number of persons in the crowd may have been armed. If the guardsmen had not kept the crowd away by firing when they did, is it not possible that there could have been a bloodbath in which hundreds of students and/or guardsmen were killed or injured?

If we want more humane law enforcement,

one thing is clear: the way to bring it about is not to abuse the police. Without a doubt, the recent anti-police demonstrations and epithets are a major reason for the resentment many policemen feel for demonstrators.

In a perfect society it might be possible to eliminate the police forces; but ours is far from perfect because human nature is far from perfect. Only an anarchist would deny that some form of police force is necessary.

Crime is a threat to everyone, not just to policemen. It is just as much a violation of one's rights to be murdered by a criminal as to be wrongfully slain by a policeman. As we see our crime rate rising so rapidly—crime rose 131 per cent in the last decade while the population rose only 13 per cent—it is obvious that to abolish our police forces would only invite chaos.

Rather than reacting blindly with slogans like "kill the pigs," we might take a sympathetic look at the policeman and his problems, and then ask ourselves how we can improve the quality of law enforcement.

His pay: an Iowa City policeman starts at \$6,672 per year and can expect to advance to \$7,368 per year by the time he is ready to retire.

Job requirements: he is on call 24 hours a day; his working conditions are whatever the weather conditions and wherever he is needed; one principal hazard of the job is the fact that one out of every eight policemen is violently assaulted each year. But he is required to be fresh and alert, cool and calm, no matter how many nights he has been awake.

He's expected to know the law and not violate anyone's rights, to know how to handle individuals and groups, to apply first aid, to handle a firearm, help children, engage in self-defense, direct traffic and a host of other things. He must be able to talk tough to the criminal and be civil around a civil person; and he often has little way of knowing what kind of person he is dealing with. He is, in short, expected to be a lawyer, doctor, psychologist, sociologist, marksman, outdoorsman, public relations man and law enforcement official all in one.

In addition, he must accept the fact that he's not going to be too popular among certain people. Whether or not he personally has committed any wrongs, he must endure an incredible amount of abuse. He must keep cool amid taunts of "pig," "fascist" and "murderer," to name only a few printable epithets, not to mention the sullen glare of the ordinary citizen who is stopped for speeding.

And his training for all this responsibility: four weeks at the Iowa Law Enforcement Academy.

If we could require all police officers to have a Ph.D. in sociology, law psychology or some related field (or better yet, open a Department of Police Science at the University), the quality of law enforcement officers would undoubtedly improve. But consider for a moment: how many of us, upon graduation from college, would take a job that makes such demands, imposes such risks and pays no more than a common laborer's wages? To attract Ph. D.'s to the police profession, we'd have to give them a starting salary of around \$20,000 a year.

If we are really concerned about improving the quality of law enforcement and are not merely using the Kent incident to inflame passions against President Nixon, we might stop throwing rocks and instead try the following steps:

1. Try to genuinely understand the policeman, appreciate his role in society, and understand his limitations.

2. Work for higher pay for police officers, so the police profession can attract more competent personnel.

3. Work for expansion of the Iowa Law

Enforcement Academy and the creation of departments of police science at the universities.

4. Work for the active recruitment of blacks and other minority groups in the police force, especially to serve in their own neighborhoods.

5. Work for better police-community relations programs, so that policemen and other community residents will better understand and appreciate each other's problems.

Liberals and law-and-order types alike have good reason to support these programs. For they should eliminate many real and imagined grievances against the police, and they should produce more efficient law enforcement as well.

Before I conclude, I'd like to present a few awards to some of the star performers of the past few weeks:

The Adolph Hitler Award for Peace goes to all those neo-Nazi types who blocked streets, broke windows, looted stores, threw bricks at car drivers, ravaged Old Capitol, vandalized ROTC students' cars and waged a campaign of terror on this campus to deny the majority their right to learn in an orderly university. All those who participated—leaders, followers and dupes alike—may share this award, but special recognition goes to those who wore "nonviolence" buttons.

The Howard Bowen Award for Moral Courage goes to President Willard Boyd for cancelling Governor's Day and letting students opt out of school. One can readily appreciate his desire to avoid violence, and one can understand why he took the easy way out. But in the long run he did not prevent violence; he only postponed it and encouraged it. For each time the radicals were permitted to stop activities and get away with it—the Pershing Rifles drill meet, the awards ceremony, Governor's Day, etc.—they became emboldened. President Boyd's message to the radicals is tragically loud and clear: "If you don't like something, the best way to influence me is to break the law and threaten to burn down the town." And you can bet the radicals heard it! The result, I fear, will be much more violence next time.

What if the ROTC students had taken to the streets to protest the cancellation? We might have had Governor's Day after all! We can all be thankful that the gentlemen of ROTC are too civilized to stoop to such antics.

And the Foxcraft Swinker Award for Journalistic Integrity goes to whatever DI staffer put the half-page, bold-type statement in the Wednesday, May 6, DI that "In memory of: The Kent State Dead, The Cambodian War Dead, The Vietnam War Dead, The American Dead . . . The University of Iowa is closed today." The fact is, the University was not closed that day and most classes were held as usual; but some students were undoubtedly misled into thinking that President Boyd had cancelled classes.

Where do The Daily Iowan personnel, a group of non-elected students, think they get the authority to close the University?

Maybe Jerry Sies told them they could.

JOHN ALLEN EIDSMEE.

#### A BILL TO ALTER THE REVENUE-SHARING FORMULA OF NATIONAL FOREST RECEIPTS

### HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would change the revenue-sharing for-

mula of receipts derived from the sale and use of the natural resources on national forest lands. Under the present law, the Forest Service pays 25 percent of all such receipts to the State to be spent on schools and roads in the counties where the forests are situated.

These payments are intended to compensate the counties for the loss of tax revenue resulting from the Federal ownership of these forest lands. Unfortunately, the size of the payment to a county is dependent upon the amount of commercial activity the Forest Service decides to undertake in a particular forest. If the Service decides to cut down on timber sales in a forest for any number of reasons, the local county suffers an unexpected revenue loss.

My bill, therefore, would protect counties against this revenue loss by guaranteeing them a payment of \$0.25 per acre, limited to one-third of the State receipts, if the Service decides to reduce timber sales in a particular forest within the State.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY CONGRESSMAN DAVID PRYOR OF ARKANSAS AT THE CONGRESSIONAL PAGE GRADUATION CEREMONY JUNE 8, 1970

### HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago tonight on Monday, June 8, the 26 members of the Capitol Page School class of 1970 received their diplomas in the Ways and Means Committee Chamber. The ceremony took place with the traditional dignity which has always marked that event. I had the pleasure to be present and the honor to sponsor one of the graduating seniors. Because of his having served as a House page some years ago, the boys invited Congressman DAVID PRYOR of Arkansas to be their commencement speaker. I am submitting Congressman PRYOR's remarks to the graduates because I feel that they were inspiring to them and to their families and friends who came from across the country to be present that night. I am also including the names of these fine young men who as our pages have served us in the Congress so well:

William R. Anderson, Eric Louis Anschultz, Raul Cleofas Blanco, Danny R. Day, James Phillip DiMeglio, Gerard F. Gerhring, Frank Stephen Gordon, Michael Gorss, Robert C. Henry, Ralph Everett Hood, Kim Joel Hughes, Kenneth Randall Jackson, and William David Kiser.

Forrest Wayne Lacy, Edward Joseph Leonard, Stephen Frank Lowndes, Dennis Michael Miller, Lowell Vincent Muse, Daniel F. O'Reilly, Sammy I. Paradice, Dennis John Phillips, Russell William Royal, Philip Leonard Tannenbaum, Clifford H. Tutelian, Karl Kuldrian Warner, and Walter Robert Weiss.



ADDRESS DELIVERED BY CONGRESSMAN DAVID PRYOR, OF ARKANSAS, AT THE CONGRESSIONAL PAGE GRADUATION CEREMONY, JUNE 8, 1970

You do me a great and undeserved honor tonight by inviting me to speak during your graduation exercises. I want you to know that I am very grateful. I must admit that I thought of a thousand things which I might say this evening, but each time I sat down to compose my thoughts, I was reminded of the fourth-grade girl I recently read about who was assigned to write a short essay on the life of Socrates. It consisted of two lines: "Socrates went about giving people advice—they killed him." Now, claiming neither great wisdom nor yearning for an early demise, I shall be sparing in advice to you tonight.

You have been a part of America's most unique school and also a working part of the world's most unique form of government.

Already, whether you believe it, or like it, you are also a part of "THE SYSTEM" which in some quarters today is a somewhat sinister word. You know its strengths, and let's be honest—you also know some of its weaknesses.

You know, for example, that the allegations now being heaped upon it that it is "too slow" to respond are in some instances too true. You know that sometimes it is sluggish, cumbersome, and prone to error. You and I both know that it is not perfect, but that it is a mere reflection of the human character and the human condition. And most importantly, I hope you know that it will and must be YOU and YOUR generation who care enough to make it better, rediscover and redefine its purposes, reestablish its goals and chart its future course.

We commonly refer to an event such as this as "commencement" or a beginning. Also, I hope we could think of this evening as a Dedication . . . a dedication by you and me, by all of us, to the basic concept that man IS capable of governing himself and that we somehow will find the wisdom to pass this concept of self-government on to future generations.

For, today, that concept is being challenged. We see its fibre tested. We see its survival doubted. We see some of its nobility tarnished. We seem, at least momentarily, to have "lost our way."

Yes, it is our greatest time of testing. But I am confident that you will be a participant in the great cause of meeting that test.

Crises is not new to us. This nation was conceived in crises. For 180 years, we as a people, as a nation, have never been removed from the throes of crises. Famine, pestilence, disease, war, civil strife, depression. But, somehow, the deep and strong foundations have resisted its adversaries. The anvil has outlasted the hammers and our basic premises remain intact.

It has not been an easy road. It has not been a road for the fainthearted or the quibbler; and tomorrow promises to be no easier.

As Robert Frost has said, we do have "promises to keep" and miles to go before we sleep.

I remember vividly some of those long afternoons 19 years ago, when I too sat on the page bench looking over the Speaker's chair to see chiseled in stone for the first time those words of Webster:

"Let us see whether we in our own generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Yes, a very noble part of America is personified in this room tonight. It is the excitement of youth anticipating a challenge, hoping, but yet just a little nervous about being called into battle . . . the desire to create, produce and to construct.

You and I know that it is simple enough to "fall away" at all the accumulated evils of mankind. It is easy enough to raise false hopes or false fears—both sins of equal mag-

nitude. It is something else to work to correct those evils.

But when we look back at the decade of the 60's, we see it as a time when we found the problems, accentuated our differences, drew the battle lines—

Race against race.

Poor against rich.

Urban against rural.

Section against section.

And finally American against American.

We all talked. No one listened. We became polarized. I sometimes agree with Pogo: "We have just met the enemy and they is us."

Yes, we became our own worst enemy. We accentuated the negative. We became too busy stereotyping each other and we sometimes forgot: the odious act of Lamar does not represent the South; the unspeakable violence and destruction of Newark is not the North; Oswald was not Dallas; Kent is not the National Guard.

We consumed ourselves with each other's wrongs—we forgot each other's rights. We exploited fears—a seed of suspicion planted in just the right place, just the right time, just the right way. Codewords became battle-cries. Man against man—neighbor against neighbor. The sinew torn, the purpose dissipated, the dreams shattered. Yes, we somehow lost in the hysteria the admonition of John F. Kennedy: "Let us not emphasize our differences, but our common interests."

And if we continue down the same path, we will defeat our strengths. We will fragment our purpose. We will scuttle our dreams.

It will be you in this room tonight who will make us come together, reason together and walk together. It will be you in this room who are saying and will continue saying "let's try, before it is too late." It will be you who will answer Webster by saying, "We did indeed, in our generation, perform something worthy to be remembered" and chisel it deeply and surely in the stones of history. More love than hate; more wisdom than wrath. No two societies in America cannot exist. There cannot be a North and a South, a rural and an urban, a black and a white. There cannot be a super-rich and a super-poor, a well and a sick, a full and a hungry.

America is one. That is its purpose. That must be its promise. America must not be a memory; America must be a hope.

There is a long and uncertain road ahead. We must walk it together, step by step, mile by mile.

Not only do we honor you tonight and thank you, but, most importantly, in you we place our hope and faith.

#### AEC COMMISSIONER RAMEY DISCUSSES FUTURE OF NUCLEAR POWER

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Commissioner James T. Ramey of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission recently delivered a most informative address entitled "Public Understanding of Nuclear Power: Current Needs and the Shape of Things to Come."

The speech was made before a meeting held by the Atomic Industrial Forum in Los Angeles, Calif., and because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place the address by Commissioner Ramey in the Record herewith:

#### PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF NUCLEAR POWER: CURRENT NEEDS AND THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME

(By Commissioner James T. Ramey)

##### INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests and fellow members of the nuclear community. It is always a pleasure to talk to the Atomic Industrial Forum, even if it is on public relations.

Looking at the surroundings here, I can understand that a plain old public relations man would have a hard time affording to come here. I am impressed that some of you have done so regardless; and I am also pleased that there are some engineering and other types of vice presidents and presidents around.

Tonight I will try to develop a few thoughts about how we should approach the matter of communicating with the public on nuclear power. As you may know, I have had a bit of experience in this regard, particularly in the last year or so. If one were logical in this field (and this is difficult since it is an area so full of emotion), we could consider the different possible approaches in terms of two or three categories:

(1) The first is what I describe as the public relations approach. This involves mounting a "hard-sell" public relations program which is designed to make the best of the situation—regardless of how inadequate that situation might be. In other words, one says to the PR man: "This is a sorry old lily. Gild it the best way you can." (Judging from your reaction, I gather some of you are familiar with this approach.) Obviously this method of doing business has its problems, and I'll have more to say about it later.

(2) Now our second option I refer to as the quality assurance approach. This means that the utility does a good job of planning, design, construction, and operation in accordance with the high standards of quality which nuclear plants require, having faith that the public understanding end of things will take care of itself. I must say that I have some sympathy with this approach. But since some of you seem to be turning a bit pale, let me hasten to add that I do not think this approach is entirely adequate.

(3) And that leads us to the third possibility which is a sort of combination of the first two—it blends a thorough job of the quality assurance approach with a first-rate job of responsible public information.

I will have a little more to say on these points later.

##### AEC positive role in public information

Before I get to my logical analysis of these approaches let me mention a bit of what AEC has been up to for the last year. As most of you know, the Commission has, since last spring, been engaged in a concerted effort to improve public understanding of our programs, with great emphasis on civilian nuclear power.

In connection with this effort we have done a number of things. The Commissioners have begun speaking out to a greater extent on the great demands for electric power, and we have pointed to the advantages which nuclear power offers.<sup>1-5</sup> In addition, we have emphasized that nuclear power can, in fact, contribute to environmental improvement since nuclear power avoids smoke pollution, and we have made the point that we regard ourselves as strong supporters of a clean environment.

And we have been doing more than just making speeches. We assigned overall responsibility for environmental matters to our Assistant General Manager, Howard Brown, and then established an organization within the Commission to provide a central point of contact on environmental affairs. Joe DiNunno, whom many of you have met,

Footnotes at end of article.

is the new Special Assistant to the General Manager for Environmental Affairs. Joe, working with Howard, is strengthening all the Commission's efforts in this area. He is improving coordination among them and pointing up areas where additional measures will be beneficial. And, of course, John Harris, Ed Stokely, Joe Fouchard and their associates have been doing a first-rate job in providing public information assistance.

The environmental effort draws heavily on the talents of just about every one of our many technical divisions and laboratories. So I can assure you that a great deal of effort is going into the Commission's activities in behalf of nuclear power, and these efforts will continue. It might be of interest to you that the Commission has in recent years been spending about \$70 million a year on environmental research, and has requested about this same amount for fiscal year 1971.

#### *The public relations approach*

Now in regard to the public relations approach, let me emphasize that any approach with the press and the public is not easy. For example one of my first attempts at the good fight was a foray with selected members of the press sponsored by Connecticut Yankee and Westinghouse at Haddam Neck, Connecticut, last May. My speech<sup>6</sup> was entitled "Nuclear Power—Facts Instead of Fiction," and I sort of candidly pointed out to the press a few of their errors. I received a few good stories and a few not so good, but one headline sticks out in mind: "AEC Official Raps Press."

My further education with the press occurred during the beginning of the Joint Committee's environmental hearings<sup>7</sup> last November. A rather prominent story in The Washington Post by its main science reporter indicated that Chairman Nassikas of the Federal Power Commission "in effect challenged the concept of complete federal control over nuclear power." The article inferred that Chairman Nassikas was talking about AEC's controversy with Minnesota over regulations of radioactive effluents. Here is what Chairman Nassikas had to say the next day with regard to the Post story:

"Whatever I may have stated yesterday in reply to questions or in my prepared testimony, I am certain that no inference reasonably could be derived that I would in any way suggest taking away from the Atomic Energy Commission its established powers over the areas of radiological effects in relation to safety and health."

The Post dutifully buried the correction in the last paragraph of a not-so-prominent story the following day.

That same day I testified at the environmental hearings, and in response to a question I described the nature of the opposition "stirrer-uppers" to nuclear power. After my testimony I stopped and chatted with a reporter for The New York Times, and we talked at greater length about the current wave of antagonism toward nuclear power and other aspects of the atomic energy program. He seemed genuinely interested, and I gave him a forthright rundown on the situation as I saw it, including evidences of "coal dust" here and there. What happened? The next day the Times had a small headline which read: "AEC Official Sees Plot to Destroy Atomic Energy."

There are far too many instances of this sort of inaccurate or sensational reporting in the news media—so many, in fact, that I am beginning to think that Vice President Agnew may be right! At any rate, perhaps we may have been a little too self-righteous even though we were providing the facts as we saw them. Certainly what was interpreted as a hard sell approach by the utility in purchasing full page ads to provide accurate

information on the Calvert Cliffs, Maryland, nuclear project may have backfired.

In all honesty, I must say, however, that we get very fair treatment from most of the science writers who understand our programs and have enough background to realize what the problems are and what we are trying to do.

#### *Problems "within the family"*

Certainly it is apparent that we have our problems with the press—magazines, newspapers, television networks and the like. But you would think we wouldn't have these problems with the nuclear "trade press," people who follow us on a day-to-day basis. And I am talking now about Nucleonics Week, Nuclear Industry, INFO and Nuclear News.

I must report, with some sadness, that there are problems with these publications, too. I think, really, there are two reasons: first, there is something innate in the journalist to seek out and emphasize points of controversy, and I think I can understand that though I don't like it. Second, I believe that a real effort is made by these trade publications—and some of it may even be subconscious—to show that they are completely independent of the AEC.

In any event, these two elements result in some distorted reporting that hasn't helped the program and certainly hasn't helped in understanding our environmental efforts and confrontations. For example, in my opinion, the original reports on the Vermont confrontation were more pessimistic as to the results of that AEC effort than the situation warranted. The person whom Nucleonics Week quoted as saying the confrontation was a "disaster" for the nuclear side, epitomized for me the somewhat myopic public relations approach to public information.

I am not going to go into any further detail on specific instances, but I would hope that we could look for better public understanding on the part of all these journals at least in their environmental reporting.

#### *QUALITY ASSURANCE APPROACH*

Now let me discuss for a few minutes the second approach I mentioned—the do-it-right or quality assurance approach.

Now I am encouraged by the growing recognition of the need for quality assurance. I sense that various exhortations<sup>8-10</sup> by me, Milt Shaw and others and the issuance of the Commission's revised regulations<sup>11</sup> in this area have had a lot to do with this. But given the problems we face, there is need for even more emphasis; there continues to be need for better understanding that quality assurance is essential to safety and reliability, and that the costs are small when compared to those that result from an inadequate program. I hope you will carry this message back to your top associates.

#### *Management know-how*

Utility management—both at top and middle levels—must be knowledgeable in nuclear technology. The unique characteristics of nuclear power, associated safety considerations, and the need for reliable power generation make it imperative that management have the knowledge and the competence to meet its responsibilities—in plant siting, procurement, engineering, construction, operation, and environmental effects. The need for at least a working knowledge in these areas does not stop at the intermediate and lower levels of the organization.

#### *Staff competence*

The utility must also acquire the trained engineers to meet its needs. They must have the understanding, ability, and experience, not only to handle design and construction, but also operating and maintenance problems. I discussed in detail the problems of developing such staff competence in the October 28, 1968 issue of *Electrical World*.<sup>12</sup>

#### *Quality assurance*

We all know that the utility has the basic responsibility for assuring the safe siting, design, construction, and operation of a nuclear power plant. Consequently, the utilities must themselves take the necessary measures to ensure that their suppliers and constructors carry out adequate site selection and quality assurance programs in the design and construction of the plant. Experience all but guarantees that deficiencies will occur unless effective quality assurance is applied throughout all phases from inception to operation in service.

Because such deficiencies in the past have been identified sufficiently early to take corrective action, they have not resulted in safety problems. But many have been costly—often very costly in time and money. It seems scarcely necessary to remind this audience that it may cost \$1 million for every month of delay in placing a 1000 MWe nuclear plant in service and up to \$4 million for every month of down-time after that.

We must also recognize that public understanding and acceptance of nuclear power will be very strongly affected by the manner in which the large commitments to nuclear power plants are met. The public understands—and well understands—both a record of success and accomplishment and a record of failure, and it is not inclined to be tolerant of attempts to explain the latter. Where nuclear plants come into operation on schedule and within costs, and deliver electric power safely and reliably, such accomplishments will help convey a powerful nuclear power message to the public. Conversely, delays, cost overruns, and lack of reliability carry an even louder message.

#### *SOME CURRENT PROBLEMS*

Now let's talk about some of the current problems confronting the atomic energy community. Howard Brown will discuss in detail on Wednesday morning the AEC's efforts and observations on the great environmental confrontation that has been going on, so I won't try to go into that in any detail. However, I do have just a few comments on some recent points that have been emphasized—especially matters which were covered in our multiple confrontations during the JCAE hearings.<sup>13</sup> I might add that these Joint Committee hearings, under the leadership of Chairman Chet Holifield and Craig Hosmer, should do much to put environmental hazards of power plants—nuclear and fossil—in proper perspective.

In my Argonne speech last July, I made the point that our critics really should be approaching matters more from the standards-making viewpoint, rather than challenging specific issues in particular cases.<sup>14</sup> I didn't realize how fast this recommendation would be taken up by Messrs. Gofman, Tamplin, and others! But I do believe it is the proper approach to consider the adequacy of standards themselves rather than debate individual cases. But Gofman, Tamplin, and their allies are doing it both ways and are violating one of the cardinal principles of scientific endeavor by not subjecting their conclusions to the normal review by their scientific peers. Instead they are trying their case in the press and other public forums. We used to call such characters "Opera Stars."

I do believe we are making some progress with the scientific community by dint of considerable effort. A good example is the testimony of Dr. Abrahamson of the University of Minnesota and Dr. Radford of Johns Hopkins during Part Two of the Joint Committee hearings. They indicated they had learned a great deal since the earlier Vermont and Minnesota discussions. Incidentally, they each made the point that had the AEC and the utilities and reactor suppliers made available scientific data on radioactive effluents to them and to their

Footnotes at end of article.



colleagues earlier—and this particularly applies to information on tritium—then much of the travail might have been avoided.

Dr. Abrahamson, in his testimony, discussed the history of the tritium argument in Minnesota, and added and I quote:

"If we then had available the information on tritium which is contained in Phase One of the hearing reports, much of this would have been clarified at the time."

I can assure you that the Commission during the intervening period has tried to make its bio-medical data available on a more expeditious basis to the people in the Regulatory program and in licensing hearings and to the scientific community generally.

I think the Minnesota and Joint Committee discussions on AEC's dual promotional and regulatory responsibilities also served to show their advantages as well as that there are a number of other agencies carrying on dual functions. I emphasized that at the staff level the functions are separate under the overall Commission umbrella, and that the two staffs even operate from separate locations.<sup>15</sup>

The overall management problem as I explained is to be sure that there is sufficient interaction so that research and development data can be oriented to meet regulatory needs, and that regulatory needs can be made known to the R&D people. We do have a coordinating mechanism for bringing these people together at the top level through a steering committee. But there is no opportunity at this technical level for the development people to get involved in any particular power reactor licensing application.

I think we are making some progress on other issues, including bringing to the attention of the people the problem of increasing requirements for electric power. This point was emphasized in testimony by Dr. Lee DuBridge, the President's Science Adviser, and John Nassikas, Chairman of FPC, as well as in speeches by the AEC Commissioners, but the true impact of the "energy crisis" has yet to be impressed upon the public. Maybe we will have to endure some more brownouts and blackouts before this point is understood. I hope not.

Although we have made some progress with the scientific community, we have made less with our non-scientific antagonists—the "ragtag" stirrer-uppers such as Larry Bogart and others who use high school debating techniques which are sometimes surprisingly effective. They seem most vulnerable when asked what alternatives they might suggest to meet the increased needs for electric power. Some like Bogart at the Senate appropriations hearings last fall talk about some far-out alternatives, such as MHD or harnessing the Gulf Stream, or using solar energy, or even tidal power.<sup>16</sup> One finds also a certain softness by them in relation to coal and fossil sources, and some obtuseness as to the air pollution problems of these competitive sources. I believe the ridiculous position of these fellows could be made more evident.

To an increasing extent, I think we are going to see student involvement in environmental matters. For example, I understand a meeting has been scheduled for early April in the Midwest—under sponsorship of the ANS and an affiliated student group—for a discussion of the environmental implications of nuclear power. Students from five Midwestern States have been invited. This will be a good opportunity to get across some points in advance of the nationwide "teach-in" that will be held later in April at many universities.

#### THE NEED FOR GREATER PLANNING AND COORDINATION IN SITE SELECTION

There is no doubt that many utilities in this country will be having greater difficulty

Footnotes at end of article.

with respect to finding suitable sites for their generating facilities. For some time, I have been convinced that we need some new or improved planning and coordinating mechanisms for the siting of power plants. As many of you know, the federal Interagency Power Plant Siting Group, of which I am a member, has been working in this area.<sup>17</sup> We should be issuing another report soon.

One of the things that has come out loud and clear in our confrontations, and one of the recurring statements our Interagency Group has heard, is that the utilities should inform the public well in advance of construction of its plans for power plant sites. As most of you know, the utilities traditionally have not done this, in part because of their concern over possible speculation and increases in land values. It is encouraging to note that utilities are increasingly accepting the idea of advance notice of their plans to the public. Northern States Power, for example, just came out with an announcement in this regard.

I still believe that the best planning mechanism that can be provided in the near future are the regional power supply councils established voluntarily in cooperation with the Federal Power Commission. These councils should be expanded and upgraded to include consideration on environmental matters and consultations with conservation and other groups concerned with such environmental matters. They should also provide for public members on the councils and be open to representatives of the small and publicly owned utilities.<sup>18</sup>

For the longer term, we will probably need some additional legislation to establish a proper framework for a coordinated planning effort.

Within the framework of the AEC's regulatory program, the desirability of early consideration of proposed nuclear plant sites has been recognized. Applicants for construction permits can request the Commission to consider the suitability of a proposed site separately from, and prior to, other questions relating to the project.<sup>19</sup> Last year the Internal Study Group designated by the AEC to examine the licensing program recommended several alternative means to make earlier regulatory decisions on applications.<sup>20</sup> As one alternative, the Study Group recommended that regulatory determinations on the matter of site suitability be made earlier than at present.

As a planning mechanism, the early site hearing or hearings have great merit in that all basic environmental problems could be worked out and decisions reached before the utility expends any significant amounts on construction. Furthermore, the public could be heard and site related matters, including impact on the environment, could be dealt with before construction began, thus eliminating a present source of alleged public aggravation with AEC regulatory procedures.<sup>21</sup>

#### THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME

Now let's take a look at the future. For those of you who have felt that the last year has been a turbulent one, let me predict that things are going to get tougher before they get better. And, of course, they are going to get tougher for fossil plants as well, as exemplified by the recent Southern California experience where oil and even gas-fired power plants have been turned down.

There is no doubt that the '70s are destined to be the decade of the environment. The President, in his State of the Union message, has called for the most comprehensive program in the environmental field in the nation's history. Passage of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, spearheaded by Senator Henry Jackson, was another indication of growing concern and activity. Under this law the three-man Council on Environmental Quality was

established. This Council is headed by Russell Train, former Under Secretary of Interior, who has been quoted as saying his group plans an early review of the AEC's licensing process. Earlier, the President had established a Cabinet-level Environmental Quality Council, with himself as Chairman and the Vice President and six Cabinet officers as members.

I think we can look forward to a continuing barrage of executive orders and legislative proposals, many of which will directly affect those of you in the audience. You can expect these from all levels of government. In fact, the President's special Environmental Message will go to the Congress tomorrow.

These proposals undoubtedly in time will significantly influence the way energy and environmental matters are treated in this country. For example, the Jackson bill can be interpreted to require the AEC to go beyond radiation effects and to look at all environmental effects in the licensing of nuclear power plants. The Muskie bill (S. 7) providing for state certification as to water quality standards on thermal effects as a condition of AEC construction permits and Corps of Engineer fossil plant permits will undoubtedly be enacted.

Then, too, we can expect to continue to hear talk of setting up a single federal agency to handle all energy development and perhaps environmental matters. As many of you may know, the Administration already has a committee, chaired by Mr. Ashe of Litton Industries, looking at how the government is organized to carry out its functions.

There will, of course, be further consideration in the years ahead as to whether the dual function of the AEC will be continued, or whether in the next 10 years or so there will be some further separation of the AEC's regulatory responsibility.

I think we must come to grips with what I refer to as the Minnesota problem—the question of state versus federal jurisdiction in the control of radioactive effluents. The public interest will not be served by a conflict between the various concerned governmental groups. We should be working in cooperation, not at odds, with each other.

We will have to do a lot of thinking and studying on matters beyond radiation safety and effluent control. I would not be surprised if we did not even find ourselves drawing up criteria which would relate to the esthetics of nuclear power plants.

As you can see, I am afraid we are headed for a rather turbulent period. What does this mean, then, in terms of public relations and understanding? Obviously, we are going to have to do much better in communicating with the public.<sup>22</sup> We will have to show through our words, and more importantly by our actions, that we indeed are performing a useful function in a responsible way with the public interest foremost in our minds.

When I think of all the really great advances which are being made as a result of the peaceful uses of atomic energy—which do not get comparable publicity to our alleged hazards—I could almost cry or cry out! It is indeed ironic that the great surge to nuclear power was in part because it was free of air pollution and was the first industry to be safely regulated from its inception.

I have faith that in due course the public will come to understand this. But it will require effort. I believe that conferences such as this sponsored by the Forum and its participants should be of great help in this effort. Programs such as the GE regional seminars and Westinghouse's environment school should also help. I look forward to finding out more about industry effort during this conference.

#### CONCLUSION

In closing, let me emphasize two points. First, when we think of the three options

available to us in dealing with the public, we need to concentrate on a strong quality assurance approach supported by a first-rate public relations effort.

The second point I want to stress is this: Utility management must have adequate planning and it must take into account at every stage the importance of public opinion and conduct its affairs accordingly. This means, in practice, that lawyers and engineers and board chairmen all will have to function as public information people. Now I am not suggesting we can do without the PR "pros", but you pros need more help from upstairs than you have been getting.

I will even compress the theme of my remarks into a single sentence: Quality assurance must extend into every area of your operation, including your public information program.

We are not at all downcast about the outlook for nuclear power. Quite to the contrary. Nuclear power is a fact of life and I am convinced the public will reach a point in time that they will not only embrace nuclear power—they will clamor for it. So through this interim period we must retain our patience and our good humor—and do the best possible job in planning and building plants properly, running them right, and helping the public understand this new source of energy! Thank you very much.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> "The Environment—And What To Do About It," remarks by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, USAEC, at a meeting of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council Solid State Sciences Panel, Argonne, Illinois, May 5, 1969. (AEC Press Release S-14-69).

<sup>2</sup> "Nuclear Power: Benefits and Risks," remarks by Commissioner James T. Ramey at a Conference on Nuclear Power and the Public, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, October 11, 1969.

<sup>3</sup> "Meeting the Energy Gap," remarks by Commissioner Theos J. Thompson, USAEC, at the Dedication of Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Oswego, New York, October 9, 1969. (AEC Press Release S-32-69).

<sup>4</sup> "Role of Nuclear Power in the Northwest," remarks by Commissioner Clarence E. Larsen, USAEC, at the Convention of the Inland Empire Waterways Association, Richland, Washington, October 13, 1969. (AEC Press Release S-33-69).

<sup>5</sup> Remarks by Wilfrid E. Johnson, Commissioner, USAEC, at the Dedication of the Southwest Experimental Fast Oxide Reactor, Fayetteville, Arkansas, May 7, 1969. (AEC Press Release S-17-69).

<sup>6</sup> "Nuclear Power—Facts Instead of Fiction," remarks by Commissioner James T. Ramey at a briefing for news media at Connecticut Yankee Nuclear Power Plant, Haddam Neck, Connecticut, June 2, 1969. (AEC Press Release S-19-69).

<sup>7</sup> "Environmental Effects of Producing Electric Power," Hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of United States, Part I, October 28, 29, 30, 31 and November 4, 5, 6, 7, 1969.

<sup>8</sup> "Quality Assurance—An Essential for Safe and Economic Nuclear Power," remarks by Commissioner James T. Ramey before the American Power Conference, Chicago, Illinois, April 23, 1968. (AEC Press Release S-21-68).

<sup>9</sup> "Providing for Public Safety in the Nuclear Industry—The Engineering Approach," remarks by Commissioner James T. Ramey before the National Academy of Engineering, Washington, D.C., May 1, 1969. (AEC Press Release S-16-69).

<sup>10</sup> "AEC Views on Quality Assurance in the Civilian Reactor Program," remarks by Milton Shaw, Director, Division of Reactor Development & Technology, USAEC, 1966 Winter Meeting of the American Nuclear

Society, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, November 2, 1966.

<sup>11</sup> "AEC Provides Additional Guidance on Quality Assurance for Nuclear Plants," AEC Public Announcement M-94, April 17, 1969.

<sup>12</sup> "Will Utility Management Have Needed Nuclear Know-How?," article by Commissioner James T. Ramey, *ELECTRICAL WORLD*, October 28, 1968.

<sup>13</sup> See Reference 7 above. Also Part II of these JCAE Hearings, January 27, 28, 29, 30, 1970 and February 24, 25, 26, 1970.

<sup>14</sup> "Radiation Protection—Past, Present and Future," remarks by Commissioner James T. Ramey at the Conference on "Universities, National Laboratories, and Man's Environment" Chicago, Illinois, July 28, 1969. (AEC Press Release S-25-69).

<sup>15</sup> See Reference 7 above, pages 111-116, 136-139.

<sup>16</sup> Testimony of Larry Bogart, Allendale, N.J., before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations, October 15, 1969.

<sup>17</sup> "Considerations Affecting Steam Power Plant Site Selection," A Report by the President's Office of Science and Technology, January 1969.

<sup>18</sup> "Planning for Environmental Protection in the Siting of Nuclear and Fossil Powered Plants," remarks by Commissioner James T. Ramey before the Federal Bar Association, Atomic Energy Law Committee Seminar on Possible New Issues in AEC Licensing Proceedings: Antitrust and Environmental Effects, Washington, D.C., October 15, 1969.

<sup>19</sup> 10 CFR Part 2, Appendix A, I(e).

<sup>20</sup> "Report to the Atomic Energy Commission on the Reactor Licensing Program," by the Internal Study Group, June 1969. (AEC Press Release M-149).

<sup>21</sup> See Reference 18 above.

<sup>22</sup> "Licensing and Environmental Considerations in Atomic Power Development: A Checklist," remarks by Commissioner James T. Ramey at the Atomic Industrial Forum Workshop on Power Reactor Licensing at Glen Cove, New York, June 30, 1969.

### IN COMMEMORATION AND MEMORY OF THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INVASION OF THE BALTIC STATES

**HON. CHARLES A. VANIK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago today the Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were invaded and occupied by the forces of the Soviet Union. For three decades these three small but freedom-loving nations have been torn by the advancing and retreating foreign armies of fascism and communism, they have been subject to armies of occupation and repression, to deportations and mass murders.

As representatives of one of the world's oldest and largest democracies, our hearts go out to these Baltic peoples who desire so deeply the independence and freedom which is the inalienable right of men everywhere.

On this sad anniversary, let us remind ourselves again—as we must remind ourselves each day, really—how precious is the freedom and liberty of man. Let us remind ourselves again that throughout the world men are held in

bondage, in political and mental slavery to oppressive governments.

Let us also remember this day that the human spirit can never be totally fettered. Man's soul is in love with freedom and will always pursue it.

Therefore, it is our duty in America, where the first great revolution for human rights began, to always act in such a way that our example will be a beacon to mankind everywhere. Through the light we hold up high, through the policies we pursue, oppressed men everywhere may take new hope and the life of the world can move toward a new day of liberty and justice.

### LETTER TO THE EDITOR

**HON. BILL D. BURLISON**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture Committee is presently in the process of trying to write an acceptable farm bill to bring to the floor. Much inaccurate and misleading material is being disseminated in the media with respect to the farm problem and the farmers who are aided by the Government program.

A prominent constituent of mine, J. R. Hutchison, Jr., has responded to a recent article of the Wall Street Journal. For the edification of my colleagues, I include in the RECORD his letter to the editor in response to that article, and also the article which prompted Mr. Hutchison's response:

LETTER TO THE EDITOR  
CARUTHERSVILLE, MO.,  
June 9, 1970.

DEAR SIR: Certainly W. R. Poage, Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, is one of the most informed persons in the United States on agriculture. Certainly he is a friend of agriculture and certainly a patriot of his country. Nevertheless, his "Irritation" regarding the agriculture committee's vote may not be as completely founded in "realism" as you suggest.

Our current agricultural bill, our present administration's attitude and the majority vote of Congress, particularly of the House of Representatives, will to a large degree be based on politics rather than economics. Most congressmen do not understand agriculture is the largest industry of the United States and that when you economically handcuff it you will eventually pull out the pillars of support for the entire economy. While one politician may be trying to tie in a political-welfare program into the economic structure of agricultural legislation another demagogic politician is knowledgeably handcuffing economic opportunities of increased technological advancements by endeavoring to limit agriculturists in the amount of government support as though they were recipients of welfare.

Most nonagriculturists, such as yourself, and most urbanites have no understanding of the agriculture program and could care less including some surprising members of Congress. I would, however, expect the Editor of the Wall Street Journal to be so well versed in the economics of our country as to advise by editorial the separation of politics and of welfare payments from the economics of agricultural legislation.



Certainly agriculture needs governmental assistance to become more efficient, to sustain confidence in its future markets for the purpose of procuring more efficient equipment, etc. It is not unlike any other industry affected by foreign trade in the United States. I suggest you enumerate an industry connected with foreign trade in any way that is not subsidized by direct, indirect subsidies, of these or quota limitations. I am confident you will not suggest negating your proposed standards.

By their many number agriculturists are unable to control their supply and need government regulations. This governmental police action and resultant subsidies are for the benefit not only of agriculturists but for *everyone*. Agricultural subsidies are more consumer subsidies than any subsidy I know of in any industry.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. HUTCHISON, Jr.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 8, 1970]

#### REALISM ON THE FARMS

W. R. Poage, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, is no foe of expensive farm programs; quite the contrary. He is, however, much more realistic than some of his colleagues. For close to a year Mr. Poage's Committee has been working with the Administration to shape a new farm program. The result, unfortunately, has been the development of a plan little different from the one already in existence.

To Mr. Poage's irritation, the committee voted the other day to go even farther in the wrong direction, making the program still more costly. In a statement the chairman voiced his objection:

"This action leaves us with absolutely all of nothing, whereas the unamended bill would certainly have given us a good part of something. I don't think it is fair to agriculture to present a bill to the floor simply to have it destroyed and agriculture discredited."

Mr. Poage evidently realizes, as some of his colleagues do not, that much of the public including many farmers, has become disenchanted with programs that do relatively little for needy farm operators and a great deal for well-to-do farmers, most of whom need no help.

The system just goes on and on, tightening regimentation of agriculture and increasing Federal outlays. As Mr. Poage knows, the public's unhappiness has seeped through to many members of Congress, who sooner or later are sure to rebel against plans that merely call for more of the same.

So Mr. Poage's pique surely is understandable. It's high time for a great deal more realism on the farms.

#### FREEDOM FOR THE BALTIC STATES

#### HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 30th anniversary of Communist enslavement of the Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

America believes in freedom and self-determination. For the millions of oppressed peoples in these countries there can be no rejoicing—no taking for granted of the fundamental human rights which we—in America—are priv-

ileged to share under our democratic system of government.

It is urged that the United States renew its efforts toward the restoration of freedom and independence of these courageous people who pin their hopes on us and the entire free world that they may, once again, live in peace in their homeland.

Let the United States take the lead in heeding the pleas of those whose rights have been denied by Communist domination. Let us maintain our greatness as a nation by standing for freedom in the affairs of all nations.

#### CONGRESSMAN CHARLES H. WILSON URGES HIS COLLEAGUES TO SUPPORT MEANINGFUL POSTAL REFORM

#### HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the House of Representatives will begin consideration of legislation of significant historic import. The legislation I am referring to is H.R. 17070, the bill to improve and modernize the postal service. Indeed, the measure will reorganize the Post Office Department into a completely new postal service.

I strongly support this legislation and hope that the Members of Congress, in their wisdom, will adopt this bill.

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I am proud to be a member, has labored long and diligently to produce a postal organization bill. We have labored under great pressures and I believe that we have forged a workable solution to the postal crisis. The chairman of our committee, the Honorable THADDEUS J. DULSKI, should be commended for his tireless efforts on behalf of the citizens of our country who have demanded postal reform. Chairman DULSKI introduced H.R. 4 on January 3, 1969, and commenced hearings on this legislation on April 22, 1969. After 36 days of hearings, 33 executive sessions, 1,516 pages of testimony, reports, analyses, and four complete rewrites, we have finally arrived at a point where a majority of our committee is able to support a bill which, if adopted, will culminate in the meaningful and effective improvement of the postal service.

As you all know, during this long period of thoughtful deliberation, our postal employees grew impatient. Who could fault their sentiment? Their impatience stemmed from years of shoddy treatment by their Government. Finally, on March 18, 1970, they had had enough and they chose to withhold their labor from the postal service so that they might highlight their grievances before the American public. As a consequence of the work stoppage, the administration and the leaders of the seven exclusive postal unions formed an agreement which included a 6-percent pay raise retroactive to January 1, 1970, to be

adopted by Congress immediately, and a postal reform package which included an additional 8-percent pay raise.

The postal workers' strikes and negotiated agreement are milestones in American labor history. They spotlight a new resolution on the part of public employees not to continue as victims of the Government's "benign neglect." They mark a new attitude of recognition and negotiation in the public sector.

Mr. Speaker, the history of this problem is plain and tragic. Postal workers and the American public have suffered. The Government has not treated the postal worker fairly and for generations has taken its postal employees for granted. It is the Government's duty to move swiftly to give the postal workers the overdue wages they so plainly deserve.

Consequently, ever since I have been in Congress, I have been a consistent supporter of postal pay increases and have supported postal reform. My efforts in this Congress were no exception. I co-sponsored and supported H.R. 13000 in committee and on the floor of the House—and this legislation would have been passed if the whole issue had not been snarled in the interminable battle over postal reform.

While I continue to find postal reform laudable, the Nixon administration should not have insisted on its adoption at the expense of the wage increases it owes to its postal workers. As you know, the administration finally agreed to support, under pressure, the paltry 6-percent raise which the Congress passed.

I believe this raise was an insult to postal workers because it amounted to only \$375 per year on the average.

I particularly support three elements of H.R. 17070 which must be retained if postal reform legislation is to have any meaning at all. These are:

First, the 8-percent pay raise retroactive to April 18, 1970;

Second, the reduction in the time it takes the postal worker to reach the top step of his labor grade to 8 years rather than 21 years—commonly referred to as compression; and

Third, the establishment of an area wage system for postal employees.

As I stated earlier, the administration grudgingly agreed to support a pay raise earlier this year—and then only a 6-percent raise. This raise was not enough. And every Member of this House knows it. H.R. 17070 includes an additional 8-percent pay raise retroactive to April 18, and again the administration is objecting. This raise, along with the earlier 6-percent raise, is long overdue.

The only argument that has been presented against the retroactive 8-percent raise is a very curious one. It goes something like this: The postal workers do not really want a retroactive pay raise. After all, the seven exclusive postal unions and the administration agreed back on April 16 that the pay raise would not be effective until the day the proposed legislation was enacted and the postal workers desperately want to keep the agreement between their union leaders and the administration even if it means that needed money is being taken out of their pockets.

Mr. Speaker, I find this hard to believe. As sure as I am standing here, I believe that postal workers want and should have their retroactive raise so that in a small way the postal workers can be compensated for the length of time they have been patiently waiting for justice. I reiterate, especially in light of today's galloping inflation, more than 6 percent annually, this raise is still not enough. I would also like to remind the House once again that, along with the retroactive pay raise, H.R. 17070 reduces the time a postal employee must wait to receive top of grade pay for his job. It thus goes a long way toward alleviating a crucial grievance of the postal workers.

Under present law, a postal worker has to wait 21 years before he can receive the top level in his grade. This means that a postal carrier goes to work at a wage of \$6,548 and after 21 years of service can only expect to make a maximum of \$8,946. This is outrageous. It never has been justified with a straight face and certainly can no longer be condoned.

At the conclusion of this statement I have presented comparative statistics showing length of time required by police patrolmen and firefighters to reach top of grade, plus a comparison between the "Moderate Standard of Living Budget" prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the top salary of the PFS-5 letter carrier.

Just a brief look at these tables reveals the shocking lack of regard shown our postal employees. Comparisons made in 24 major cities show that police patrolmen reach the top of their grade in 3.6

years on the average; firefighters reach their maximum in 3.5 years on the average—a far cry from the 21 years our postal workers must wait to achieve their maximum.

The other side of the coin is, as I have already stated, the low-salary level. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that a moderate standard of living for a family of four in Washington, D.C., required an income of \$10,937—based on prices as they existed back in the first quarter of 1969. Today that amount is at least \$11,800 and is increasing day by day, thanks to Nixonomics. The top PFS salary, after 21 years, is under \$9,000.

I have felt strongly about this matter for a long time. In fact, I tried to add a "compression" amendment to the 6-percent pay bill which passed earlier this year, but, unfortunately, it was not accepted. I am certainly pleased that it is part of the legislation that is before the House now.

Finally, after our postal employees receive their justly due retroactive pay and no longer have to wait an unreasonable time to arrive at the top level of their grade, I believe their pay must also reflect the cost of living in the area in which they work. I, therefore, during the committee's deliberation on H.R. 17070, suggested an amendment to establish a wage area system. An amendment to this effect was adopted.

As of now, every postal employee of the same grade and seniority receives the same pay whatever the living costs may be in the area in which he works. Private industry long has recognized the

need for industrial wage differentials. It just is not equitable for a letter carrier to attempt to exist on the same pay in New York City, with its high cost of living, as a postman in an area in which the cost of living is considerably lower. Even among major metropolitan areas, as shown by the moderate budget estimates I have already referred to, living costs vary by almost \$2,000—and if smaller cities were included the range would be still greater.

It should be pointed out that this is not an attempt to discriminate against any particular region of our country. I feel an area wage is fair to all. The post office workers' interests would be served and so would the interests of the citizens of our country. As these statistics show, this area wage concept will benefit the postal worker in Atlanta, Ga., or Dallas, Tex., or Los Angeles, Calif., or Chicago, Ill., or New York, N.Y., on an equal basis.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation offers a great deal more than the solutions to just the three issues I have discussed today, but I believe that these are most immediately important to the postal worker. However, I want to make it clear that I generally support H.R. 17070 as it was reported out of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and hope that it will be enacted into law. Make no mistake about it, it is not a perfect bill. There is no such animal. We still have a long way to go but I feel that this bill is a significant step in the right direction. I therefore request the support of my colleagues for H.R. 17070 as now written.

I include the following tabulation:

CHART 1—MAXIMUM SALARIES IN 1969 AND YEARS OF PROGRESSION TO REACH MAXIMUM FOR LETTER CARRIERS AND FOR POLICE PATROLMEN IN MAJOR CITIES

City	Previous maximum salary	Most recent increase	Current maximum salary	Years of progression to maximum	City	Previous maximum salary	Most recent increase	Current maximum salary	Years of progression to maximum
Indianapolis.....	\$7,000	\$300	\$7,300	12	San Francisco.....	\$9,564	\$972	\$10,536	3
Atlanta.....	7,046	610	7,656	15	New York <sup>1</sup> .....	9,384	1,041	10,425	13
Houston <sup>2</sup> .....	6,762	1,416	8,178	13	Los Angeles.....	9,564	540	10,104	13
Boston <sup>2</sup> .....	7,305	1,105	8,320	3	Seattle.....	8,400	1,200	9,600	21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Pittsburgh <sup>2</sup> .....	7,400	1,300	8,700	3	Minneapolis.....	8,088	1,200	9,288	15
Cincinnati.....	8,080	727	8,807	13	Buffalo <sup>2</sup> .....	7,285	1,940	9,225	14
Milwaukee.....	8,700	500	9,200	4	Baltimore <sup>2</sup> .....	8,640	444	9,084	5
Washington, D.C.....	8,400	880	9,280	17	Denver.....	7,752	1,008	8,760	14
Cleveland.....	8,934	492	9,426	12	Philadelphia <sup>2</sup> .....	7,429	900	8,329	2
San Diego.....	9,432	468	9,900	3	St. Louis <sup>2</sup> .....	7,670	611	8,281	15
Detroit <sup>2</sup> .....	8,335	1,965	10,300	12	Kansas City, Mo. <sup>2</sup> .....	7,392	756	8,148	5
Chicago <sup>2</sup> .....	9,000	1,500	10,500	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dallas.....	6,888	588	7,476	13
PFS-5 letter carrier <sup>3</sup> .....	8,520	426	8,946	21					

<sup>1</sup> Longevity increases are granted beyond the maximum salary.

<sup>2</sup> Cities for which higher maximum salaries have already been announced.

<sup>3</sup> Current maximum salary has been in effect for more than 1 year.

<sup>4</sup> Salaries shown for PFS-5 letter carriers are present maximum salary.

Source: Salary surveys of Fraternal Order of Police (1968 and 1969); International City Managers' Association; and civil service or police departments of each of the cities.

CHART 2—MAXIMUM SALARIES IN 1969 AND YEARS OF PROGRESSION TO REACH MAXIMUM FOR LETTER CARRIERS AND FOR FIREFIGHTERS IN MAJOR CITIES

City	Previous maximum salary	Most recent increase	Current maximum salary	Years of progression to maximum	City	Previous maximum salary	Most recent increase	Current maximum salary	Years of progression to maximum
Kansas City, Mo.....	\$7,044	\$348	\$7,392	3	Chicago <sup>2</sup> .....	\$9,000	\$1,500	\$10,500	3 $\frac{1}{2}$
Atlanta.....	7,046	610	7,656	15	Detroit <sup>2</sup> .....	8,335	1,965	10,300	14
St. Louis.....	7,593	635	8,228	5	Los Angeles <sup>2</sup> .....	9,564	540	10,104	3
Denver.....	7,752	1,008	8,760	14	San Diego.....	9,204	456	9,660	3
Boston.....	7,670	1,146	8,816	3	Washington, D.C.....	8,400	880	9,280	17
Baltimore <sup>2</sup> .....	8,640	444	9,084	5	Pittsburgh.....	7,400	1,800	9,200	3
Buffalo <sup>2</sup> .....	7,285	1,940	9,225	14	Milwaukee.....	8,510	400	8,910	4
Minneapolis.....	8,088	1,200	9,288	15	Cincinnati.....	8,080	727	8,807	13
Cleveland.....	8,964	562	9,426	12	Philadelphia <sup>2</sup> .....	7,429	900	8,329	2
Seattle.....	8,400	1,200	9,600	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	Houston <sup>2</sup> .....	6,762	1,416	8,178	13
New York <sup>2</sup> .....	9,348	1,041	10,425	13	Dallas.....	6,888	588	7,476	13
San Francisco.....	9,564	972	10,536	3	Indianapolis.....	6,600	100	6,700	12
PFS-5 letter carriers <sup>3</sup> .....	8,520	426	8,946	21					

<sup>1</sup> Longevity increases are granted beyond the maximum salary.

<sup>2</sup> Cities for which higher maximum salaries have already been announced.

<sup>3</sup> Salaries shown for PFS-5 letter carriers are present maximum salary.

Source: Salary surveys of the International Association of Fire Fighters (1968 and 1969) International City Managers' Association; and the civil service or fire departments of each of the cities.



CHART 3—FAMILY BUDGET COSTS FOR A MODERATE STANDARD OF LIVING IN MAJOR METROPOLITAN AREAS IN 1969, AND MAXIMUM ANNUAL SALARY OF LETTER CARRIERS

PFS-5 carrier after 21 years:	
Present.....	\$8,946
Budget costs in major metropolitan areas:	
Houston, Tex.....	9,235
Dallas, Tex.....	9,305
Atlanta, Ga.....	9,327
Baltimore, Md.....	9,716
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	9,728
Cincinnati, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana.....	9,918
Kansas City, Mo., Kans.....	9,940
Detroit, Mich.....	10,036
St. Louis, Mo., Illinois.....	10,122
Denver, Colo.....	10,124
Philadelphia, Pa., New Jersey.....	10,214
San Diego, Calif.....	10,221
Indianapolis, Ind.....	10,294
U.S. average, all metropolitan areas.....	10,306
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.....	10,386
Washington, D.C.....	10,397
Chicago, Ill., northwestern Indiana.....	10,430
Los Angeles, Long Beach, Calif.....	10,457
Cleveland, Ohio.....	10,466
Milwaukee, Wis.....	10,546
Seattle, Everett, Wash.....	10,576
Buffalo, N.Y.....	10,599
Boston, Mass.....	10,945
San Francisco, Oakland, Calif.....	11,008
New York, northeastern New Jersey.....	11,174

Source: "3 Standards of Living for an Urban Family of 4 Persons, Spring 1967," U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Updated to 1st quarter of 1969.

FOCUS ON THE BALTIC COUNTRIES  
ESTONIA-LATVIA-LITHUANIA

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, over the years this historic Chamber has been the scene where our distinguished colleagues speak on vital topics. We have been stirred by eloquent words when they pointed with pride to some accomplishment or viewed with alarm some problems.

Today, I wish to speak about a tragic event that took place 30 years ago. I do so for several good reasons. First and foremost, because we all feel a kinship with our fellow human beings and commiserate with those who have been hurt, injured, unjustly deprived of their God-given freedom or been murdered.

The event I recall today is the sad 30th anniversary when the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—all Baltic nations lost their freedom and independence. The hordes of Soviets invaded those countries during June 1940, and enslaved their populations and started a vicious process of deportation, extermination, and annihilation. These genocidal operations continued unabated with the result that one-fourth of the entire population of these once proud and independent nations are now lost.

If ever there were people that deserved the tributes of mankind, it is the men and women of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia who have, and are, waging an intensive fight for their freedom. We should not forget them.

The United States has absolutely refused to recognize the unlawful seizure and forced "incorporation" of these nations by the Communists into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

On June 21, 1963, House Concurrent Resolution 416 was adopted. It urged the

President of the United States to direct world opinion to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the Baltic States and urged restoration of their rights.

Inasmuch as today marks the 30th year of the brutal invasion by the U.S.S.R. of these three once great and independent nations, I invite the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the words of the House concurrent resolution I referred to which has never been implemented and urge the President to comply with the wishes of the Congress without further delay.

The resolution reads as follows:

H. CON. RES. 416

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Passed by the House of Representatives June 21, 1965.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,  
Clerk.

AMERICANS FOR CONGRESSIONAL  
ACTION TO FREE THE BALTIC STATES,  
Los Angeles, June 5, 1970.

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Baltic peoples have been suffering in the Soviet captivity for 30 years. Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia lost their freedom and independence when the Soviets invaded and occupied these three peace-loving countries on June 15, 1940.

In a little more than one week the U.S. Congress will mark this sad anniversary. I kindly ask you to take part in this sorrowful commemoration in the House. Enclosed you will find a copy of a two-page essay prepared by us on the question of the Baltic States. This will serve you as a good source for your remarks.

Enclosed you will also find a copy of H. Con. Res. 416, unanimously adopted by the House and the Senate, which calls for freedom for Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. In your remarks please urge the U.S. President to implement this very important legislation by bringing the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States to the United Nations.

Would you be kind enough to insert H. Con. Res. 416 in the Congressional Record, to bring it to the attention of your colleagues in the House.

As you know, you are a member of the Honorary Committee of this nationwide organization. Needless to say, we are grateful to you for all the aid and assistance given to us in this crusade to free the Baltic States.

Thank you.

With kindest personal wishes and regards,  
Sincerely,

LEONARD VALIUKAS,  
President, Executive Committee.

NEGOTIATING WITH COMMUNISTS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, we always seem to come out on the short end when it comes to negotiating with Communists to end conflicts they started. The concessions—meaningful ones that is—always seem to come from us, starting right off with where the meetings are held.

As the following interesting editorial appearing a while back in the Manchester, N.H., Union-Leader indicates, Mr. George Naum, a former official U.S. photographer who covered the Korean peace negotiations reports that the site of Kaesong—inside enemy territory—caused us to proceed there with white flags flying. This was the wrong way to start out. And as Mr. Naum so well points out, Helsinki is not much better for SALT, another location chosen by the Communists.

Whether at Paris or Helsinki, negotiations ought to be required to develop some meaningful concessions from the enemy within a designated time limit, or the delay can only operate prejudicially to the United States. It is unlikely that concessions will be made unless it is to the enemy's advantage to make them, which means he must be facing serious losses if hostilities continue. To date this has not been the situation, and in the presently prevailing atmosphere in the United States, including such developments as the grossly distorted "Amendment To End the War" proposed by certain U.S. Senators, there is bound to be even less inducement to negotiate. After all, why should the Communists make concessions if the United States is going to withdraw under fire anyway?

The editorial follows:

WHITE FLAGS OF SURRENDER

I recently got to thinking about what former Ambassador Taylor had to say about conceding a point to the Communists and about the meeting in Helsinki, a location picked out by the Communists.

I had the opportunity of covering the initial meeting of the Korean peace talks (July 10, 1951). Now, at that time, the UN forces (mostly us) had stopped cold the much heralded spring offensive by nearly 500,000 Chinese "volunteers" and North Koreans. The Communists needed a "time out" and needed it badly. They were on the ropes. General Ridgeway was running them northward so fast they would have been pushed back to the Yalu River in a short time.

Peace feelers were sent out by the enemy through diplomatic channels.

They needed that breather!

Our military people had suggested the meeting take place on board a Danish (neutral) ship in Wansong Harbor (enemy territory). This would have permitted the military action to continue—something like a football game being played with the talks being held on the sidelines.

Well, this wasn't acceptable to the enemy. Imagine!

The State Department finally agreed to the enemy's proposal to meet in Kaesong. Score one point for the Communists!

The convoy we traveled in was held up for better light so the Communist movie cameramen could get better pictures of all vehicles flying white flags (Surrender!). Score another point for the enemy!

The whole world knows what happened after that. At least, people should remember.

The talks dragged on until, finally, an agreement was reached two years later (July 27, 1953). I think it just about killed the chief UN negotiator, Admiral C. Turner Joy.

Now we have the Paris peace talks. Months dragged by trying to agree on the size and shape of the table!

You know, people should realize by now that these North Koreans, Chinese and Viet Cong are sharper than any riverboat gambler. One can come away from the "table" minus shirt, pants, shoes, socks and drawers—and that's exactly the way they plan it.

The American people, I think, are generally placing too much faith in these talks. Past performance indicates that we are going to come away from that table with less than we sat down with.

## WE HAVE SHOUTED DOWN OUR SENSE OF BALANCE

**HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the disorder and violence that marred many of our campuses this past spring has been a cause of alarm and concern among all of us. Yesterday, the Washington Post carried an article by Prof. Alexander Bickel of Yale which struck on a point of extremely critical importance in regard to this matter. He suggests the responsibility for the rising disorder and increasingly violent expressions of dissent on many of our campuses rests with the "incivility and even violence of rhetoric and action that academics and other intellectuals have domesticated into their universe of discourse." One needs to feed young, inexperienced, imaginative minds, he argues, with only so much loose talk of the "ob-

solescence and rottenness of our society and institutions," engage in only so much vilification and slandering of our leaders, and toss out only so many suggestions that tragic but aberrant events like those of Kent State and Jackson, Miss., represent an incipient state of repression or fascism and rampages, trashings, rioting, and bombings are likely to be the result.

If Professor Bickel is correct, then more harsh and repressive laws, more menacing rhetoric from Government officials, and more interventions of police and National Guard forces on the campuses will not restore peace and order to our universities. In fact, they will have the opposite effect by providing symbolic reinforcement and confirmation of already exaggerated fears and suspicions. Rather, the responsibility for restoring order, sanity, and civility to the universities rests with the academic community itself.

This means first of all, that it must develop and strictly enforce its own internal mechanisms of discipline and order; society will not long forbear an institution which allows itself to be used as a staging area for violent attacks on the very hand that feeds it. But more important it must clean up and restore a semblance of reason, balance, and perspective to its own discourse and rhetoric. For it is angry, exaggerated, hyper-passionate words and habits of mind which breed deeds of violence and destructive nihilism.

We who are charged with making the laws of the land have the responsibility to exhibit an extra measure of forbearance and patience where political expediency might suggest otherwise; but if the university community cannot summon the courage, will, and commonsense to set its own internal affairs in order, then the repression which many of its members so foolishly imagine may well be the bitter harvest of its own indulgence and irresponsibility. At this point in the RECORD I would like to include the full text of the article to which I have referred:

### WE'VE SHOUTED DOWN OUR SENSE OF BALANCE (By Alexander M. Bickel)

Among academics and other intellectuals, let alone "poets, yeggs and thirties," it is not merely fashionable, it is required to speak apocalyptically of the country in crisis.

There is a crisis and it went from bad to worse this spring. But it is not only, it is not even chiefly, the crisis that fashion requires us to shake our heads about. The war has got to stop, the march into Cambodia is a gruesome error, the cities are a mess, our rivers and our air smell awful and the blacks will not and ought not stand for being forgotten again.

But there is another crisis that will incapacitate us from dealing with the ones I have just mentioned. It is not the crisis of allegiance on the part of downtrodden blacks and not the tinderbox of conflict between them and the lower-class whites who confront them, but the crisis of the abandonment of reason, of standards, of measure, the loss of balance and judgment by intellectuals and their audiences.

The symptoms of this crisis are the incivility and even violence of rhetoric and action that academics and other intellectuals have domesticated into their universe of dis-

course, and the interdiction of objective discussion of certain problems that they have increasingly tolerated.

I write from the vantage point of a university—Yale—that has by and large kept its head. Violence and disruption are not a regular feature of our lives. No Nobel Prize-winner has been forcibly denied access to his laboratory, as was Dr. Isador Rabi at Columbia recently. There has been only one significant seizure of a building, and that last fall and very brief. Students were more or less on strike for a few weeks this spring, but many parts of the university continued normally in session just the same, and all parts were open. No students will receive credit for work that has not been evaluated.

Since the move into Cambodia, numerous students have put all they have of dedication, energy and talent—and they have breathtaking much—into political action. They have organized a lobbying effort and executed it soberly and with high intelligence. They have committed themselves to the nitty-gritty work of campaigning this summer and fall. And at the law school, they have labored day and night over legal memoranda dealing with the constitutional division of war-making power between President and Congress.

Yet here is what happened at Yale in the weeks immediately before. Some blacks, members of the Panther Party, including Bobby Seale, the party's chairman, are under arrest in New Haven, charged with murder. The trial has not yet begun. Preliminary motions are being heard and decided. So much of the evidence as has emerged in the course of these preliminary hearings indicates that a brutal murder has indeed been committed.

While the accused are of course to be presumed innocent, the state has made out enough of a case against them to obtain an indictment, and to convince a judge to hold all but one of them without bail, as in a capital case he may. Two of the accused have pleaded guilty to second-degree murder. Proceedings thus far have raised some legal issues—most cases do—but there has been no showing of gross or plain violation of anyone's rights.

There was one minor disturbance in the courtroom, and the presiding judge summarily imposed six-months contempt sentences on two members of the Black Panther Party who were in court as spectators and on whom the disturbance centered. This was, in the view of many impartial observers, a grave overreaction. Within a few days, the judge corrected himself and commuted the sentences. Everything else has gone along regularly, peaceably and with decorum.

### A CALL TO VIOLENCE

Nonetheless, The Movement, and amorphous collection of radicals, SDS, Yuppies, whathaveyou, pressing an alliance with the Black Panthers which the latter accept apparently only on occasion, mounted an agitation to stop the trial and free the accused. The call went out to come to New Haven for a May Day demonstration.

Many of the groups or grouplets from whom the call issued or to whom it went took it as a call to bring Yale to its knees by violence: Come to New Haven and see it burn. Very few if any of Yale's students and faculty accepted the call to violence.

For a dominant portion of the student body, however, the issue was not the violence that was offered the city and the university by thousands of people about to descend on them. The issue was the trial as an instance of repression. The crisis was not the open threat of fire, death and destruction to a university and a city. The crisis was a trial for murder, even though there's no doubt a crime has been committed, no basis whatever at this stage for the surmise that the trial will be unfair, and no possibility other than the trial of dealing with an occur-



rence—the murder—which would be monstrous to ignore.

Over this trumped-up crisis of the trial hundreds upon hundreds of students whipped themselves to a pitch of hysteria, finally voting to strike. Interestingly enough, the passions raged in the college and in some measure in the graduate school. The law school—training still tells a little—was virtually untouched. On April 23, the faculty of Yale College met, and having heard the president of the university express his skepticism that black revolutionaries can get a fair trial anywhere in the United States, voted to countenance the strike. I was at the meeting and so voted, and did not really feel ashamed until I walked out through the crowd of students who we had known were out there, whom we had heard, and who now cheered us.

We did not call off school. Most faculty and many students continued to attend class, and there was little attempt to bring pressure on them. Nothing we could have done would have likely dispelled the hysteria of a large mass of undergraduates, and many things we might have done would have heightened it. The difference between recognizing the situation, as we could not but do, and countenancing it, as we did, can be seen as minor. To countenance the condition that prevailed among our students might spare the university the kind of experience that Harvard had last spring and that come to other places.

#### "TRUTH . . . IS IRRELEVANT"

We were spared. But there is cause to be ashamed. We did not return a rational answer to our students, because we were too alone and it was too late. If we had said what is true, that the trial was no crisis, that it was inconceivable not to let it proceed, and that there is no reason to equate the police in Chicago with the courts in New Haven and with the state and federal courts that sit to correct the errors of courts in New Haven; and if we had added that the university would continue to function, its members being held to no more than their normal duties (which do not include constant attendance at class) and no less—if we had said all that we would have been denounced as rigid, unresponsive, authoritarian; we would have risked riots and destruction, and been saddled with responsibility for possible police overreaction.

That is what it has come to. Truth and the function of the university are irrelevant and dangerous. They are pitfalls. I have to be grateful, and I am grateful, that we avoided these pitfalls, and that we had steady and shrewd leadership which saved us whole.

But we should realize where we have arrived, and try to know how and why. I suggest we have listened and talked ourselves into the situation we are in. We have listened—quietly, even solemnly, as if it were rational—to incredibly loose talk about the obsolescence and rottenness of our society and all our institutions, and have come to parrot it in order to propitiate a sizable number of young people.

It all started with the war, which does represent a malfunction of the system, because a democracy must not wage wars with the assent merely of a simple majority. Large and intense minorities have, and of right should have a veto against war, and there is no higher national interest than the speedy liquidation of a war that has been so vetoed. Lyndon Johnson never understood that, and Mr. Nixon's understanding of it has been revealed as imperfect. Hence the insufferable war continues, and leads quite naturally and reasonably to talk of systemic crisis.

But it is not reasonable to extend a systemic indictment to the entire structure of government, to the electoral process itself, to the administration of justice, to every debatable

action that a new national administration thinks it has a mandate to take, and to every type of institution, including universities.

#### A LOSS OF PROPORTION

Everything can be improved, even radically improved, and change is the law of life. But not everything can be improved instantly, and not all change is good. And destructive nihilism is evil no matter how motivated. These things it is now unfashionable for intellectuals and their audiences to say and hear (What is fashionable is the apocalypse and filthy and violent rhetoric.)

We listen to the rhetoric as if it were the statement of a position of one side of an issue, and we respond by disagreeing perhaps, but by accepting the premise of apocalyptic crisis. The reward we hope for is not too much violence.

In New Haven there were three small fires, obviously set, in the law school, and a bombing in Ingalls Rink. But the peace was kept, by speakers who advised the crowd that the time was not ripe for violence, yet. The university is full of slogans painted and stenciled all over it. These stenciled and spoken slogans and threats are called dissent. But they are in truth vandalism, a kind of aggression almost physical, in content most often a series of curses which do not pretend any attempt at persuasion.

No principle of a free society requires public, let alone private, institutions to allow this sort of verbal violence to take place on their walls or orally within their precincts. Yet we observe it and listen to it respectfully, and thus legitimate it. Nothing is unspeakable, and hence nothing is really undoable. The university, we hear it said and assented to, is thoroughly unworthy, and so is the entire legal order. Therefore the university and the society may not use force to protect themselves against violence, let alone the threat of it, but force may justly be used against them.

#### EQUATION OF VIOLENCE

There has been an appalling use of deadly force at Kent State, in Augusta, Ga. and in Jackson, Miss., which we must punish as criminal and which we must bend every effort to prevent in the future.

The President was rightly criticized for reacting to the Kent State killings by saying in effect that violence will breed violence. To have said only that was not enough and is not the whole truth. But what the President did say was nevertheless true. It is probable statable in the form of an equation that so many rampages, so many bricks and bottles thrown and even so many epithets hurled will eventually, in one or another corner of the country, produce so many innocent victims. It is probably also statable in the form of an equation that so much talk of the rottenness and sickness of men and institutions, solemnly countenanced by so many apparently rational people, will produce so many rampages and bottles and rocks, and so much incendiary counter-rhetoric like the Vice President's, as well as some counter-rampages.

No sane person can condone riots by construction workers or by police, and certainly not killings. But a price is inevitably going to be paid for destroying the order of society. If the streets belong to the people, they are going to belong to all the people, not just young radicals. If all we say about Kent State is that it is an instance of brutal repression for which the Vice President and the Attorney General and an isolated and insensitive President are responsible, we are not telling the truth, and by not doing so we will help bring on more Kent States.

What, in the title of one of Lenin's pamphlets, is to be done? We must restore conditions in which slogans and mass emotions do not drown out and drive out reasoned

analysis; in which passionate assertion is not automatically seen as highminded and presumptively right, while dispassionate judgment is denounced as insensitive and presumptively immoral.

The young are right about the war in Indochina, because the majoritarian political process alone does not legitimate a war. The President must stop it, and Congress must make him stop it. The young are right too about a great deal of racism, and about the debasement of values by commercialism. But many of the young are wrong about repression. The society is free and open, if flawed and gravely troubled. What repression there is is imposed, as often as not, by the young in the universities, where their pressure for ideological orthodoxy and a kind of emotional solidarity threaten to achieve what Joe McCarthy never did.

Our domestic problems can be solved or alleviated only through the democratic political process, which is slow, and out of which no one gets all he wants. The political process is not only slow, it is prone to error, and it carries a high frustration factor. But revolution would produce only something less responsive to claims of social justice and infinitely more coercive and oppressive.

All this many of the young may not believe, but it is not disproved by epithets and demonstrations. Of course, the objective situation in the United States, as the Marxists would say, and as the true Marxists probably do say, is such that violent repression is much more likely than violent revolution. But if we are to have neither we must have order—order under law, which means freedom to question the law and test it and freedom to seek a higher justice than the law may embody; but which means also freedom from coercion and violence, physical or verbal.

The place to begin restoring order in speech and action is the university. No single university can do it, and virtually all have slid so far into disorder that they must in fairness give notice of intention to return to earlier ways before acting to do so.

The heads of leading universities should convene publicly and reassert standards of civility of speech and conduct. Instead of commiserating with each other under various pious auspices about a supposed crisis of irrelevance in higher education, they should announce their intention to institute a reform which is the precondition of all other reforms: the use of disciplinary power to keep discourse and action within the bounds of order. No more vandalism; no more assaultive, vicious speech; no more incitement to violent action; no more bullying, simulated or actual.

If the reassertion of this minimum of authority should bring strife and violence in the short term, as it may, it will be less strife and less violence than is otherwise in store for us.

#### BALTIC STATES

### HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the infamous anniversary of the Soviet invasion and occupation of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. At this time it is fitting for the 91st Congress to reaffirm our dedication to the principles expressed in House Concurrent Resolution 416, call-

ing for the freedom of these three enslaved states. I urge the President to implement this legislation by bringing the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States to the United Nations. These peoples must be freed from Soviet domination so that they may shape their own destinies once again.

In June 1940, the Soviets presented Lithuania with an ultimatum in which they charged that the three Baltic States had transformed the Baltic Entente into a military alliance directed against the Soviets and demanded the formation of a friendly government. The ultimatum was followed by invasion, and by June 15, 1940, the Soviets fully occupied Lithuania.

Shortly after the annexation of the Baltic States, the Soviets perpetrated one of history's great frauds and held "elections" under Red army guns followed by the incorporation of these nations as constituent republics in the Soviet Union. A year later, thousands of Baltic citizens were deported to various parts of the Soviet Union, mainly Siberia. Since June 15, 1940, these three nations have lost more than one-fourth of their entire population. Supplementing the deportation, the Soviets pursued a policy of colonization of the three Baltic States with persons of Russian stock. This served as a method of changing the ethnic composition of the area and replacing the cost of labor and resulted in the creation of economically dependent industrial melting pots in the Baltic States. The Soviets have not succeeded, however, in weakening the ethnic and cultural identity of the Balts, nor have they been able to change the priority of loyalties from native to Russian.

Despite the captivity in which they live and despite the hardships which they have endured, the Baltic peoples remain dedicated to the cause of the restoration of their self-determination. Armed guerrilla warfare has been replaced by passive resistance. Thirty years of Soviet domination has not crushed the spirit of these dauntless people. They deserve not only our admiration but our wholehearted support of their efforts to free their homeland.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF U.S.  
DISTRICT JUDGE JOHN W. OLIVER.

**HON. RICHARD BOLLING**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I find in the recent commencement address of U.S. District Judge John W. Oliver, for the western district of Missouri, interesting historical references as well as wise counsel that deserves attention beyond the graduating seniors who heard it. The address, delivered to the graduating class of Central High School at Cape Girardeau, Mo., follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN W. OLIVER

I am grateful to the Senior Class for the honor of having been chosen as your Commencement speaker. This is your graduation day and your commencement address. I

should tell you, however, that I view you as a group of my fellow Americans who feel and share the concerns of the day; indeed, as fellow citizens who, either already, or may in the very near predictable future, entertain real doubts and even fears about man's ability to cope with the problems which, like it or not, we are all forced to face.

If this were a graduating class from a law school, my task of communication would not be as difficult as I consider it to be today. My confidence in being able to communicate with law students would rest upon the fact that I know they would have had a concentrated exposure to the tradition of the common law and its accumulated wisdom based on the literally centuries of Anglo-American experience with the difficulties which complicate the most sincere efforts to administer equal justice for all persons.

But this is not a class graduating from law school. And times have changed since I graduated. The year 1930 was a time of relative calm. In those days a commencement speaker could tell a joke or two, throw in some onward and upward talk, and bid the graduates on their merry way. If this graduating class is anything like the high school class with which our youngest son graduated earlier this week, you will agree that the times call for something more than that sort of a speech.

As my time to speak approached, I found it extremely difficult to decide what should be said and how I should try to say it. I sense that a great many people in this country are deeply troubled and that young people are more troubled than most because they are having their first experience with what older people recognize as a rather constant condition of our national life. This is not to say that we have seen times exactly like this before. It is to say that at different times in our past we have experienced some things not totally dissimilar from what we see today.

Our eldest son knows much more than I do about how young people feel and what and how they think. Although he is once again a student, he has had the experience of teaching high school students. I therefore sought his help. He suggested, and I follow his suggestion because I love him dearly and respect him highly, that this graduating class be asked, as Robert Cross, the President of Swarthmore College from which John graduated, recently asked other high school graduates, to exercise their imaginations and to think what one might see if he were sitting on a reasonably distant star looking at the United States. Robert Cross said that:

"He'd see a country that was wracked by violence and distress . . . A country where young people were being conscripted into a military service by a process which they had very little to say about . . . A country in which gross injustices in race relations prevailed, especially between white and black, but also between other ethnic groups . . . A country experiencing an incredibly rapid growth in population, so vast that no one could tell what the end result would be. He might see . . . great concentrations of population in the cities [which] posed problems to which no one had satisfactory answers, and he might be dismayed by the complacency of those who did not live in the cities about what was going on . . . He would be struck, I think, by the immense uncertainties of young people about their personal identity, their relationships with each other, particularly their relationships with members of the opposite sex. Such an observer might despair and might say such a world was . . . not a civilized place at all."

But Robert Cross added:

"Yet a person who is looking from that star today and seeing those phenomena would, my scientist friends tell me, be seeing, not the world of 1969, but the world of 1864."

Our eldest suggested that "once the burn-

ing questions of today have been put into an historical perspective by no means all has been said." Interestingly, and in order to drive home the necessity for historical perspective, he suggested that this class attention be called to the 18th chapter of Ezekiel in which the House of Israel was challenged by the Lord for attempting to use the proverb "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge."

Ezekiel had the Lord's word that "ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb" because, as was the message throughout the chapter, father and son were to be equally and independently judged as to whether either father or son "hath oppressed none, hath spoiled none by violence, hath given his bread to the hungry, and hath covered the naked with a garment . . . and hath executed true judgment between man and man." And Ezekiel said that because "every one . . . would be judged . . . according to his ways" all who made up the House of Israel "must turn yourselves from all your transgressions . . . make you a new heart and a new spirit . . . wherefore turn yourselves, and live."

I do not think that this Nation needs a new heart and a new spirit. I think we desperately need to use the ones we have always had. I also think we need to recognize that most of our troubles and concerns spring from the very strength of her heart, which produces a spirit, while it is never quite realized, nevertheless, will not be denied.

Can anyone reasonably doubt that the heart and spirit of this country is best expressed in the Declaration of Independence? Lincoln, as he so frequently did, spoke for all of us when, as he said on February 22, 1861, while on his way to Washington to assume the Presidency, that "I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence. . . . [The] great principle or idea . . . that kept this Confederacy so long together . . . was . . . that sentiment . . . which gave liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but, I hope, to the world, for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men." And when Lincoln spoke at Gettysburg, the bedrock upon which he based his case was that this Nation, conceived in Liberty, was "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

It is one thing to agree upon the statement of a principle. It is quite another to agree upon the application of that principle to a particular state of facts. Even agreement that an apparently acceptable principle should be applied to a particular state of facts produced disagreement in regard to how such an application should be made and the speed with which it should be applied.

There are all kinds of examples which come immediately to mind. The Sixth Amendment to the Constitution provides, among other things, that "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial . . . and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense." That principle was agreed upon when we first began our experiment with representative government. But the Supreme Court of the United States was not called upon to decide whether one convicted in a State court without any counsel at all was deprived of a federally protected constitutional right until 1963.

When the Court predictably decided that the Constitution meant exactly what it said, and that one who was convicted without any counsel was entitled to a new trial, a considerable howl went up throughout the land because it must be recognized that we have always had among us a substantial number of very noisy people who really have never accepted the very heart of American democracy.



Those howls died down because, generally speaking, the people of the United States have learned, sometimes the hard way, to respect the Supreme Court of the United States. They recognize that, in a very high percentage of the time, history has been on the side of the Court regardless of how temporarily painful its decisions might have been at the time. Once the principle is accepted that all persons accused in a criminal prosecution, the rich and the poor alike, are going to have the assistance of counsel in their defense, sharp disagreement then arises as to how this is going to be accomplished. Should the State have a Public Defenders office? Should the problem be handled in each individual court? Or should the cities establish and pay for their own programs? Those, and many more questions, must be decided. And what is at the heart of how Americans decide questions?

From the time every student (and ex-student) in this room began to participate in the making of group decisions you were taught, primarily by example, that the only rational and peaceful way to decide who was going to be president of your home room, for example, was to have an election. He who received a majority of the votes was declared the choice. Those disappointed in the result came to understand that there would be another year and that your view of whom should have been elected might prevail the next time out. And, most important, you learned to wait until the next election.

There is every evidence that the American people have learned that lesson well because, except in one instance, the election of 1860, we have peaceably accepted the results of our national elections. In 1960 John Kennedy defeated Richard Nixon by an eyelash. And in 1968 Richard Nixon defeated Hubert Humphrey in an equally close election. No rational person dreamed of attempting to say that the people of the United States had not spoken.

You learned before you started high school the theory of representative government and how persons are elected to represent the people residing in their particular areas. That system contemplated that if a representative elected by the people did not cast his vote in accordance with the views of a majority of the people whom he represents that those people will elect someone else to replace him. It was that principle that Lincoln was talking about when he argued for patience in his First Inaugural address by saying in 1861 that "while the people retain their virtue and vigilance, no administration, by any extreme of wickedness or folly, can very seriously injure the government in the short span of four years."

Our arguments and difficulties as a self-governing people arise not so much from an inability to agree on how broad principles should be stated but rather they arise from how those principles are to be applied to particular problems which substantial numbers of people believe is the business of America to do something about. If we depart very far from firm and patient reliance upon the fundamental principle of majority rule then we wander into areas which, in my judgment, are quite dangerous.

There can be no reasonable doubt that both John Adams and Thomas Jefferson were deeply committed to the basic truths which they declared were self evident, that all men are created equal, that all men are endowed with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Those two men labored side by side through the Revolution. They later were completely agreed on the broad principles stated in the Constitution and its Bill of Rights. There simply can be no reasonable doubt that these two men were in solid agreement in regard to how the broad general principles of our government should be stated.

But it is difficult to think of any two men who occupied the Presidency who held more radically different views in regard to the particular means by which justice was to be established, how domestic tranquility was to be preserved, how we should provide for the common defense, how the general welfare should be promoted, and how the blessings of liberty should be secured for themselves and their posterity. It was, of course, for those broad purposes and objectives stated in the Preamble to the Constitution that We, the People, ordained and established our present form of representative government.

When it got down to the implementation of the broad principles stated in the Constitution, both men were undoubtedly shocked by many things the other said and did. Imagine, for example, what Mr. Jefferson thought when he learned that John Adams had suggested that President Washington should be called "His Highness, the President of the United States." And what do you suppose Mr. Adams thought when he read that Thomas Jefferson had written a preface to Tom Paine's *Rights of Man*. It was simply inevitable that the political philosophies of these two men in regard to the means and priorities of governmental action would eventually clash. That is exactly what happened. Jefferson eventually resigned from his post as Secretary of State in Washington's Cabinet, and returned to Monticello. Adams was not at all sorry to see him leave. Indeed, the depth of his emotional feeling was so strong, he wrote his wife that "I am not sorry for it on the whole. . . . His mind is now poisoned with passion, prejudice, and factions."

The two men, however, were thrown back together when John Adams was elected to succeed Washington as President and Jefferson was elected Adams' Vice-President. Any apparent respect for or tolerance of the other's viewpoint became totally ruptured during Adams' Presidency. The conflict over how the agreed objectives of government were to be implemented and carried out led to the inevitable and necessary development of political parties. It was also inevitable that Adams would become the leader of the Federalists and Jefferson the leader of the opposing party which eventually acquired the name Democratic. Adams and his party favored one kind of legislation to accomplish the broad objectives stated in the Constitution, while Jefferson and his party favored another. The intensity with which each held their respective views cannot be overstated. Adams and Jefferson, during the time each was President, undoubtedly looked upon the other as truly a dangerous menace and that the ideas each represented were a threat to the very life of the Republic.

Under these circumstances of extremes and fundamental disagreement what happens next? In France, at about the same period of time, the notion that tocsins should be sounded, barricades should be mounted, and that the people should take to the streets was accepted and acted upon as an appropriate means to attain the declared French ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity. All that noise and violence, of course, produced first, the Reign of Terror; and second, a dictatorship of the Right.

Our American experience was fundamentally different. We borrowed heavily from the English experience and from our own Colonial experience with self-government to the end that we developed a patience and a confidence in the basic soundness of the principle of majority rule. But our experience of a hundred years ago establishes that the basic principle of representative government completely breaks down unless the climate in which it is expected to operate is such that certain prerequisites are permitted to exist. The underlying assumption upon which our system is based is that people are

to be permitted to speak their minds and others are to listen.

Our system is based upon the assumption that one's view is subject to change and that no person, regardless of his position, is infallible. The spirit of the process is well illustrated by Benjamin Franklin's plea to the members of the Constitutional Convention in 1789 when he urged his colleagues to approve that document. He confessed that there were several parts of the Constitution which he did not presently approve but he stated that he had found from experience that he had frequently changed his opinion on many important subjects. Typically, he lightened his argument with recalling "a certain French lady, who, in dispute with her sister, said, 'I don't know how it happens, Sister, that I meet with nobody but myself, that is always in the right.'" He asked every member of the Convention not to be like that lady but he hoped they would join with him and "doubt a little of his own infallibility," to the end that the Constitution be approved.

When the prerequisites of our system of self government are present it is possible to change the course of any administration by ballots rather than bullets. This means, of course, that concerned people of different viewpoints take to the streets for purposes other than mounting barricades. It also means that they pound the pavements for purposes other than mere demonstrations. It means that people seek and find candidates who reflect their point of view. It means that like minded people seek out their neighbors, seeking their votes. In short, it means that one participates in the democratic process rather than mouth meaningless slogans about "participatory democracy."

Participation in such a process by young or by old involves hard, intelligent, and sometimes frustrating work. To say that such work is not worth the candle is arrogantly to deny our heritage as a free people. To say that people today feel so strongly and adamantly about their particular positions that they are not amenable to any possible change or reconciliation is no more than still another denial of our heritage.

Thomas Jefferson and John Adams and the many, many people who agreed with each were at least as far apart politically as any persons or groups which could be named today. John Adams and most of the high ranking leaders of the Federalist party left Washington and refused to return even for Jefferson's inauguration in 1800.

But the climate of that time was becoming comparable to the time in which we live. Hawks and Doves of that day were then fighting each other throughout the land. The country was divided as it had never been before, and the War of 1812 was just around the corner.

It was under those circumstances that John Adams, on New Year's Day, 1812, wrote Thomas Jefferson a letter. Adams suggested he believed that they should attempt to explain themselves to each other. Both men obviously felt and recognized that something had gone wrong somewhere. They therefore commenced what, to me, is one of the most beautiful correspondence in all American history. From 1812 to 1826 they found they were able to speak, to listen, and to explain themselves to each other. Adams was eventually able to write Jefferson that "I admire your Navigation and should like to sail with you either in your Bark, or my own along side of yours; Hope with her gay ensign displayed at the prow; Fear with her Hobgoblins behind the Stern." And this expression was from a man who had earlier said that "I am sometimes Cassandra enough to dream that another Hamilton, another Burr might rend this mighty Fabric in twain."

You are familiar with how the corre-

spondence came to an end. Legend has it that the Liberty Bell received its famous crack on July 4, 1826. It is a matter of history that Jefferson died early in the morning of that Fourth of July and that John Adams died late the same afternoon. Adams' last words were reported to have been: "Thomas Jefferson survives."

There can be no doubt that the heart and the spirit of the Declaration for which Jefferson was primarily responsible still survives. Those who deny that fact of our political life do so at their peril. Jefferson was probably dead when the message he wrote for the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence was read at the celebration in Philadelphia on July 4, 1826. He expressed the hope that the Declaration would "be to the world . . . the signal for arousing men to burst the chains which monkish ignorance and superstition had persuaded them to bind themselves, and to assume the blessings and security of self-government."

Our entire national experience establishes that all governmental proposals and actions are somehow instinctively measured against the consistent challenge and the hopes of the Declaration. Our history also establishes that the only viable way that disagreement about whether a proposal or a course of action squares with the heart and spirit of America is to put the propositions before the people in order that they may cast their votes for representatives who will reflect the articulated majority of the governed. But this not uncomplicated process simply will not work unless concerned people of all ages become active participants in that process and unless all of us are willing to doubt our own infallibility at least to the extent that all persons shall be guaranteed their right to speak and their right to be heard. And all of us, of all ages and in all walks of life, must learn to listen.

But it is very hard for anyone to doubt his own infallibility if he cannot hear what reasonable people have to say. We simply cannot listen to each other when voices get as shrill and strident as many of the voices we hear today. And it is even more difficult to listen when persons, both young and old, undertake by provocative violence to establish confrontations which are calculated to produce even more violence. Those tactics are designedly in the exact pattern of the tocsin sounders who urged the French people to take to the streets two hundred years ago.

Verbal encouragement to violence or to counter-violence, in my judgment, increases the chances that we may never be able to explain ourselves to each other. But I think that probably disturbs me the most is the apparent approval of violence and counter-violence, the illusion of which is created by the silence of many people. The silence of the young is sometimes rationalized by their apparent acceptance of the notion that everyone is entitled to do their own thing. The silence of the young, and much more important, their failure to take appropriate action, means that many other people may erroneously be led to believe that the young have accepted as their leaders the anarchists who are in their age group.

There are similar risks incident to the silence of all groups in our society, other than the young. Silence on their part may give the impression that they believe something which may well be exactly the opposite of their actual views. Can anyone doubt, for example, that many, if not most, of us were surprised when both young and old began to say out loud what they had long been silently thinking in regard to this country's involvement in Asia?

I hope the disagreements that trouble our country today are confined in the main to arguments about how our declared principles

are being realized and executed, rather than about the validity of those principles which represent the heart and spirit of our country. But I fear for our condition unless all of us begin to recognize that if the process of explanation of ourselves to each other is not given top priority and that if we do not learn to listen to each other, we are in deep trouble.

Let us therefore cast away our transgressions against the always old and always new heart and spirit of our country so that we not only turn ourselves and live, but that in due time we shall come closer to the promise of the American dream that the weight shall be lifted from the shoulders of all mankind.

#### COMMISSIONER ALLEN'S RESIGNATION REGRETTED

### HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, the departure from the U.S. Office of Education of its distinguished Commissioner is a source of regret to many Americans, especially to those—the teachers and their pupils—whose interests he had sought so earnestly to serve and whose cause now is blighted by the untimely, unseemly, and ill-advised action of his departing superior in the Department, Secretary Finch.

Commissioner Allen was my constituent in the 29th district of New York before he resigned his position as commissioner of education in New York State to come to Washington at this administration's request. I have known him well for nearly two decades, and have shared the respect and admiration which his associates, other educators, and millions of residents of New York have given him in response to his faithful and effective service.

Many others, as I suggested, also deplore Commissioner Allen's unfortunate departure from the Office of Education.

At this time, I wish to bring to my colleagues' attention the views of some of those who have commented on this unhappy development. These include an editorial, "Political Victim," from the Albany Knickerbocker News; an editorial, "A Blow to Education," from the New York Times; a third editorial, "HEW: Commissioner Allen as a Case Study," from the Washington Post; and a recent column by Carl Rowan which appeared in the Albany Times-Union before Dr. Allen's enforced resignation:

#### POLITICAL VICTIM

"He wasn't a good administrator," says the Nixon Administration in explanation of the firing of Dr. James E. Allen, Jr. as the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Maybe so, although his tenure as New York State Commissioner of Education for 14 years would seem to belie that statement.

Perhaps the fundamental and true reason for the firing of Dr. Allen was that he was his own man—a compassionate man, a courageous man, a man who followed his conscience in preference to following a political banner. Thus, he spoke out against the in-

volvement in Cambodia. He continued to press for integration in schools, even though it be brought about by busing.

It must be noted that Dr. Allen's administrative difficulties resulted in substantial measure from his inability to recruit aids. He complained, on one occasion, that prospective aids could not meet White House approval for political reasons.

It most certainly is the President's prerogative to have men about him who can work with him. But that does not mean they must be subservient to him in a slave-and-master role. Dr. Allen would be no man's slave.

And so James E. Allen, Jr. has become a victim, a victim of—among other things—Administrative double-talk. Oh, no, the Administration would not ask for his resignation for his Cambodia stand. Oh, yes, it liked men of independence among its officials. Most certainly it expected him to remain.

Then the cruelty. That Administration fired him.

#### A BLOW TO EDUCATION

The abrupt dismissal of Dr. James E. Allen Jr. from the key post of United States Commissioner of Education is a reflection not on his leadership capacity but on disorderly governing procedures of this Administration.

Leaked insinuations that Dr. Allen, like his immediate superior ex-Secretary Finch, had been a poor administrator are part of those by now routine attempts to justify high-level firings. Such charges would be more convincing in Dr. Allen's case had he been given an opportunity to administer much of anything. The fact is that "the inordinate influence of partisan political considerations"—to use Dr. Allen's own words—has persistently prevented him for more than one year from making key appointments without which the huge and unwieldy departmental apparatus simply cannot be made to function.

It was a mark of a loyal official that, trying to live with such demeaning frustrations, Dr. Allen repeatedly brushed aside suggestions that he protest interference by the President's political watchdogs.

But Dr. Allen's silently borne limitations were more than procedural. His long-standing commitment to school integration was repeatedly ignored, as his policies were undermined by the Southern strategists in the Justice Department and the President's entourage. Despite Dr. Allen's refusal to take his case to the public, it had become an open secret that Mr. Nixon prepared his controversial school desegregation statement without either the advice or the consent of his chief education official.

The President is, of course, entitled to seek counsel from those who reflect his own outlook. But when he chose his commissioner to preside over the Administration's education policies, Dr. Allen's views were an open book. His liberal and integrationist convictions had made him a nationally recognized force for progress, far in advance of the majority of the nation's public school officials. The integrity that marked his long career made it unlikely he would let himself be used as mere window-dressing.

The breaking point appears to have come with Dr. Allen's characteristically straightforward criticism of the President's Cambodian adventure and the war in Vietnam in general. Considering the depth of the academic community's anti-war feelings, especially among the nation's youth, to have expected the Federal spokesman for education to equivocate on this issue would have been to ask him to lose all self-respect, as well as the respect of his constituency.

The fact that acquiescence in politics and priorities which cut deeply into the support of education was apparently a requirement



for continued tenure will not make it easier to find a man of strong sense of purpose to take Dr. Allen's place.

#### HEW: COMMISSIONER ALLEN AS A CASE STUDY

In its way the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is like the Pentagon or New York City, easy to run (if you don't mind its running itself) but exceedingly hard to govern. Because the so-called "new" agency was never new at all, but rather, from the beginning, a collection of well-established bureaucratic fiefdoms and baronies, each with its special connections among the lobbies and on the Hill, no talent for civil administration short of Henry II's has seemed able to bring it lasting order or organization. To this built-in problem was added another in the early and mid-sixties with the passage of innovative legislation—for schools, civil rights, health care, and so on—which HEW was to administer and which put the department and its top officials smack in the middle of any number of political controversies. So it was never easy to make the department work in an effective way. But the Nixon administration, over the past year and a half, has made it all but impossible to do so, and the case of the missing Education Commissioner—James E. Allen Jr.—goes a certain way to explaining why.

To be sure, there are "Washington reasons" that can be invoked for the unceremonious dumping of this distinguished educator from New York. Even under the Nixon Doctrine (by which we mean the President's self-described policy of not "censoring" the views of Vice President Agnew or Mr. Hickel or any of the other cross-speakers in his administration—see press conference of May 8), you could say that Commissioner Allen was bound to give some offense by failing to conceal his dissent from administration policy on Cambodia. And there is no question that Mr. Nixon had every right to dismiss a man who served at his pleasure and who, while doing so, was under some obligation to follow the official line. But these are minor matters in relation to what Commissioner Allen's saga was all about from the beginning, and the same may be said of the explanations for his dismissal that have been emanating from higher up in the past day, explanations that are not only trivial but in some respects grotesque.

To argue, for instance, as Mr. Ziegler has, that the President was profoundly disappointed in Commissioner Allen's failure to get the "right to read" program off the ground is to assume a great national forgetting of the fact that Commissioner Allen thought this one up himself and floated it first as a trial balloon, managed—once he had done so—to get a warm presidential endorsement, and then saw the whole thing slighted in the budget and left to the realm of fancy rhetoric. The other argument, that Commissioner Allen was a poor administrator, will hardly do either. It is as if the administration had complained after the fact that Leon Panetta was a poor enforcer of the desegregation guidelines: The White House consistently refused to grant political clearance to would-be appointees to Commissioner Allen's staff with the result that the Office of Education was severely undermanned; it visited any number of humiliations upon him—from closing him out of its deliberations on an education message to publicly stating that his testimony on the Hill did not represent the administration view; and, having thus thoroughly demonstrated to his subordinates at HEW that Commissioner Allen counted for little, the administration wonders why he was unable to run his jurisdiction better.

All this is anything but untypical of the state of affairs at HEW, and it bears directly on the meaning that can be read into the

shift of command there, which will see Under Secretary of State Elliot Richardson take over as Secretary of HEW while Robert Finch goes on to become a White House counselor. *Theoretically* the case could be made that everyone involved, plus government itself, will profit from the change. Mr. Richardson, after all, is a man of impressive talents, known not just for his quick mind and broad social sympathies, but also—and perhaps more importantly in this case—for his capacity to deal with and master the problems of bureaucratic sprawl. Moreover, he and HEW could be expected to have an experienced friend in court in the person of Mr. Finch. But Mr. Allen's fate is yet another development that puts all this in the realm of speculation, raising further questions about Mr. Finch's strength and commitments as an advocate and about the capacity of any administrator—never mind how good—to do a good job under hopeless circumstances.

#### JAMES E. ALLEN: A COMFORT IN WASHINGTON (By Carl T. Rowan)

WASHINGTON.—Much has been written about Leon Panetta and other government officials who have resigned or been fired because of their opposition to "Southern strategy" educational policies.

In the center of many a dramatic conflict over racial policies has been James E. Allen, Jr., the commissioner of education.

This noted educator has seen the Nixon administration ignore him, sneak around him and do a hundred things that run counter to his beliefs. But he hangs in there, fighting to get American educators to do what he believes is best for the nation—and all its children.

In his recent speech on school desegregation, President Nixon almost completely ignored warnings from Allen, the top education official in government, that "the elimination . . . of racial segregation in education is . . . the most important educational challenge of our time."

Two weeks before Mr. Nixon's March 24 speech, Allen sent the President a memorandum and a proposed message from Allen imploring the American educator to "do everything he can to achieve educational integration."

Certain of the President's more segregationist advisors were angered. Allen's proposed message was scuttled, and the President proceeded to issue that unfortunate statement in which he opposed government-imposed (de jure) segregation but proposed to coexist with "de facto" segregation that supposedly just sort of arises out of segregated housing patterns.

"Segregation in our schools simply makes a mockery of the concept of equal educational opportunity," Allen's memorandum said. "There is . . . no sophistry or evasion whereby the principle of equality of educational opportunity can be made to accommodate the continuing existence of segregated schools in a democratic society—no matter how difficult the problems involved in eliminating them may be."

Allen took his gagging like a good, faithful servant—but one who was determined that American educators would hear from him, rather than someone like a G. Harrold Carswell, who might get his job if he walked out.

Well, last week Allen finally got a slightly revised version of his suppressed appeal to educators into the public arena. He put it into the record of hearings before a Senate appropriations subcommittee.

Allen, who was New York State commissioner of education before Nixon brought him into the Administration amidst glowing praise and promises, wanted to say that "continued segregation can only weaken the fabric of our society. All our children must live

in a multi-racial world and the school is a natural place in which to introduce them to that world."

Allen wanted to implore educators to "help the public to understand . . . the harmful educational effects of segregation on all our people."

"It is the educator," he said, "who must see to it that debates about means such as busing, neighborhood schools, district boundaries, etc., are not allowed to obscure the ends being sought."

Allen's statement said: "I shall continue to emphasize the educational value of integration, and the educational deprivation of segregation regardless of cause."

Who knows how long James Allen can survive in Washington? He may be trudging in the footsteps of Panetta moments after this column is read in the White House. Or Allen may not wait to be fired.

But it is a comfort to note that while he does not run, he does not buckle under. In the name of decency, justice, better education—for all children—he perseveres.

And in a sadly glorious way he reminds you and me that they also serve who only stay and fight.

#### HOW A SENATOR DELIVERS—OR IS THE PENTAGON FOR REAL?

#### HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, along with my fellow Californians of both political parties, I cheered a recent announcement that North American Aviation had been awarded a Government contract to start work on the B-1 bomber.

I accepted at face value the explanation Pentagon officials offered in support of the award—that the Southern California firm made the strongest presentation, and that contract award would help keep together the Nation's most efficient team of aerospace designers, engineers, and assemblers.

Imagine my surprise, Mr. Speaker, upon learning—from the Governor of California, no less—that we owe this multibillion-dollar contract to the persuasive power of Senator GEORGE MURPHY.

I have for years labored under the apparent delusion that merit was the overriding consideration in making these awards, involving as they do such enormous amounts of the taxpayers' money.

So that our colleagues may share my new sense of enlightenment, I place at this point in the RECORD Governor Reagan's press release of June 5 setting matters straight:

#### GOVERNOR REAGAN'S PRESS RELEASE

The award of the B-1 contract to a California firm was halted today by Governor Ronald Reagan as a "strong example of what men like Senator George Murphy can mean to our state."

"Senator Murphy worked vigorously to point out to the Administration that California's aerospace industry is the most talented in the United States and would be the logical choice for developing and manufacturing this new aircraft.

"He held long discussions with top officials in Washington to secure this award. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator Murphy's value to California is again demonstrated by the award of this contract to our state.

"I am, of course, extremely pleased that California has been selected.

"The 43,000 new jobs this important contract will bring our people will provide a strong shot in the arm to California's economy.

"Working with Senator Murphy, members of the national Republican administration, and the Department of Defense, we have long stressed that California's aerospace industry merited strong consideration in those deliberations which led to the award of the B-1 contract.

"California has led the way in aerospace and military technology for many years. Today's decision bears out the deserving recognition our aerospace industry has received by our nation's leaders in Washington.

"But even more important, the decision demonstrates the value of the close working relationship between our state administration, Senator Murphy and the national administration."

### INCREASING NUMBER OF BALD EAGLE DEATHS

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Interior issued a news release under date of June 5, 1970, reporting on findings that the pesticide dieldrin is causing an increasing number of Bald Eagle deaths.

So that my colleagues may be aware of this disturbing report, I include the text of the Department of the Interior news release at this point in the RECORD:

#### DIELDRIN PESTICIDE CAUSING INCREASING NUMBER OF BALD EAGLE DEATHS

Commissioner Charles H. Meacham of the Interior Department's Fish and Wildlife Service reported today that scientists at Patuxent Wildlife Research Center in Laurel, Md., have detected pesticide poisoning from dieldrin in growing numbers of bald eagles found dead in the United States.

Dieldrin is a persistent pesticide like DDT, but considerably more toxic. Residue analyses are performed at the Patuxent Center, operated by Interior's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, for all bald eagles found dead in the United States by cooperators.

The national bird is declining in numbers in most parts of the country except Alaska, where about 7,000 bald eagles remain.

Commissioner Meacham said that in 1968, the last year for which research results have been completed, 7 of 26 bald eagles examined had high levels of dieldrin in the brain. Two of these birds also were diseased, but dieldrin was the only apparent cause of death in the remaining five. The dieldrin victims came from Florida, Wisconsin, Maryland, Missouri, and South Carolina.

Of the 22 bald eagles found dead in 1967, one from Minnesota had a lethal dosage—9.5 parts per million. Of 21 found dead in 1966, none had lethal levels of dieldrin.

Commissioner Meacham said research at Patuxent indicates that dieldrin is hazardous to eagles when residues in the brain approach about 4 parts per million.

Other birds also are affected by this pesticide. Patuxent reports that an osprey recently found dead in Connecticut had 8 parts per million dieldrin in the brain.

### CHEMICAL MANUFACTURER OPPOSES ELIMINATION OF ASP

**HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ernest May, president of Otto B. May, Inc., Newark, N.J., recently testified before the Ways and Means Committee regarding his opposition to the elimination of the American selling price system of valuation. His testimony is of great importance to the people of my congressional district and to the entire State of New Jersey and I would like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

The material follows:

#### STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO THE ELIMINATION OF THE AMERICAN SELLING PRICE METHOD OF VALUATION ON BENZENOID CHEMICALS

(By Ernest M. May)

I am Ernest M. May, President of Otto B. May, Inc., a dyestuff manufacturing concern founded by my father. Our plant is in Newark, New Jersey, where we have been active in business and community affairs since 1920.

I was technical adviser for the dye industry to the Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations and provided that office with a complete analysis of the dye industry here and abroad, including projections of production and import-export trends.

Our principal product is vat dyes for cotton. It is an extremely labor-intensive family of dyes, the fastest available for cotton textile fabrics.

Although small, our company has been innovative in product development and production methods. We pride ourselves on the quality of service we provide our customers, the Blue Book of the textile industry. We have, for example, designed, built and placed in operation the world's only travelling technical service laboratory to solve problems at customers' plants.

We are here to oppose the Separate Package proposal because it would have a tremendously adverse impact on our company, innovative and enterprising though we are, and because there is no equitable or workable substitute for American Selling Price valuation.

For the products that we manufacture, the Separate Package actually provides for an average additional reduction of 47.3 per cent beyond the 50 per cent duty cuts agreed to in the Kennedy Round.

Our basis for this statement is simple.

We have received written quotations from manufacturers abroad for our line of products.

We first calculated in cents-per-pound the duty that would be applicable under American Selling Price after the full 50 per cent Kennedy Round cut is operative.

Then, using the bona fide price quotations which we obtained from abroad, we calculated the duty in cents-per-pound that would be applicable if the Separate Package were implemented.

The duties calculated for American Selling Price and Separate Package were averaged out for the dyes that comprise one-half of

our product line (55.7 per cent to be exact). The average additional reduction, as a result of the Separate Package, worked out to 47.3 per cent.

The remaining one-half of our manufactured product line is made up of specialty items that are not presently manufactured abroad. But they could be, and we believe that if they were, the same discouraging statistics would apply.

If the Separate Package is enacted, our company would be critically affected. We would be forced to substitute imported products in semi-finished stages for our own manufactured products, causing us to discontinue some of our present manufacturing operations. Based on current estimates, we would discontinue about one-half of our present manufacturing operations. This curtailment would mean the elimination of jobs, primarily among hourly-rated workers.

At our Newark plant, we employ 218 people. Our average annual pay in 1969 was \$8,711 per employee.

Of our work force, 77 per cent is black, and of this number 36 per cent is part of our salaried, supervisory work force. Thanks to on-the-job training received in our plant, these people have advanced to responsible positions in manufacturing, production control and supervision.

The nation, the state of New Jersey, and the city of Newark in particular, cannot afford the loss of these jobs by these men.

We do not think it is fair, moreover, to call upon us to accept a duty cut of nearly 50 per cent on top of a 50 per cent cut which has already been achieved under the Kennedy Round.

The volume of imports is increasing in our field and will continue to increase until the last of the duty cuts becomes effective in 1972. At this point, competitors abroad will merely have to decide which of our products they want to replace, and knock them off one by one, as their production capacity is increased.

Imports and foreign controlled manufacture already account for 50 per cent of dye consumption in the United States.

Isn't this enough? It is more than enough! What this country needs today is not a "Second" giveaway package but a second look at its foreign trade policy and the determination to bring it in line with the realities of international competition in the world marketplace.

### THE 30 YEARS OF SUFFERING BY THE BALTIC STATES

**HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN**

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the sad anniversary of 30 years of suffering by the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia under Soviet captivity. The people of these states have been denied all of their basic human rights of self-determination and the right to freely choose their political states. The Baltic people have been dominated, subjugated, and exploited by the Soviets and forcibly deprived of their God-given rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I believe that all of the Members of Congress and all freedom-loving peoples support the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia in their drive for self-determination rights. Today I am



urging the President of the United States to implement House Concurrent Resolution 416 which was unanimously adopted by the Congress in 1966.

I hope all of us will bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic people.

#### THIS IS MY COUNTRY

### HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at a time when youthful dissenters are monopolizing the newspaper headlines, it is a pleasure to read the words of a young man who appreciates the many benefits of our form of government.

A young constituent of mine, Peter Bierstecker of Combined Locks, Wis., wrote the winning essay in the 1970 Americanism essay contest sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary of the State of Wisconsin. Peter is a ninth-grade student at J. R. Gerritts Junior High School of Kimberly, Wis.

It is with great pride that I include his winning essay:

#### THIS IS MY COUNTRY

I do not have the answers to the Vietnam War, air and stream pollution, population explosion, or the equal rights movement. I only know how I feel about living in the United States of America.

As a pre-schooler I accepted without question all the wonderful things around me. I took for granted the comfort and safety of my home, and the joys out-doors. Then I learned to read and started to study history. The word "regulation" kept popping up. My government had protected the animals in the woods, the fish in the water, and the birds in the sky. It set aside parks to preserve their natural beauty. Through laws they tried to maintain peace and safety for us all whether we were at home or away, on the road, in the air, or on the water. It was at this point that I began to think of my government as a sort of guardian angel—a figure who was always present to guard and protect my rights and freedoms.

Today, I realize that all the wonderful things I have around me are gifts, and that a great price has been paid for these gifts. The cost list is long—Lexington, Valley Forge, Fort Sumter, Gettysburg, Marne, Argonne Forest, Salerno, Normandy, Okinawa, Old Baldy, Pork Chop Hill, Heartbreak Ridge, Korea and Vietnam. Yes, my ancestors left their blood at these places along with their hopes and desires for the future. I hope they all know that their dreams have come true.

Because of them I am being offered all the stepping stones that lead to a promising future. I walk into a library and know that anything and everything I want to read and learn about is available for the asking. I walk into school and know that our education system has been geared to giving me the best. I go camping in the summer time at State and Federal Parks that offer beautiful camp sites; guided nature hikes; and clear lakes for swimming, boating, and fishing. I have written to many departments of our government, and have always received all the help I've asked for. It seems that the government has "left no stone unturned" in its attempt to give me every chance for success and happiness.

I like to think, to dream, and to plan. In what other country could you think, dream, and plan a future like you can in this country? The world has literally been placed at my feet. I will be free to work, eat, sleep, speak, pray, and live as I desire. I can choose my field of work and get the necessary education to accomplish my goal. If my parents cannot financially cover the cost of my education, the government will again be there with a helping hand in the form of loans and grants. It's almost like a dream—a beautiful dream.

The United States of America is my Country. Thank God.

#### AUTHORIZING U.S. FLAGS FOR PRESENTATION TO PARENTS OF DECEASED SERVICEMEN

### HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, my bill authorizing the presentation of the U.S. flag to parents of deceased servicemen comes before the House today, and I would earnestly urge its quick adoption.

Some time ago I faced the sad task, as have we all, of arranging for the presentation of a U.S. flag to the wife of a serviceman from my district who had been killed in the fighting in Vietnam.

I also desired to make a similar presentation to the parents, but found that no provisions existed in the law permitting such. The current regulation states that the U.S. flag shall be presented to the surviving spouse or next-of-kin only. My bill would amend the rule so that a second flag may be provided for the parents or persons who have served in a parental capacity. I think that this is only fitting since the flag has an equally precious meaning to the parents as well as to the widow.

There can be no real understanding by others of the deep grief which engulfs a family when the grim word comes that a loved one has died in the service of his country. The presentation of the flag can serve in some small way to speak for the rest of us in the Nation, letting the parents as well as the widow, know that we share in their sorrow and join in their prayers.

There are many others here, I know, who join me in these feelings. Sixty Members of Congress have cosponsored the bill or have proposed similar pieces of legislation. The measure has the unanimous endorsement of the House Committee on Armed Services. It is strongly recommended by the Department of Defense, and there is no opposition to its passage by the Bureau of the Budget.

It is appropriate that this proposal come before the House on the day after Flag Day, a time when all join in paying honor to the stars and stripes as a symbol of the freedom we enjoy in this Nation. The flag is also a symbol of the sacrifices made by our sons and daughters in preserving that freedom. Adoption of this bill today will be another way of showing our deep gratitude for their sacrifices.

#### IS HARVARD AWAKENING?

### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of discussion in recent weeks of a plan which I believe originated at Princeton University that would permit classes to be suspended for 2 weeks next fall so that students might campaign for "antiwar" candidates before the election.

While Princeton and a few other schools are adopting this program, it is interesting to see that Harvard University is not going along and the faculty, by an overwhelming vote, has rejected the whole idea.

An editorial appearing in the Sunday, June 14, 1970, edition of the Chicago Tribune discusses the Harvard decision and I ask that it be placed in the RECORD at this point.

#### IS HARVARD AWAKENING?

Harvard University, which has done so much to make dissent fashionable, may now be realizing that dissent can be carried too far. On Monday, by an overwhelming vote, the faculty rejected a proposal to suspend classes for two weeks next fall so that students [and no doubt faculty members, too] might campaign for anti-war candidates before the election.

The faculty approved a motion declaring that the university's function is learning and scholarship, not politics, and that political decisions "must be individual, not institutional." It said that when a faculty or a university "accommodates its work or reshapes its goals to political purposes, however worthy, its function will be jeopardized, its quality eroded, and its existence ultimately brought into question."

The faculty was not even in a mood for compromise. It rejected a resolution providing that while classes should be held as usual, students who departed for the campaign should not be penalized for the work they missed.

The faculty which has now condemned the intrusion of politics into academic affairs is the same faculty, curiously enough, which only last year voted for purely political reasons to deprive R.O.T.C. of its academic standing.

It had begun to look as if Harvard, the most prestigious university in the country, were becoming a sort of Berkeley East where the venerable motto of "Veritas" [Truth] was being battered about by transitory and emotional winds. Harvard has given a certain academic respectability to student strikes and riots, faculty participation and encouragement, and administrative submission.

Steven Kelman, a Harvard senior [just graduated], described in his book, "Push Comes to Shove," how Harvard has been polarized by a handful of agitators. Later, visiting Northwestern University for The Tribune, he found once again that the instigators of violence were a small group—and that almost every one of them came from the east or west coasts. Harvard and the University of California at Berkeley have become models of disruption to be emulated by dissenters all over the country.

In the light of all this, it is encouraging that Harvard seems to be reversing the trend; that while Princeton and other universities are bending to the demand for time off for electioneering, or giving academic credit to students who have done little to deserve it,

Harvard seems to be moving back onto the academic reservation.

Nor is it wholly irrelevant to note that Vice President Agnew has chosen as his chief speech writer J. C. Helms, 29 years old, who attended Harvard as an undergraduate and has just received a Harvard graduate degree in philosophy. Mr. Helms attracted attention last summer when, testifying before a Senate subcommittee, he delivered what one senator called "a ringing indictment of the Harvard administration" for capitulating to violence.

Fads come and go quickly, fortunately, and if Harvard shows that it is no longer willing to play along with the present fad of mixing politics and education, it will redeem its worthy reputation and serve as a good example for weaker university administrations elsewhere.

## TWENTY-SIX YEARS OF OBSTACLES

### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to note an article which appeared in the Evening Star recently lauding the exemplary voting record of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable CHARLES E. BENNETT. I want to bring this article to the particular attention of my colleagues for I am certain there are none among us who have not admired the full extent of Congressman BENNETT's able and dedicated efforts on behalf of his Florida constituents and our country. He is a longtime, serious, and devoted public servant, and those whom he represents in the Congress are indeed fortunate.

I submit the article for reprinting in the RECORD:

BENNETT'S VOTE RECORD: 20 YEARS OF OBSTACLES

(By Dillon Graham)

Rep. Charles E. Bennett overcame broken limbs, grounded planes, snowstorms and stalled elevators to capture the longest consecutive voting record in congressional history.

The Florida Democrat has cast 2,467 consecutive roll call votes in a series that started June 5, 1951. He broke former Rep. Paul Brown's record of 16 years, seven months and 27 days.

What was Bennett's closest squeak?

He thinks it was the time he started driving from his Falls Church, Va., home in a snowstorm at 7 a.m. and skidded into a ditch. He walked to a bus stop but the bus took three hours for a normal 45 minute run.

HE WALKED ALL THE WAY

"That left me more than a dozen blocks from the Capitol with no buses or cabs in sight. I walked all the way, falling twice.

"I walked up those long snow-covered steps on the West Front of the Capitol and into the House where a roll call was in process and almost ended. A few minutes more and I would have been too late," he said.

His record is all the more remarkable because he has to wear a long brace on his right leg and walk with a cane. He contracted polio while a guerrilla fighter in the Philippines during World War II.

He has kept his record going despite breaking one leg four times and both arms. In 1968, when he had a broken leg, he went to the House in a wheelchair to vote.

Once he was in an elevator in the Capitol with other congressmen when it stalled during a roll call. They opened the top of the

cage and pushed him through it so he could reach the chamber.

When his daughter, Lucinda, was born seven years ago, Bennett took his wife to the hospital in early morning and waited with her until mid-afternoon.

"The doctor told me it would be late that night before the baby would be born so I decided to drive to the Capitol and see what was doing. I walked in in the midst of an unexpected roll call. Even if they had alerted me at the hospital when a vote was called I would have been too far away to have arrived in time," he said.

SPENDING WEEKEND AT HOME

Bennett recalls the Sunday night he was spending a weekend in his Jacksonville home when he learned that flights to Washington had been cancelled because of snow.

"The train for Washington had already left. But I knew that another train from South Florida passed through a town not too far from Jacksonville. So I raced to that community, flagged the train and bought my ticket on board," he said.

Once he broke a leg and his doctor would not allow him to leave the hospital when a vote was expected because the cast had not hardened.

"I telephoned the floor manager of the bill, told him how anxious I was to keep my voting record intact and asked him to delay the vote until the next day. This required unanimous consent of the House but the floor manager asked for and received it.

"I was on hand to vote the next day," he said.

## DAY OF MOURNING IN BALTICS

### HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a day of mourning in the Baltic States of Europe for it brought to mind that night in 1941 when 60,000 men, women, and children were arrested, dragged from their homes, herded into cattle cars and shipped like freight to the most forbidding regions of the Soviet Union. This was the first mass deportation, followed by others in 1945 and 1949, in which over half a million Baltic people eventually perished.

These wonderful people had lived in peace for 22 years under the peace treaty of 1920 and the League of Nations. They had built their hospitals and schools, and their individual economies on a basis of peace and freedom. The Soviet Union, however, did not honor this peace, and these tiny nations were overrun. For almost 30 years now the Russians have been trying to wipe out any trace of the Baltic States, but they can never erase the memories of freedom that still dwell in the hearts of the Baltic people everywhere. Many Latvians, Estonians, and Lithuanians who fled their homelands during the last 30 years have settled in my congressional district. It is through them that I have come to know how precious is the freedom we as a Nation take so for granted.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to look upon June 14 not as a day of mourning, but as a day of dedication to freedom, a day on which we all rededicate ourselves to the cause of peace everywhere.

## THE ART OF RED BARN CAMPAIGNING

### HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, for some years now, those of us from the southern tier of New York State have had the pleasure of reading the caustic wit and wisdom of the "Bard of Binghamton," Tom Cawley. Mr. Cawley's column regularly appears in the Binghamton Evening Press; and his field of vision has extended to a wide variety of matters. He is undoubtedly the principal authority on local lore and history, he is an expert on the species "man," and his observations on the gyrations of people both famous and infamous have made him widely read and widely appreciated.

Last week, the New York Times printed a column by Tow Cawley which first appeared in the Evening Press. The column reveals the keen eye which has made him a great reporter; and it reveals also the sharp, but warm humor which has made him such an outstanding person. I insert the full column, which takes a humorous look at downstate campaigners adjusting to the upstate constituency, because I know it is bound to be enjoyed by many of my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, June 6, 1970]

TOPICS: THE ART OF RED BARN CAMPAIGNING

(By Tom Cawley)

BINGHAMTON, N.Y.—In the 1966 campaign for Governor, Frank O'Connor of New York City stepped out of an airplane at Binghamton, ready to read a statement carefully prepared for the occasion. It was a lyrical tribute to Broome County, queen of dairyland.

A local political reporter glanced through the text swiftly and muttered to a city boy from the New York Times who had accompanied O'Connor on his upstate grope, "There haven't been any cows around here since Mrs. O'Leary ruined their image." The word got back to the Democratic nominee. His advisers suppressed the statement immediately and Mr. O'Connor ad libbed something or other.

His confusion was no less than that of Averell Harriman, who is at home in New Delhi, Paris and Sun Valley, but, like most politicians from the big city, awash in disorientation upstate. During a campaign, on the eve of Election Day, Mr. Harriman made a brief appearance at the door of his airplane at Binghamton and murmured how delighted he was to find himself once again in Elmira.

It is a political axiom to all residents of the vast upstate spaces that all candidates for public office live in Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn or Long Island. Every four years, with their regalia clanking, their press aides whispering hoarsely, "No, not Binningtin, it's Bing-ham-ton!", their outriders alert for Indian raiding parties, the candidates venture north of Riverdale to distribute trinkets to the natives.

HORSES AND HIGHWAYS

They strive wistfully to identify with the picture their speech writers paint. They are briefed on new-mown hay. The children in the big centralized school districts of the sprawling suburbs around the industrial centers occasionally do get to see new-mown hay in a TV educational film given over to the quaint old practice of farming, featuring posed hayseeds.



They are filed in on red-painted barns. There are so few operable barns that a horse's neigh scares the drag racers off the four-lane highways that crisscross upstate. They are given the picture of bewhiskered old Yorkers whose conversation consists of "Yup." The only beards to be found upstate are on the 45-odd huge State University campuses that gradually are pushing the Adirondack Mountains back into Canada, and where conversation has graduated beyond one clean syllable.

The Red Barn Syndrome is the fault of the New York City political reporters. At least once during every statewide campaign, every New York writer is required to write one misty, Iroquois-smoke-tinted mood piece about the new red paint on the barns along Broome County roads, or lose his franchise.

The fact is that public safety experts have taboored red as a color for roadside objects because at night the human eye has great difficulty detecting anything painted red. This is known as Perkinje's Shift, the discovery of Dr. J. E. Perkinje (1787-1869). It is because of Perkinje's Shift that upstate fire trucks are being painted yellow, but that's another story.

#### IN THE STICKS

The New York politicians try so strenuously to relate to the sticks that they overdo it. The late Senator Robert F. Kennedy (who delighted in saying, "I'm off to Johnson City" to the confusion of his advisers, who thought the only Johnson City was along the Peder-nales River) took upstate to his bosom.

In a rush of affection, he got thirteen of its counties, gleaming with industrial plants and bursting with affluence, declared as part of Appalachia. This still has the boards of directors in the country clubs of Broome County fidgeting as they hoist their bonded whisky and toast the ways of downstate campaigners.

#### COMMEMORATING CAPTIVITY OF BALTIC STATES

### HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today is indeed a sad day in the history of freedom and independence.

It was on this day 30 years ago that the peace-loving peoples of the Baltic States were forced under the domination of Soviet rule. We commemorate this tragic anniversary as an unfortunate example of man's occasional inhumanity to his fellow man in the hope that the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia will once again enjoy the freedom they once knew.

The Baltic States have sought peace throughout their history. But geography placed them in a vulnerable position: That of small states resting in the shadow of a giant nation, Russia.

Russian Communism did not reach Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia through legal or democratic processes although the Kremlin likes to claim that the Balts voted for inclusion into the Soviet realm.

This incorporation brought with it a brutal occupation, costing these people nearly one-quarter of their population and endangering the survival of Baltic culture and traditions.

The United States has refused to recognize this seizure and subjugation of

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviet Union. Further, the memory of this tragedy should encourage action insuring against yet another.

It is with this in mind that we must work to build a world in which small nations can retain their individuality and where self-determination can mean more than mere words.

In observing this anniversary, we extend our expression of concern to people of Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian descent in our land and about the globe, assuring them we have not forgotten.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION MUST GIVE MORE EFFORT TO THE FUTURE

### HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, last week I warned this House that the administration's "fire brigade" technique on the economy would push them from crisis to crisis. The newest crisis is "illiquidity." Corporations, governments, and individuals are finding it increasingly difficult to have and hold on hand sufficient money to service their cash flow requirements. Pressure predictably will now mount for the Federal Reserve to increase the money supply above 4 percent. This will give us no end of agonizing, for industrial output for May fell by 0.8 percent, the largest decline in 10 months of steadily reduced production. Since production is the indicator for new wealth and new wealth is the supporter of new money, you do not have to be a graduate economist to see that this situation is not a comfortable one.

I predict, however, that the money supply will be increased. This will be accepted domestically but will increase the already perceived rumblings from international quarters about the soundness of the dollar. We can anticipate a new play by the "gold group" to replay the whole scenario on the drive for gold reserves and an accompanying pressure on the dollar. Fighting the gold group is like battling crabgrass—any letup or any opportunities are quickly exploited and gains are immediately threatened. In short, then, attention to the internal crisis of illiquidity will rekindle the dual external crises of gold flow and attacks on the American dollar.

On another front, the truly effective weapon against inflation is increasingly evident—unemployment. The latest figures show another marked increase. Five percent will soon be giving way to a prediction of 6 percent as the deterioration effects in the economy take hold. Although the Wall Street Journal had an article on today's front page explaining why the present figures were not all that bad, the full story is more complex and less favorable. Many persons in the work force are becoming underemployed. That is to say, engineers, draftsmen, production specialists, and even scientists are taking jobs far beneath their capabilities

and far below the salary level they had been receiving. The purchasing power in several areas of the country, such as Michigan and southern California, will be lowered more significantly than the present unemployment figures would indicate. This will be followed by unemployment in other segments once the effects of this reduction in spendable income in these specific areas begins to reach out. It is a grave error to cover these facts with the national figures, because their specific serious nature will eventually affect the national picture.

I predict that the administration will immediately pick up attention to and express concern for legislation aimed at alleviating the pangs of unemployment. The Youth Conservation Corps is a likely candidate for this crisis attention. It will not, nor do I expect other like measures, to bring effective solution to our basic problems.

As I have said before, the real answer is in developing new thrusts for the use of our industrial complex and its technological and scientific skills. A directed flow of both manpower resources and capital resources to a dynamic new assault on transportation; an innovative and carefully executed plan for water reclamation and pollution control; a sensible and well-financed effort in rehabilitation of old cities and location and induced building of new cities; and an organized program for long-range ocean research and ocean resource expansion.

Without a new set of goals and programs sensibly funded to attain such goals, we will not be creating acceptable wealth in consort with the new values and standards which really give people the confidence they now lack in both our economy and in our money.

The administration must give more effort to the future and less to firefighting. They need to stop fiddling and start composing. Our people need the new themes to march by and they are getting the ricky-ticky tunes of the past played more for diversion than for direction.

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS

### HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 1940—30 years ago today—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were invaded and occupied.

The Balts are proud peoples who have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic from time immemorial. For instance, this year marks the 719th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251.

The Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians have suffered for centuries from the "accident of geography." From the west they were invaded by the Teutonic Knights and from the east by the Russians.

Since the beginning of Soviet occupation, the Balts have waged an intensive fight for freedom. The U.S. Government has refused to recognize the "incorporation" of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union. We maintain diplomatic relations with the former free Governments of the Baltic States. Since June 1940, all the Presidents of this country have stated our nonrecognition policy.

In 1966, the Congress adopted House Concurrent Resolution 416 which calls for freedom for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. I would like to conclude my remarks with a copy of that resolution. I hope my colleagues and the American people will read it closely on this 30th anniversary of occupation:

H. CON. RES. 416

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—  
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

CXVI—1249—Part 15

DDT: A DECISION FROM THE MADISON HEARING

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in December 1968, extensive hearings by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources were initiated on the subject of DDT. Those hearings, held in Madison, were to determine whether DDT should be classified as a water pollutant and, therefore, subject to regulation under the State Water Quality Act.

Those hearings went on for many weeks and resulting testimony filled thousands of pages. This was the first assault on the merits and demerits of this chemical, and many persons have anxiously been awaiting the results of that hearing for some time.

A ruling on this case has been made, Mr. Speaker, and it is most gratifying for those who have been pleading the case against DDT for many years.

After reviewing the thousands of pages of hearing testimony, the hearing examiner for the State Department of Natural Resources has reported the following regarding DDT:

Its ingestion and dosage therefore cannot be controlled . . . and minute amounts of the chemical, while not producing observable clinical effects, do have biochemical, pharmacological and neurophysiological effects of public health significance.

In short, Mr. Speaker, he has ruled after much consideration that DDT is harmful to humans as well as to fish and wildlife. As a result, the examiner has ruled that this chemical and one or more of its related chemicals is an environmental pollutant under State law.

This decision is one of the most significant to date regarding pesticides and the environment. Most significant is the fact that it is a decision based not on emotion, but on facts. It is a welcome decision and will certainly be considered when States other than Wisconsin establish water quality standards.

A newspaper article announcing the decision appears below:

DDT RULED DANGEROUS FOR HUMANS

MADISON, Wis.—The hearing examiner in Wisconsin's famed DDT inquiry has ruled that DDT is harmful to humans and subject to regulation under the state water quality act.

Maurice Van Susteren said in a 29 page ruling mailed out last week that it was not possible to set tolerance levels for DDT because it had the characteristic of being accumulated and stored in the human body and the food chain of aquatic life and some animals.

He added:

"Its ingestion and dosage therefore cannot be controlled . . . and minute amounts of the chemical, while not producing observable clinical effects, do have biochemical, pharmacological and neurophysiological effects of public health significance."

HURTS FISH, BIRDS

In addition, he said, DDT at chronic low levels was harmful to fish by reducing their resistance to stress and it interfered with

the reproductive processes of fish eating birds.

Because of this Van Susteren said, DDT and one or more of its related chemicals was an environmental pollutant under the law.

The hearing was held on a petition of the Citizens Natural Resources Association and Wisconsin Izaak Walton League for a declaratory ruling on whether DDT could be banned as pollutant.

The hearing began Dec. 2, 1968, and lasted several weeks. Testimony filled 2,811 pages of transcript and the exhibits filled another 1,690 pages.

SALE, USE NOW BANNED

The Industry Task Force for DDT of the National Agricultural Chemicals Association defended the chemical. Victor J. Yannacone, Jr., Patchogue, N.Y., acted as "prosecutor" for the Environmental Defense Fund that opposed DDT.

Since the hearing, the Wisconsin Legislature banned the sale or use of DDT in Wisconsin. However, the petitioners were anxious to get Van Susteren's ruling as precedent for use in other states.

EDF and Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.) have been seeking a national ban.

The defenders of DDT can appeal the ruling to Natural Resources Secretary L. P. Voight and then to Dane County Circuit Court under administrative review.

BENEFITS NOT AN ISSUE

Van Susteren quoted liberally from the voluminous testimony in his ruling.

He noted the great economic benefits from DDT in agriculture and pest control and added: "Without doubt, DDT has provided enormous economic benefits, but economic benefits are not an issue or part of any issue in this case."

He said in his opinion:

"Clinically observable toxic effects of DDT in humans are obtained only with extremely large dosages by sudden extreme exposure. . . . Clinically observable effects are evident injury, illness, loss of body function which directly inconveniences a person at work and at play. Toxicity, as the word is ordinarily expressed, is related to dosage, which in turn is related to storage.

FOUND EVERYWHERE

"DDT is ubiquitous. It is found in the atmosphere, soil, water and in food in what might be considered minute amounts. The chemical property of being soluble in lipid or fat tissue results in storage primarily in the body fat and nervous systems in all organisms in all levels of food chains. It is therefore impossible to establish levels, tolerances or concentrations at which DDT is toxic or harmful to human, animal and aquatic life.

ISRAELIS FEAR WAR OF ATTRITION  
AS SOLDIER DEATHS MOUNT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, amid mounting Russian-inspired agitation and violence, Israel has been trying valiantly to maintain its independence and equilibrium in the troubled Middle East. In this small beleaguered country, each terrorist bombing and death is a very personal thing. The casualty may well be a relative or the child next door. Ray McHugh of the Copley News Service has captured a part of the spirit of Israel in the following June 4 feature story from



the San Diego Union and I am pleased to share it with my House colleagues:

ISRAELIS FEAR WAR OF ATTRITION AS  
SOLDIER DEATHS MOUNT

(By Ray McHugh)

JERUSALEM.—The little procession of soldiers, led by a rabbi, walked at slow cadence through the Jerusalem street and busy crowds grew silent.

Men bared their heads and twisted their hats awkwardly in their fingers. Women bowed their heads. A few sobbed and the words of ancient Hebrew prayers hung in the warm afternoon air.

War is a strangely personal thing in this little country.

Each victim of Egyptian artillery along the Suez Canal or El Fatah mines along the Jordanian, Syrian and Lebanese borders is literally "the boy next door."

Evening newscasts lead off with the names and addresses of any soldiers killed that day.

"To delay even a few minutes would provoke thousands of telephone calls from anxious mothers, said a radio newsman.

This family concept may have an important bearing on Israel's policies in this period of diplomatic impasse and rising casualties.

"We are not prepared, physically or emotionally, for a long drawn-out war of attrition, said a university professor. "We lost 30 to 35 men killed in May. We cannot afford such losses. We will have to take some kind of action."

Israel has less than 3 million people—only 2.5 million Jews—and they are knitted together by adversity. Those of middle age and older remember the horrors of World War II in Europe, the persecutions and ostracism of hostile Arab lands like Yemen, Morocco, Iraq, or the struggle in Palestine, first to build homes, then to claim independence from the British mandate and encircling Moslem nations.

Younger adults are veterans of the 1956 and 1967 wars and the years of privation that have turned Israel, despite its conflicts, into a garden spot in the largely arid Middle East.

Some are prone to dismiss the development of Israel as a product of the financial backing by American and Western European Jews. Bitter Arabs will charge that the Israelis "stole" the rich soil of Palestine and drove off Arabs whose roots here were 5,000 years old. Some say the Israelis inherited and improved an already well-organized British administration.

In each point there is a seed of truth, but even put together they do not explain or diminish the accomplishments of Israel.

Now faced with direct Soviet participation on the side of Egypt, many commentators say Israel is living in its "darkest hour." Foreign Minister Abba Eban refuses to use such dramatic terms.

"I do not deal in comparisons," he said. "Suffice it to say that the situation is more dangerous than it was a month ago."

The average Israeli in the street, however, does not always share the quiet confidence of the urbane minister.

"It is a tragic comedy," said a Romanian-born taxi driver who fled Bucharest and the Russians more than 20 years ago and who now has a 21-year-old son serving on the Suez front.

"It is as if the Russians were pursuing us, determined to destroy us."

Oddly enough, the three prime ministers who have led Israel since it declared its independence in 1948 were all born in Russia. David Ben-Gurion and the late Levi Eshkol fled the pogroms of the czars and came to Palestine before World War I. Golda Meir was taken to America as a girl of 5 and raised in Milwaukee where she became a schoolteacher before emigrating to Palestine in the 1920s.

She still tells the story of an older sister, marked by experiences in Russia, who ran screaming from a Milwaukee parade when she saw mounted policemen who she thought were "Cossacks."

Eshkol, in an interview before his death in 1969, told this writer about spending weeks locked in his home in what was Lithuania as the czar's police searched for Jews.

In another interview, Ben-Gurion spoke almost wistfully of the 3 million Jews still living in the Soviet Union and of the contribution they could make to his little country. None of this is lost on the Israelis.

Doubt and disappointment have tempered the excitement that followed the six-day war of 1967. The peace they thought they had won has slowly slipped like sand through their fingers. But hope lives almost fiercely in these people.

"Give peace a chance to breathe," pleads Eban.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING SAFETY  
AND HEALTH STANDARDS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the dignity and importance of the American workingman has been attested to time and time again by this Congress.

Currently, the House Education and Labor Committee is considering legislation which I, and a number of others, have introduced, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1969.

This legislation would establish safety and health standards for all American workers in all industries and work areas.

The commissioners of Allegheny County, where my city of Pittsburgh is located, have issued a resolution urging passage of this bill.

As Commissioners Staisey, Foerster, and Hunt say of workingmen, these safety standards represent their just due. In other words, we owe this legislation to the working American.

I would like to introduce this resolution into the RECORD and urge my colleagues to vote for the establishment of national safety and health standards:

RESOLUTION OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY BOARD  
OF COMMISSIONERS

Whereas, this nation owes its undisputed position as the greatest and most powerful civilization the world has ever seen to the limitless skills and driving energies of its work force; and

Whereas, the daily toll of this work force of men and women has generated the great bounty of peace and prosperity as well as the military might needed to defend our freedoms; and

Whereas, safe and healthful working conditions for this work force is a fundamental necessity if our national growth is to continue and our resources are to be utilized fully; and

Whereas, legislation on a national scale is the logical means to ensure such safe and healthful conditions in order to prevent a hodgepodge of state and local laws which could bring chaos without federal law to provide meaningful standards; and

Whereas, legislation to ensure the required federal standards for health and safety for our workers has been introduced into the U.S. House of Representatives by the Honor-

able William S. Moorhead, of the 14th District of Pennsylvania, and the Honorable Joseph Gaydos, of the 20th District of Pennsylvania.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that this Board of Commissioners of Allegheny County commend these Representatives and make known our total support of such legislation; and

Be it further resolved that this Board strongly urge the Congress of the United States to enact into law without delay a measure which will provide our working people the safeguards which are no more than their just due.

Resolved and enacted this 7th day of May, 1970.

LEONARD STAISEY,  
THOMAS J. FOERSTER,  
WILLIAM HUNT,

Board of County Commissioners.

Attest:

THOMAS B. CARPENTER,  
Chief Clerk.

BALTIC PEOPLES LOST THEIR  
FREEDOM 30 YEARS AGO

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 30th anniversary of the loss of independence by the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and their absorption into the Soviet Union.

Estonia and Latvia were independent nations until the 13th century and Lithuania remained independent until 1386, when it established a union with Poland that lasted until the Russian partition of Poland in 1795. During World War I, patriots in the three nations took advantage of the weakening of the czarist regime in Russia and declared themselves independent nations.

Attempts by the Russian Red army to destroy the new states proved futile and the countries entered into peace treaties with the Soviet Union guaranteeing the independence and sovereignty of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania "voluntarily and forever." The Baltic States were admitted to membership in the League of Nations in 1921.

During World War II, however, the Soviets charged these three countries with forming a military alliance against Russia and demanded the establishment of friendly governments. This ultimatum was followed by invasion of Lithuania 30 years ago today—June 15, 1940—and Estonia and Latvia 2 days later.

Mr. Speaker, the United States never has recognized the incorporation of the Baltic area into the Soviet Union. House Concurrent Resolution 416, passed on June 21, 1965, in this body and on October 22, 1966, by the Senate, urged the President to direct the attention of the United Nations to the fact that the Soviet Union has violated the United Nations Charter by occupying Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

On this 30th anniversary of the conquest of the Baltic nations, let us remember that people of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian ancestry through-

out the world look forward to the day when they can return to their homelands in freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud to be a member of the Honorary Committee of Americans for Congressional Action to Free the Baltic States. I call to my colleagues' attention the following material prepared by this organization and House Concurrent Resolution 416:

RED TERROR IN LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA

The Kremlin is fond of saying that Russian imperialism died with the czar. But the fate of the Baltic nations—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—shows this to be a cruel fiction. The Communist regime did not come to power in the Baltic States by legal or democratic process. The Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by force of arms. The Soviets invaded and occupied the Baltic States in June of 1940, and the Baltic peoples have been suffering in Russian-Communist slavery for 30 years.

The Balts are proud peoples who have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic from time immemorial. For instance, this year marks the 719th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251.

The Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians have suffered for centuries from the "accident of geography." From the West they were invaded by the Teutonic Knights, from the East by the Russians. It took remarkable spiritual and ethnic strength to survive the pressures from both sides. The Balts, it should be kept in mind, are ethnically related neither to the Germans nor the Russians.

After the Nazis and Soviets smashed Poland in September of 1939, the Kremlin moved troops into the Baltic republics and annexed them in June of 1940. In one of history's greatest frauds, "elections" were held under Red army guns. The Kremlin then claimed that Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia voted for inclusion in the Soviet empire.

Then began one of the most brutal occupations of all time. Hundreds of thousands of Balts were dragged off to trains and jammed into cars without food or water. Many died from suffocation. The pitiful survivors were dumped out in the Arctic or Siberia. The Baltic peoples have never experienced such an extermination and annihilation of their people in their long history through centuries as during the last three decades. Since June 15, 1940, these three nations have lost more than one fourth of their entire population. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight.

Since the very beginning of Soviet Russian occupation, however, the Balts have waged an intensive fight for freedom. During the period between 1940 and 1952 alone, some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the invaders. The cessation of armed guerrilla warfare in 1952 did not spell the end of the Baltic resistance against Soviet domination. On the contrary, resistance by passive means gained a new impetus.

The Government of the United States of America has refused to recognize the seizure and forced "incorporation" of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by the Communists into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Our Government maintains diplomatic relations with the former free Governments of the Baltic States. Since June of 1940, when the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, all of the Presidents of the United States (Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Richard M. Nixon) have stated, restated and confirmed

our country's nonrecognition policy of the occupation of the Baltic States by the Kremlin dictators. However, our country has done very little, if anything, to help the suffering Baltic peoples to get rid of the Communist regimes in their countries.

The case of the Baltic States is not a question about the rights of self-rule of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, since this is established beyond any reasonable doubt, but the question is how to stop the Soviet crime and restore the freedom and independence of these countries. The Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R., created by the 83rd Congress, after having held 50 public hearings during which the testimony of 335 persons was taken, made a number of recommendations to our Government pertaining to the whole question of liberation of the Baltic States. According to the findings of this House committee, "no nation, including the Russian Federated Soviet Republic, has ever voluntarily adopted communism." All of them were enslaved by the use of infiltration, subversion, and force. The American foreign policy toward the Communist enslaved nations, the aforesaid House committee stated, must be guided by "the moral and political principles of the American Declaration of Independence." The present generation of Americans, this committee suggested, should recognize that the bonds which many Americans have with enslaved lands of their ancestry are a great asset to the struggle against communism and that, furthermore, the Communist danger should be abolished during the present generation. The only hope of avoiding a new world war, according to this committee, is a "bold, positive political offensive by the United States and the entire free world." The committee included a declaration of the U.S. Congress which states that the eventual liberation and self-determination of nations are "firm and unchanging parts of our policy."

At a time when the Western powers have granted freedom and independence to many nations in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world, we must insist that the Communist colonial empire likewise extends freedom and independence to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia whose lands have been unjustly occupied and whose rightful place among the nations of the world is being denied. Today and not tomorrow is the time to brand the Kremlin dictators as the largest colonial empire in the world. By timidity, we invite further Communist aggression.

Recently the U.S. Congress has made a right direction by adopting H. Con. Res. 416 that calls for freedom for Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. All freedom-loving Americans should urge the President of the United States to implement this legislation by bringing the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States to the United Nations. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial in the whole or in part, any place in the world, including the Soviet Union is surely intolerable.

H. CON. RES. 416

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH BY CHAPLAIN MAJ. LAWRENCE B. GRAHAM

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day is always a time of reflection and soul searching which causes each of us not only to reaffirm our opposition to conflict among nations but also to pay homage to those who have given their lives in defense of freedom.

Many fine addresses were made on Saturday, May 30, and I had the privilege of attending one at City Point National Cemetery in Hopewell, Va., at which Chaplain Maj. Lawrence B. Graham, of Fort Lee, was the speaker. I do not believe that I have heard a more challenging address than the one made by Chaplain Graham on that occasion. I was so much impressed with it that I have asked him for permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it can be read by not only other Members of Congress but by the public at large.

I take pleasure in inserting this speech in the RECORD and commend it to the reading of the Members of the House.

The speech follows:

MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH BY CHAPLAIN MAJ. LAWRENCE B. GRAHAM

Each year at this time we, individually and collectively, honor those men of combat who in the common defense have made the supreme sacrifice—a sacrifice which cannot be bought by all the resources known to man—a sacrifice that transcends the greatness of all that is great—a sacrifice so unique that scientists over the centuries are still trying to understand it: The sacrifice of life itself.

To most of us, this commemoration is traditionally depicted by scenes of the quiet cemetery up on the hill outside of town. It is hopefully a bright sunny day with a gentle breeze tuffing the grass blades and bending the shade trees ever so slightly. The off-white tombstones stand in proportioned lines, looking somewhat like military forces in battle



array. Here and there gravesites are watched over by small American flags. There are speeches and remembrance ceremonies conducted in big and little places on this day. There is the music and the lonely sound of "taps." Then everyone goes home.

This traditional scene, however, is far removed from the way most of these men died. For these men, and for those who were fortunate to live through it, war was a special province in which the Gods of chance rose to full stature. They came to know that uncertainty and confusion were inseparable from combat. That every action produced an enemy counteraction. That every action produced thousands of interlocking actions which created millions of smaller frictions, accidents and chances. They knew the unknown as the first-born son of combat and uncertainty as its other self.

Yet they were not lacking in the resolve and determination necessary to withstand these pressures. On the contrary, they manifested an aura of confidence which is hard to put into words. It was confidence in their ability to fight, and fight well. It was confidence in the importance of themselves as individuals—as men. It was confidence in themselves as a group—a mutual dependence and respect of buddies in an outfit. And it was the firm belief that their country stood behind them and backed them up in what they had to do.

This is not to say that they did not experience fear, for they most certainly did. They knew it intimately. They knew the violent pounding of the heart; the sinking, sickening feeling in the pit of the stomach; the cold sweat; the shaking of the hands and trembling of the body—much as does the athlete before the starting gun. And yet, with the bitter dryness of fear in their mouth, they went forward against enemy fire—sometimes not just once but many times. Their world shrank to the immediacies of staying alive and destroying the enemy.

These men did not voice tender expressions of idealism, for on the field of battle, actions spoke louder than words.

Then why, we may ask, did these men, as individuals, give so much of themselves?

Were they truly aware of what they were doing? Could they conceive of the enormity of the sacrifice their nation called upon them to make? The boy fresh from the farm or the factory—did he know what his country was asking? The youth from the ghetto street—was he switched off when he entered the darkness of the pit? The young father who had known the fullness of life so briefly—could he imagine that an implacable destiny might forbid him to see his family forever?

Those cynics who deride patriotism and faith tell us no. They seek to convince us that these men went blindly and fought blindly while they cursed the impersonal fate which led them inexorably through the darkness of combat.

I have never believed this; I never shall. No American worthy of the name can accept this cynical counsel of despair. We know that when men have been long in battle and have thought deeply about their situation, there comes at last the awareness of ultimate responsibility—that one man must go ahead so that a nation may live.

Today it is sometimes unfashionable to speak of patriotism and idealism, to fly the flag, to proclaim in depth what America stands for and what our freedoms cost us. Nevertheless, we believe in the meaning of all these, and it was this deep belief that motivated those we honor today.

I do not mean to say that all our men could precisely articulate what they felt. But make no mistake! They all knew what they were fighting for and why. They knew their own lives might well be the price of victory. They sensed this with a sensitivity which surpassed mere understanding. Our

national ideals inspired them, and the power of the national spirit moved them to great deeds of valor.

Thus it is fitting on this day that we recall clearly the exclusive brotherhood of these honored heroes and what they died for.

It is also fitting on this day to ask why America has had to fight wars. A great American, General of the Army Omar Bradley, had one answer. Listen to his words spoken on another Memorial Day, in 1948, at Longmeadow, Massachusetts:

"This lad we buried today is partly the victim of your folly. He is the victim of your folly and the folly of all the peace-loving peoples who turned their backs on the ills of the world. For at the very time those aggressors, at whose hands he met his death, conspired against the peace of the world, we blinded ourselves to their threats and by our shameful inaction countenanced their starting attack.

"Secure in distant and peaceful towns like these, clinging to comforts, refusing risks, seeking safety in refuge and refuge in words, we recanted power and conscience to side with those who sought peace at any price. Too late we discovered the price was too high; and to keep our freedom we paid in the bodies of our young sons.

"If the United States ever again stoops to expedients to avoid the difficult decisions that come with leadership, the heavy burdens that come with defense, we shall once more run the dangers of all half-way measures and waste our strength and conscience as a weather vane rather than a force.

"If we cringe from the necessity of meeting issues boldly with principle, resolution, and strength, then we shall simply hurdle along from crisis to crisis, improvising with expedients, seeking inoffensive solutions, drugging the nation with an illusion of security which under those conditions cannot exist. If we are to scamper from crisis to crisis, fixing principles and policies to the change of each day, we shall place ourselves supinely and helplessly at the mercy of any aggressor who might play on our public opinion and decimate our forces at will.

"To live bravely by convictions from which the free peoples of this world can take heart, the American people must put their faith in stable, long range policies—political, economic, and military—programs that will not be heated and cooled with the brightening and waning of tension.

"The United States has matured to world leadership; it is time we steered by the stars, not by the light of each passing ship.

"On this Memorial Day . . . we pay homage . . . to all . . . fallen comrades . . . to the strong, the weak; the leaders, the led; the brave, the fearful; to all who perished where only God could witness their charity to their fellow man.

"Proudly—but reverently, sadly—we honor them. We pray they will ever rest in peace."

These perspective observations by General Bradley are just as true and timely today as they were over twenty years ago.

True and timely also is the meaning of the words in the West Point motto, "duty, honor, country," these high ideals are as inspiring to true Americans today as they were in an earlier, less sophisticated time when our forefathers struggled to create a way of life new to the world. A life in which "freedom" was paramount. The world scoffed at this impossible dream. Yet imperfect though we may be, it grows toward fulfillment. On the road, we have found many times that the choices were few—fight or forget it, but each success brings us a step closer to a full realization of what began nearly 200 years ago.

Today our genius and resources have put a man on the moon, created equipment of almost unbelievable sophistication and provided well-being beyond most of the world's belief. Today it is well to remember that

dedication to simple challenges of "duty, honor, country" can inspire men to deeds beyond their normal strength and courage. This is the spirit which protects the dream, and this is the dream for which men will face fire.

So as we prepare to leave this ground where sleep the brave, remember that the price of freedom will never be cheap. Our presence here emphasizes that the purchase price is often life itself.

However, if we raise our children with the high ideals, dedication and determination of those patriots who have gone before us, we cannot fail.

If we firmly demonstrate to all who threaten freedom that we will pay the price, we increase the probability that the lives of Americans in the future will not be lost as they have been in the past.

If the world's aggressors are given pause by our steadfast refusal to compromise on freedom, these heroes we honor today may sleep peacefully, knowing they have not died in vain.

## UNIONS AGAINST THE WAR

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, recent headlines about prowar demonstrations by hard-fisted, hard-hatted union members may lead some to believe this hawkish disposition is characteristic of union members everywhere. To counteract that impression, I would like to enter in the RECORD two recent articles, one from the San Francisco Chronicle and one from the New York Times, which give the other side of the picture. In a full-page advertisement in the Chronicle, several hundred northern California union leaders renounced the war and the invasion of Cambodia in no uncertain terms. "We've had it!" declared the May 18 advertisement, which contained the names of leaders of some unions which were previously among the staunchest supporters of the war. The advertisement is a welcome fissure in the facade of prowar union sentiment and suggests that facade may be more fragile than the administration would like to believe. The articles follow:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, May 19, 1970]

#### PEACE AD BY BAY UNION OFFICIALS

A cross-section of Bay Area union leaders, including some of the most conservative, spoke out strongly yesterday against American military involvement in Southeast Asia.

"We want out of Cambodia—now! We want out of Vietnam—now! We've had it!" they declared in a full-page newspaper advertisement signed by 336 leaders.

The signers ranged in political outlook from President Harry Bridges of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, which long has opposed the Vietnam war, to such men as Secretary Dan Del Carlo of the local building trades council of the AFL-CIO, which has been one of the staunchest supporters nationally of the war.

Other signers included leaders from the International Typographical Union, Newspaper Guild, Auto Workers, Electrical Workers, Social Workers, Carpenters, Teamsters, Teachers, Painters, Watchmakers, Communication Workers, Iron Workers, Laborers,

Lithographers, Office Employees, Bartenders, Hospital Workers, Boilermakers, Laundry Workers, Clothing Workers, City Employees, Machinists, Broadcasters, Cemetery Workers, Bottle Blowers, Oil Workers, Cooks, Retail Clerks, Service Employees, Culinary Workers, Barbers, Butchers, hodcarriers and pile-drivers.

Among the most prominent AFL-CIO signers were Harry Bigarani, secretary of the Painters District Council here; Thomas Rottell, head of the Metal Trades Council here; Secretary Art Carter of the Contra Costa County Labor Council; Secretary Richard Groulx of the Alameda County Council and Secretary Charles Weir of the Marin County Council.

Among the Teamsters leaders were Joseph Diviny, the union's first vice president nationally and head of its joint council in the Bay Area, and Director Einar Mohn of the union's Western Conference.

The signers accused President Nixon of violating the Constitution by expanding the war into Cambodia, said the American troops being killed there "are our sons," and charged there is no reason to believe Mr. Nixon's promise to withdraw U.S. men from Cambodia by June 30.

(By Wallace Turner)

SAN FRANCISCO, May 19.—The shattering of labor union support in this area for President Nixon's Indochina policies was signaled yesterday in full-page advertisements in both The San Francisco Chronicle and The Examiner.

The names of 451 labor union officers were signed to the advertisement. It was captioned: "We've had it!"

The text said that "working people and their families, are deeply disturbed at your explanation of the war into Cambodia," adding that Mr. Nixon had "further divided this country" by his move.

Addressing itself to the President, the ad said:

"You have created a credibility gap of incredible proportions. The economy of our country is steadily being eroded, your promises to stabilize the economy and control inflation have become meaningless."

#### A SHIFT IN POLICY

While the sentiments expressed in the advertisement are not new, the signatures to such a document of the names of many leaders of conservative unions constitutes a departure from national labor policy. Behind President George Meany, most of the old-line unions in the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations have consistently supported Mr. Nixon's war policies.

But the signatures to the antiwar advertisement include those of the ironworkers, carpenters, boilermakers, painters, communications workers, lithographers and butchers unions.

More predictably, there are also signatures of officers of the more liberal unions, such as the auto workers, longshoremen, led by Harry Bridges; the American Federation of Teachers, and the farm workers.

Some of the signatures that stand out are of Einar O. Mohn, head of the Western Conference of Teamsters; Joseph Diviny, first vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Richard Groulx, executive secretary of the Alameda County Labor Council in Oakland; and Larry Vail, secretary of the State Retail Clerks Union.

#### WAR I CRITIC SIGNS

One note from the long past was the signature of Warren K. Billings, listed as a member of the executive board of Watchmakers Local Union 101.

Mr. Billings was convicted with Tom Mooney of bombing the Preparedness Day parade here in 1917. He learned watchmaking

during the long years he spent in Folsom Prison.

The advertisement was prepared by liberal union members whose previous antiwar attitudes were intensified after four students were killed by National Guardsmen at Kent State University in Ohio.

#### C. & O. HISTORICAL PARK AT LAST?

### HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the editorial "C. & O. Historical Park at Last?" appearing recently in the Washington Post, expresses clearly my view concerning the development of the C. & O. Canal and its banks. The time has long since passed when we should take a firm position in the spending of park moneys so that they can, to the highest degree possible, serve the needs of urban peoples.

I commend the editorial to my colleagues, but more than this, I urge their full support and that of the administration to expand and develop the C. & O. Canal National Historical Park.

#### C. & O. HISTORICAL PARK AT LAST?

Secretary Hickel's endorsement of the bill to convert the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal into a national historical park is a bow to the art of the possible. The secretary has indicated on various occasions that he has a great interest in cleaning up the Potomac River and dedication of its shores to scenic and recreational use. No doubt the temptation was strong to ask Congress for funds to buy all the land that will be needed in the future for a major park along the Potomac. But the secretary was well aware of the opposition to such a project at this time and of the apathy in Congress. He has sensibly chosen to take a step at a time, and the logical first step is the enactment of the C. & O. Canal bill.

Washington is fortunate in having this thread-like park which stretches from Georgetown to Cumberland. It is an open door to green space, to woods and streams, to the habitat of birds and deer, to pleasant skies and a seemingly interminable winding trail—the towpath. In an era when we are increasingly concerned about our natural environment, it links the ghetto, the business district and the suburbs to the best wilderness that can be found in these parts. Most of what it has to offer is relief from hot streets and urban congestion, but the scenery at Great Falls and the region of the Paw Paw Tunnel bring it well within the national park category.

What is now proposed is that this National Monument be given the additional space and facilities needed to make it useful and enjoyable on a large scale. The 185-mile ribbon of land, including the old canal, now constitutes only 5,250 acres. The Mathias-Gude-Beall bill, now approved by the administration, with amendments, would expand the park to more than 20,000 acres, including 12,156 acres now in private ownership. The additional space is urgently required for picnicking, camping, parking, hiking and protection of scenic and recreational values. If this park can be brought to a high state of usefulness for an estimated outlay of \$19,472,605 for land acquisition and \$47 million for development, it will be a bargain of great significance to the community.

Enactment of the C. & O. Canal park bill at this session of Congress would be in line

with the current emphasis on the expansion of recreational areas near the big cities. In the past Megalopolis has been denied its share of federal funds for open space and rejuvenative environment. The C. & O. Canal may well become an important demonstration of what can be done with scenic resources close to central population areas. We hope that Congress will not miss the opportunity.

#### ADMIRE

### HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a most unique international scientific, educational and fun event. It is ADMIRE, an international paper airplane contest. ADMIRE is an acronym for: Airplane derby means interest, research, enjoyment. The competition calls for people of all ages throughout the free world to make and enter paper airplanes for the international fly-offs in Columbus, Ohio.

ADMIRE is sponsored by the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch and the Center of Science and Industry of the Franklin County, Ohio, Historical Society, with the full cooperation of Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, Navy recruiting, educational, and scientific groups.

The contest is a distinct step in man's giant leap into the realm of higher science and in the study of aeronautics. ADMIRE is wholesome recreation and will bring families together in a spirit of fun and unity.

Focusing attention on flight is a valuable contribution because the aerodynamics of paper airplanes are much the same as aerodynamics for jet-powered crafts.

Interest in the contest has been spurred by a galaxy of outstanding prizes including an 8-day Florida vacation for a family of five to be won by a youth younger than 18. Other prizes include optics, scientific instruments, electronics, athletic equipment, and home accessories.

There are no fees or gimmicks involved.

Mr. Speaker, the response stretches from Ethiopia to Japan and many areas in between. Significantly, a friendly approach was made by many Governors. Gov. Claude Kirk, of Florida, entered an alligator with wings, complete with the seal of Florida and a map of the State. Gov. Marvin Mandel, of Maryland, issued a public statement to all Marylanders to enter airplanes for screening by his office. The best will be entered as Maryland's official entry. Outstanding crafts were entered by Gov. Lester Maddox, of Georgia, and Gov. Winthrop Rockefeller, of Arkansas. Gov. Linwood Holton, of Virginia, consulted the Commonwealth's aviation division, as ADMIRE rules permit, to design an airplane calculated to sweep top honors. Several other Governors have indicated that their State airplanes will be in the contest shortly.

The Vatican Secretary of State advised



that Pope Paul prays for ADMIRE's success and heavenly favors.

The Honorable Walter J. Hickel, Secretary of the Interior, used the ADMIRE contest as a means of conveying an ecological message to the people of the United States. His entry is made entirely of "reconstituted" garbage; his letter was on reconstituted paper; the shipping box is to be recycled, as is the plane which is named "The Environmentalist." Newspapers all over the United States reported Secretary Hickel's message about improving the ecology—another indication of how something as inconspicuous as a paper airplane can be used to emphasize a vital theme.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, I am delighted with the interest and participation of men and women in uniform. The Navy Nurse Corps entered an airplane shaped like a hypodermic needle and used the entry as an incentive in Navy nurse recruiting.

The U.S.S. *Columbus*, a guided missile cruiser at sea, entered a skillfully designed airfoil airplane. When the all-paper airplane arrived in Columbus, Ohio, the city for which U.S.S. *Columbus* was named, the air boss of ADMIRE located Mrs. Edward Meyers who christened and launched U.S.S. *Columbus* back in April 1944. Mrs. Meyers volunteered to fly the U.S.S. *Columbus* entry in the ADMIRE contest for the men of her ship. A story in the Columbus Dispatch reported that Mrs. Meyers had been selected as "Mother of the Year" in 1944 and chosen to sponsor U.S.S. *Columbus* because she had lost two sons in the World War II Army service. Again, a patriotic message, badly needed in these times, evolved from something as remote as a paper airplane contest.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, is holding an open house on June 21 anticipating an overflow crowd of 200,000 enthusiastic spectators. Many will fly paper airplanes as the first phase of the ADMIRE contest and as a prelude to a demonstration by the Air Force Thunderbirds. Air Force equipment will be on display but even more important, so will the men and women of the Air Force and other military and naval services.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my congratulations to Col. Richard J. Downs, commander of the 317th Tactical Airlift Wing at Lockbourne, and to his capable public information officer, Capt. William H. Johnson, Jr., who is incidentally one of my constituents. Both men have worked long and hard on the planning of this tremendous air show and the day's related events. My reports indicate that their work will pay off with an even greater success than expected.

I think it is commendatory that the Columbus Dispatch, commonly referred to as "Ohio's Greatest Home Newspaper," has arranged to use the ADMIRE paper airplane program as a bridge to bring citizens into closer and harmonious contact with the dedicated men and women who provide our country's defenses. It is salutary that Americans in uniform are being presented to the public in a very human way, as individuals with the same fine character-

istics possessed by the overwhelming majority of American citizens. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will enter ADMIRE.

I am inserting contest rules and other specifics for your information at this time.

#### ADMIRE—AIRPLANE DERBY MEANS INTEREST, RESEARCH, ENJOYMENT . . .

**Who:** Everybody. Young and old. Central Ohio residents or people from other states or countries. Civilians and service people at home or abroad. Heads of foreign nations and people with aspirations.

**What:** A Paper Airplane Derby. Every airplane must be constructed solely of paper, glue, or tape. No metal. No plastic. No wood.

**When:** Take-off to Lockbourne Air Force Base, Sunday, June 21, for a mammoth Open House during the hours of noon to 5:00 p.m. Children may participate in using the Kiddie Jump Tower, a simulated parachute jump of 100 feet. See a huge KC135 Tanker craft refuel a B52 Bomber in the air. Climb aboard every type of aircraft used by the Tactical Air Command. Experience the thrill of free-fall parachute jumping. Meet and see the world's greatest precision pilots, the renowned Thunderbirds, as they fly paper airplanes and then put on a thrill-a-second airborne demonstration with their brand-new F4E Phantom Jets. Be a guest of Colonel Richard J. Downs, USAF, and all of the men and women under his command at Lockbourne. You'll be in the mood to launch your own paper aircraft when the Derby starts the next day, June 22.

**Where:** With the Jet-Assisted-Take-Off from the Lockbourne Air Force Base Open House, actual flying for young people starts Monday, June 22, at the Center of Science and Industry, 280 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, USA. Children should enter the proper age group. Accompanying parents may also fly.

Adult Fly-Offs will be held in the Neil House Ballroom commencing Monday evening, June 29. Children with parents may fly. Jumbo aircraft (more than two feet long) will fly at the Naval Reserve Training Center, 85 North Yearling Road, Columbus, Ohio, Sunday, July 12, commencing at 1:00 p.m. Paper airplanes longer than 20 feet will not be eligible.

**Why:** Advance science. Contribute to man's knowledge of flight. Discover undiscovered aeronautical geniuses. Guide the engineers who labor over the drawing boards. Help in mankind's leap into higher science. Prepare yourself for the time when families will have their own airplanes for picnics and travel to the office. Re-live history with classic airplane models of yesteryear. Unite the family in a Fun Break . . . when it is most needed.

**How:** Attend a scheduled Fly-Off bringing your paper airplane. If you are the head of a foreign nation, live abroad or in a section of the United States which makes it inconvenient to attend a Fly-Off, ship your paper airplane to Professor COSI; see page 4 for details. If you wish to attend a Fly-Off as a participant do not ship your airplane; bring it with you to the Fly-Off.

#### OTHER INFORMATION

No airplane will be returned. After display at the Center of Science and Industry, airplanes will be used for research and study by scientists. Crafts may later be turned over to the Department of Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering of the Ohio State University, the U.S. Air Force, or the Smithsonian Institution. Consideration will be given to applications from other recognized educational and scientific centers.

**Caution:** Any aircraft employing advanced aerodynamic principles which should be classified in the interests of international se-

curity, should be clearly marked "Top Secret." Logistical advice on the movement of the paper aircraft from abroad or from remote parts of the United States, may be obtained from the Honorable Victor Bodish, Postmaster, Columbus, Ohio or from Professor COSI.

Test pilots will fly airplanes for contestants unable to appear at a Fly Off. Lt. Commander Pat Gallagher, USN, (Naval Plant Rep's Office, North American Rockwell Corp.) is Chief Test Pilot. Another Chief Test Pilot is Sister Suzanne, O.P. President. Ohio Dominican College. Other outstanding Test Pilots or Sky Pilots will fly the avalanche of foreign entries.

If you are in the Mid-Ohio Area, or can arrange a visit, bring your airplane. So we can look for you, why not drop a card of intentions to Air Boss, Public Service Department, The Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch?

#### SPONSORS

This contest is jointly sponsored by: Columbus Dispatch (Ohio's Greatest Home Newspaper); Center of Science and Industry (of the Franklin County Historical Society); with the cooperation of: Lockbourne Air Force Base; Department of Aviation, The Ohio State University; Department of Aerospace Studies, Air Force R.O.T.C. and The Angel Flight of The Ohio State University; Educators; Airlines; Scientists; Judges; many distinguished people and organizations.

See details in this brochure for further instructions, eligibility and technical advice on the construction of paper airplanes for ADMIRE.

#### VOLARE AD GAUDIUM

Who flies harder, faster, longer and higher than the U.S. Air Force? The answer is easy . . . nobody.

That's why Lockbourne Air Force Base is calling your attention to "ADMIRE," the International Paper Airplane Contest. We urge each U.S. Air Force installation to send an entry and help prove that "we fly harder." Officers and airmen are encouraged to submit individual paper planes in the competition, in addition to an entry from each installation. Name your plane. Decorate it.

To insure considerate and careful handling of your craft, send each entry to Captain Bill Johnson, USAF, Information Officer, Lockbourne AFB, Ohio 43217. Your immediate action would be appreciated. Help us prove that the USAF is "TOP DOG" in the air . . . regardless of the type of aircraft.

We'll provide Ace Test Pilots to fly your craft publicly.

#### GROUP ENTRIES

A group may participate with one entry if certified by an executive officer as authentic. A member of the group may fly the craft or it may be entered in the "foreign" category for flying by a Test Pilot. Groups offering an entry might be: civic clubs, PTAs, patriotic organizations, book clubs, garden clubs, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, individual school classes, the school as a whole, fraternities, sororities, dance clubs.

A corporation, partnership or sole proprietor may enter his business establishment. Sections and departments of the establishment may enter a craft.

Individual states may enter. So may foreign nations or political divisions thereof. In the instance of a foreign country, certification by the President, King, or Dictator is recommended, although the Minister for Foreign Affairs may sign for the Executive Head.

Efforts to improve the ecology suggest that paper items slated for disposal might be used for aircraft construction. Doctors may construct aircraft from old prescription blanks, unpaid bills or outdated medical literature.

Lawyers might use wills, deeds and subpoenas. Educators in their creativity, and

reach for academic freedom, might make airplanes using examination papers, attendance registers or pages from books made obsolete in the "knowledge explosion."

Engineers are encouraged to make airplanes from drawings and blue prints of unpatented inventions. Airline employees may use timetables and route information. Bankers are reminded that "money flies" and consideration should be given to constructing paper airplanes from "long green" with the \$5.00 denomination being preferred. Bear in mind federal regulations protecting money from mutilation. Foreign currency is acceptable.

#### JUMBO AIRPLANE

Jumbos, the airplanes of the future, have their place in ADMIRE and will be flown at the Naval Reserve Training Center, 85 North Yearling Road, on July 12, from 1:00 p.m. until 5:00 p.m.

Airplanes eligible are those more than two feet from nose to tail but not exceeding 20 feet. Construction must be entirely of paper, glue and tape. No wood, metal or plastics. No age groups. Everyone enjoys equal terms.

Each craft will be judged as to distance . . . Duration . . . Originality of Design. One flight per craft. One entry per person.

A separate category of aerobatics is open to all including those who participated in the open contest. An additional airplane must be used.

Air Marshal: Captain James Blazek, USN, Director, Navy Recruiting, 4th Area, 85 Marconi, Columbus, Ohio 469-7410

#### PRESIDENTIAL SCHOLAR

### HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in 1964, the presidential scholars program was established to identify and honor the most outstanding young men and women high school graduates in the country. Clearly, to be chosen as a presidential scholar is the highest possible honor for an American high school graduate.

Two presidential scholars are chosen from each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and an additional 15 are chosen at large. This year, I had the great pleasure of meeting and talking with Miss Jeanne T. Black, of Lexington, Mass., who was selected, through the most rigorous of procedures, as one of two young scholars from Massachusetts to be so honored.

Of the nearly 3 million students who graduate from high school each year, only 119 are chosen as presidential scholars. They represent the highest standards of intellectual excellence as well as leadership capabilities and personal achievement. Jeanne Black fulfilled all these requirements of excellence. Throughout her career at Lexington High School, Jeanne was an outstanding student, becoming valedictorian of her class and participating actively in positions of responsibility in school-related programs.

I was most impressed with Jeanne's intellect, her poise, and her genuine interest, and concern in pursuing the best possible education so that she can make

a real contribution to the community. I know that she will continue her exemplary record of achievement at Pembroke College in the fall and I am convinced that as long as our educational system can continue to produce students of Jeanne Black's quality and determination, our Nation's future will be that much more secure.

#### PLANES TO ISRAEL

### HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave afforded by Representative LESTER WOLFF of New York, I wish to take this opportunity to announce my association and agreement with all my colleagues who signed and sent the letter of June 10, 1970, to the President.

I am in firm agreement with the sentiment to hasten the immediate sale of supersonic jet planes to Israel which is so essential to the preservation of the precarious balance of peace in the Middle East. I feel it my responsibility to denounce the continual flow of sophisticated offensive arms from the Soviet Union to Arab nations, and to strive persistently for the preservation of the last stronghold of democracy in the Middle East.

The sale of additional jet planes to Israel can no longer be postponed or overlooked, when one realizes the fact that the Soviet-Arab aircraft strength is four times the strength of that of Israel. The United States must react affirmatively to the widespread influx of Soviet aircraft, missiles, tanks, boats, guns, and supporting military equipment to the United Arab Republic and her neighbors. The restraint on American sales of jet planes to Israel has failed in its intent of encouraging a deceleration of the Russian military commitment to the Arab nations. Inaction has resulted only in the growing dominance of Russia in the Middle East. The Soviets have shown no evidence of objectively seeking peace, and have openly displayed their reluctance to consider any arms limitations in the Arab-Israeli conflict. The increased involvement of Russian pilots, technicians, and advisers in Egypt has only aggravated the tension steadily mounting since the 1967 conflict.

It is my hope that ultimately all of the nations of the Middle East will be able to achieve peace and stability through a face-to-face confrontation across the bargaining table in direct negotiations. Although I am optimistic that many Arabs are ready to embrace a lasting and genuine peace with their Israeli neighbors and are presently channeling their efforts toward this goal, I feel that the unwarranted major building of the arms race by the Soviet Union constitutes a real danger to the Arab-Israeli cooperation.

I strongly believe that the maintenance of a secure and effective Israeli

defense is vital to our national interest and fundamental to the establishment of permanent world peace, in the face of the menacing presence of Soviet arms and personnel. With the Soviet buildup of Arab military power, the probability of war and the risk to Israel's survival is great, unless the United States takes positive action to assure a degree of balance of power. It is my conviction that the United States should continue to furnish adequate military equipment and aircraft to the Israelis to provide Israel with a deterrent force capable of preventing future aggression.

#### A LESSON FOR REVOLUTIONARIES

### HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, many of today's self-styled revolutionaries live in a superficial, shallow "now" world, arrogantly dismissing as irrelevant anything that happened before 8 o'clock this morning.

It is a shame that they hold history in such contempt, because it could teach them a lot. One notable example was cited in the June 13, 1970, morning edition of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

In an editorial, the Star-Telegram reminded us of what happened to the late Alexander F. Kerensky, a leader of the 1917 effort to reform the czarist government of Russia, who died last week. Himself earnest and idealistic, Mr. Kerensky was forced to watch helplessly as more militant radicals seized control of the movement he helped set in motion. The result was the totalitarian regime which remains in power to this day. One can but ponder how vastly different the history of our times might have been had Alexander Kerensky and the forces of reason and moderation prevailed.

To share this perceptive editorial with my colleagues, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

#### KERENSKY'S EXAMPLE WARNING TO REBELS

Many of those on college and university campuses who cry out for revolution in this country dismiss history as having no meaning. What has happened in the past, they say, is irrelevant. Only what is happening today is worthy of notice—and most of that they want radically changed or instantly destroyed.

Though it is a current happening, the death of Alexander F. Kerensky in New York Thursday may not gain the attention of these campus revolutionaries, but it should. His moment of power and glory—a brief one—was more than half a century ago, but his whole career is a reminder that revolutions, once launched, seem always to get out of hand and go to ruthless excesses far beyond anything the authors intended.

Kerensky himself was a product of the campus movement for social betterment, a genuine opponent of czarist absolutism but more a champion of reform than of actual revolution. In the anarchy that followed a two-headed uprising in Russia in early 1917, he became for a brief moment in history the supreme ruler of all Russia.



This lasted 3½ months. Kerensky was too moderate, and he made the mistake of believing that other revolutionaries shared his attitudes. One of his mistakes was bringing back from exile or releasing from prison such hard-bitten revolutionary figures as Leon Trotsky, Nikolai Lenin and Josef Stalin. They took over from him in the bloody revolution of November 1917, still celebrated as the triumph of communism in Russia, and began the totalitarian regime that has continued to this day.

Kerensky was a brilliant orator, as eloquent as any who now sway student audiences with their demands for instant change and—the more radical of them—with their cries for overthrow of the system. He was idealistic in the same way that the young today are idealistic, and he was battling against far more patent evils. In the convulsive upheaval he helped to start, he learned that those who initiate revolutions seldom are able to shape the results.

The death of the exiled Kerensky at 89 makes his fate, and the fate of his ideals, contemporary enough that the campus advocates of revolution ought to take heed. They might profit especially from some of the writings of Kerensky about what has befallen his country since the revolution he helped to create, even if they read no more than the title of a book he wrote in 1934. It is called "The Crucifixion of Liberty."

#### REVOLUTION 1970

### HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, a very gifted and talented writer and speaker and a close friend of mine, Mr. Bill Freehoff of Kingsport, Tenn., recently spoke to members of the Delphian Club at their meeting in Kingsport on a very important subject to me and millions of other Americans.

Mr. Freehoff spoke on "Revolution 1970" and it is certainly apparent that his remarks were most well-timed in today's society, especially when violent revolution is sweeping across this country in almost uncontrollable surges.

Mr. Freehoff speaks of the radicals, the left wingers, and the Communists who are seeking to destroy our Nation. How true are his assertions.

So the readers of the RECORD may enjoy his speech, I submit the text as follows:

#### REVOLUTION 1970

(By Bill Freehoff)

This is the centennial of the birth of Nikolai Lenin, Lenin who said . . . "The suppression of the bourgeois state by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution."

Lenin also said the purpose of the revolution is not to seize control of the state, but to destroy the state.

Well, let's see how the Revolution is coming along in America, the last bastion against the communist seizure of the world itself and if the world, next the moon and—who knows—the universe itself!

Revolution? Yes, Revolution. You see TV, hear the radio, and read the papers.

There is violence—almost incredible violence in the streets of our cities, on the campuses of our colleges.

Bombs are tossed into buildings.

The First Lady of the Land dare not visit a historic place in Virginia. The President Himself hesitates to speak in certain places.

And the radicals—who take credit for sending Lyndon Johnson into retirement—now openly boast they will do the same to his successor.

Mark this well, it was not Johnson the man nor Nixon the man the radicals dislike. It is the office of President they seek to destroy and with it, the Republic itself.

For the President alone is the spokesman for the nation. The President symbolizes our national unity as a people.

The President is not the only target of the Left, of course. Those anywhere who dare to speak out, who challenge the dogmas of communism are marked for extinction sooner or later including, I do not doubt, your speaker.

They destroyed Senator Joe McCarthy, they brought pressure on President Truman to sack Douglas MacArthur because MacArthur dared to try and win a war against communism.

They have discredited Senator Dodd. They keep up a constant attack on J. Edgar Hoover and they have never forgiven Richard Nixon for insisting that the investigation of Alger Hiss continue in the face of tremendous pressure to drop it all.

They have succeeded in getting the Bible out of the schools and the communists in.

They have mounted an unceasing and unrelenting attack upon the Christian Faith aided—ironically—by a goodly number of the so-called Men of God.

And here it is appropriate to recall the words of the Prophet Jeremiah who said—"An appalling thing, an outrage, has appeared in this land—prophets prophesy lies and priests go hand in hand with them and my people love to have it so. . . ."

We are told that the ancient and immutable Law given by God Almighty Himself to Moses on Mount Sinai no longer applied to Modern Man.

Today there ARE no absolutes. Do that which you think is good.

Adultery, homo-sexuality, fornication—the crimes of which the Apostle Paul speaks against with such venom are now commonplace and the laws against them are gradually being repealed.

The Left tells us that while it is morally wrong to take the life of a degenerate on death row, it is permissible to murder an innocent babe in the mother's womb simply if that mother does not want to bear that child at that time.

Gross immorality floods the news-stands and fills the screens of the movie houses and the picture that was chosen the best of all is devoted to the very vilest kind of people using language that is even yet, illegal on the streets of our city.

In my youth, a broad minded person was one who was willing to look at all sides of an issue.

Today, you are broad minded if you laugh at a filthy joke.

Revolution, 1970?

Look around. The symbols are here—the clenched fist—supposedly the symbol of "black power"—is actually the traditional communist salute, as distinctive as the raised hand of Hitler's nazis.

"We Shall Overcome," the battle hymn of the Civil Rights Movement, was re-written by a communist folk singer from the old spiritual, "We Shall Overcome Some Day" and was used, in the Spanish, by the communist under Castro when—as a minority—they seized power in Cuba.

The slogan—"All power to the people" used by today's radical youth is but an up-dated version of Lenin's slogan of half a century ago—"All power to the Soviets."

The so-called "peace symbol" used even as a pectoral cross by the new Bishop of New York is actually the ancient symbol of the anti-Christ.

Revolution, 1970?

The purpose of the Radical Left is not simply to "protest" grievances, real or imaginary.

The purpose of the Left is to destroy this republic and all that it has ever stood for.

"Burn, baby, burn" is the slogan of the New Left.

Prior to every major civil disorder since the Berkeley riots in September of 1964 the major radical leaders have made trips to communist countries:

Jerry Rubin—the same Jerry Rubin who told the kids at Kent State to kill their parents BEFORE the Guard was ordered in—Jerry Rubin went to Cuba before Berkeley in 1964 and 1965.

Tom Hayden went to Hanoi before the Newark riots of 1967.

David Dellinger went to Czechoslovakia before the march on the Pentagon in 1967.

Mark Rudd went to Cuba before the Columbia University take-over and riots in 1968. Coincidence? What do you think?

That phase of the Revolution that is most on our minds these days is the Revolution on campus.

Professor Ernest Blanco, who fled Castro Cuba, was in Havana when the communists seized that city's once great university.

But the communist influence there, he tells us, began back in the 1920's among the respectable socialists.

Blanco saw the clenched fists on campus and heard them shout "We shall Overcome."

Here are the 8 steps the communists took to seize power at the University of Havana in February 1959:

1. The administration and faculty—the so-called "Establishment" were discredited by revolutionary students and propaganda in the leftist press.

2. Patriotic professors were accused of incompetence or charged with collaborating with Batista who was, after all, the legitimate head of state.

3. Pro-communist newspapers attacked the University as corrupt, turning public opinion against it.

4. Students demanded absolute control of policy and curricula, the hiring and firing of professors—and were backed up in these demands by Marxists on the faculty itself.

5. The administration yielded to student demands. Purge tribunals were established to punish the anti-communist students and professors.

6. Kangaroo courts, operating under Castro's influence, got rid of the so-called "reactionaries".

7. The student government organization was taken over by communists. Goon squads terrorized anti-communist students. Faculty members who were still around and who were not communists were threatened. Finally, total communist control was established.

8. Incompetent but communist professors were named to key faculty positions, the curricula was restructured along communist lines and academic freedom was destroyed.

After Professor Blanco came to this country, he got a job at Tufts, one of those prestige colleges in the East.

He began making speeches, however, off-campus about what had happened in Cuba and he was dropped from the faculty at Tufts. Do you recall hearing or reading where the American Association of Professors or the Civil Liberties Union or Professor Schlesinger ever made any demands that he be rehired? Do you recall hearing of any demonstrations at Tufts because Blanco was fired?

You bet your life you didn't!

But . . . when admitted communist Angela Davis was about to be fired from the faculty at UCLA—That was a different story wasn't it?

Professor Blanco has warned us. If it could happen in Cuba, it could happen here and—he points out—the Cuban communist students did not even have LSD or marijuana to use as weapons in their take-over!

So much for the universities—which are already alienated from the mainstream of American life.

What now of the remnants of the old Civil Rights Movement, a movement which from the first was penetrated by communists?

There are the Black Panthers—defended at Yale, defended at the nation's largest Protestant seminary in New York, wined and dined by Leonard Bernstein.

There is "Snick" and Stokely Carmichael and James Foreman and Marxist demand on the churches to pay up or else because the ancestors of some of the blacks sold some of their ancestors into slavery to New England ship captains.

Remember this when you hear about slavery—where there was a buyer, there had to be a seller and the sellers were the black Establishment of the 17th Century Africa—the powerful chiefs.

Then there is the Republic of New Africa with HQ in Detroit and with consulates in 8 major American cities.

The stated objective of the RNA is to establish a Negro Republic in the Black Belt of the South, in an area that would include a part of Tennessee.

There is the Nations of Islam with HQ in Chicago and which teaches dogma, the hatred of the white race and denies any allegiance to the United States. The Nations of Islam, which the FBI says is the largest black militant group in the country.

There is the Revolutionary Action Movement—the RAM—oriented toward Red China and which is training agents in Cuba in guerrilla warfare.

So much then for the Radical Blacks.

What of the Radical whites—the so-called New Left which brags it is further to the left than the Communist Party itself?

There is the SDS—the Students for a Democratic Society with at least 250 chapters and 40,000 members and which is reaching into high schools. J. Edgar Hoover calls the SDS—in his words—"a communist anarchist group. . ."

Then there is the Young Socialist Alliance, claiming 10,000 members which says it is Trotskyite-Marxist and whose objective is the seizure of the control of student bodies.

One of the newest of the groups is the Young Workers Liberation League, set up in February of this year in Chicago by communist youth groups and which claims a membership of 800 including college and high school students.

One of the officials of this group is Mike Zagarell who spoke at Vanderbilt in May of 1967.

I would go on but my time is running out. My time, and yours and maybe our republic's time is running out.

We are, I suggest, in the middle of a Revolution, a revolution for real and upon the outcome of this revolution even more than the Revolution of 1776 rests the future—not alone of the United States—but of Western Civilization itself.

The Barbarians are no longer at the gates. They are in our very midst.

Now what are we going to do about it?

I have presented the challenge. The response I leave to you.

As we say at my place of business . . . Think about it!

#### COMMEMORATION OF THE BALTIC STATES' LOSS OF FREEDOM

**HON. JOHN BUCHANAN**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is always with a mixture of sadness and hope that those of us who are privileged to live in this great and free Nation commemorate events whereby others have lost their freedom and independence. To-

day I wish to join with other colleagues in the Congress in observing the anniversary of such a loss of freedom by the people of the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The Baltic peoples lost their freedom and independence 30 years ago when the Soviet Union invaded and occupied these three peace-loving countries on June 15, 1940.

This invasion and occupation was followed by incorporation of these nations as constituent republics in the Soviet Union. A year later, within a few days centering around June 14, 1941, thousands of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian citizens were deported to various parts of the Soviet Union, mainly Siberia.

After a long history of fighting for their freedom and intermittent domination by other nations, patriots in the three Baltic States seized the opportunity presented by the conflict between Germany and Russia during the First World War to reassert national independence. Lithuania officially declared its independence on February 16, 1918; Estonia on February 24, 1918, and Latvia on November 18, 1918. The Russian Red Army attempted to destroy the new states and invaded them, occupying most of Latvia and Estonia and approximately four-fifths of Lithuania in 1919. The small armies of the three states succeeded, however, in clearing the Baltic lands by the end of 1919.

The next year, in 1920, the three Baltic States entered into peace treaties with Soviet Russia. In these treaties the independence and sovereignty of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was recognized by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. The latter, in these treaties, renounced all sovereign rights over the people and territory of the Baltic States. Between the two World Wars, the three Baltic States enjoyed two decades of national independence accompanied by domestic progress and international cooperation. As already indicated, however, this situation was abruptly and tragically changed by the Soviet invasion of June 1940.

This was the beginning of an even more tragic and brutal occupation, which has resulted in the loss by these three nations of more than a fourth of their entire population since June 15, 1940. Since the very beginning of this occupation, however, the Baltic peoples have waged an intensive fight for freedom—first through armed resistance and then by passive means.

The United States extended full recognition to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in 1922 and has never recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union. Since June of 1940 all the Presidents of the United States have restated and confirmed our country's nonrecognition policy of the occupation of the Baltic States by the Soviets.

I would like to express my strong support for the brave peoples of the Baltic States in their struggle for freedom, and in this I know I am joined by millions of Americans and freedom-loving people everywhere. The repression to which these brave people are subject is a very deep source of concern to us all. The U.S.

Congress gave formal expression to this concern in 1966 with the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 416, which reaffirms the support of the U.S. Government for the aspiration of the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania for self-determination and national independence. In this resolution, the Congress urges the President to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

This resolution follows herewith:

H. CON RES. 416

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Passed the House of Representatives June 21, 1965.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,  
Clerk.

It is my profound hope that through our expressions of support these proud peoples of the Baltic States will be encouraged in their struggle and that freedom and independence for them will become a reality.

#### VETERAN'S BENEFITS

**HON. ROBERT PRICE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today Flag Day ceremonies are being held across the land. I believe it is most appropriate for the House to consider legislation to provide service-connected compensation increases for veterans, for it is only through the sacrifices of those



valiant men and their fallen comrades at arms that our Nation has been secured and our freedoms preserved.

To put matters squarely in perspective, there is no known way to adequately compensate a veteran who has suffered irreparable physical or psychological injuries while in service to our country. This notwithstanding, however, society has tried to compensate our veterans in such amounts so as to enable them to live with the dignity they have so costly earned and so justly deserve.

The last increase in service-connected veterans' compensation rates occurred in the 90th Congress. Since that time, however, the ravages of inflation have greatly eroded that increase. As a result, our Nation's veterans stand in sore need of legislative assistance.

Earlier in this Congress I introduced two bills relating to this general area. One would increase the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities; the other would increase payments for veterans and widows who receive non-service-connected pensions. The latter would also increase payments for dependent parents receiving dependency and indemnity compensation.

The House Veterans' Committee has held hearings on these and other veterans' benefits proposals. The committee has now requested the House to confine its attention at this time to increasing rates of disability compensation for service-connected disabilities and loosening certain criteria for determining the eligibility of widows' benefits.

I implore my colleagues to approve these proposals. The increases which vary from a low of 8 percent to a high of 12 percent, depending on the extent of an individual's impairment, will certainly go a long way toward restoring the economic security of those veterans possessing service-connected disabilities. Standards for determining widows' benefits should have been changed years ago to bring the standards more into line with the case law and present day realities; for at present, they reflect neither the law nor reality.

I also implore my colleagues not to turn their heads away from the problems of our Nation's veterans once this legislation is passed. Increasing veterans' benefits is an important matter, but it is no way cures major veterans' problems such as inadequate medical care and rehabilitation. These are areas in which grave and unconscionable problems exist. These are problems that must be rectified by appropriate legislation if we, as a society, truly expect to discharge our obligations to our disabled veterans of military service.

#### TRIUMPH OVER CANCER—A CRUCIAL CRUSADE

**HON. JOHN M. MURPHY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced a

resolution declaring it to be the sense of the Congress that cancer research be made a national crusade and that all the necessary resources of the Nation be marshaled to find the cure and prevention of this dreaded disease. I urge that a supreme effort be made in the course of the next 6 years so that in 1976 we might commemorate the 200th anniversary of independence of this Nation with the demise of cancer.

There has been a good deal of discussion in this Congress and throughout the country, on the need for reordering our national priorities. I am one of those who believe that this needs to be done. The Nation has several problems which have come to the point of crisis. Some need immediate action and a massive national effort to prevent disaster. Others, given constructive programs and dedicated effort over a long period of years, approach a point of breakthrough and need a massive effort to bring them to a triumphant conclusion.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the position in which cancer is to be found today. It has been with us from time immemorial, but until 25 years ago, almost no progress had been made against it. Now we find that although the death rate from cancer is as high as ever, some forms of the disease at long last have begun to yield to the scientific skill of the medical men who have devoted their lives to the problem.

Twenty-five years ago when a patient was discovered to have cancer, there was one chance in five that he would be alive 5 years after treatment began. Today, when a patient is diagnosed and the treatment is begun, there are two chances in five that he will live for more than 5 years. This is progress, but it is not enough progress for a nation such as ours against a disease such as cancer. There is no reason why this Nation, with its medical minds and medical resources, backed up by Federal funds in a total national effort, cannot solve the mystery of cancer, not only to cure every patient who gets the disease, but to prevent the disease as well and bring to an end its great cost in money, suffering and loss of life.

The prospects of an early breakthrough in cancer are very real. There are imminent innovations due in the fields of surgery and radiotherapy. Even more promising is the field of chemotherapy where a great fund of knowledge in the treatment of advanced, disseminated cancers has been developed. In leukemia, enormous progress has been made in the last 20 years. It was about 20 years ago that chemicals were used successfully in a patient for the first time to bring about a complete but temporary remission. Today, it is possible to gain complete though temporary remissions in more than 90 percent of the cases in one form of leukemia. What has been learned in the treatment of cancer cells in leukemia is now being used against solid cancers, those of the lung and the thoracic cavity, and it is clear that this chemical approach is on the verge of dramatic results.

Another field of cancer in which there is great hope for the immediate future is in viruses which we know cause can-

cer in animals and have some evidence that they do in man. This year we are stepping up the research program in viruses but we are tardy and inadequate and need to do more here as we do in the other fields of cancer. We should have a vaccine by now and be able to prevent this kind of cancer as we do smallpox, measles, and poliomyelitis.

There are no limits to what we can do as a nation if we have sufficient dedication and dispose our talents and resources to a given goal. In World War II we developed the atom bomb and we did it with an incredible concentration of management, money, and brains.

In more recent times we sent a man to the moon and our approach in the space program was very much like the Manhattan project. I ask now that we do the same thing in cancer and I assure you that if we do, we shall find the same success as we did in the A-bomb and the moonshot and we shall have the gratitude not just of our own Nation but of all mankind.

The resolution referred to follows:

H. RES. 999

Whereas cancer takes the lives of more than three hundred thousand Americans each year; and

Whereas the death rate from cancer is steadily increasing as our population grows; and

Whereas more than one million Americans are currently under treatment for this dread disease; and

Whereas it is clearly in the interests of mankind that this disease be cured and controlled; and

Whereas prominent medical authorities have indicated that cancer can be cured and controlled if the necessary funds are made available; and

Whereas current appropriations are inadequate to accomplish this task; and

Whereas it is both necessary and desirable that a national commitment be immediately undertaken to achieve a cure and control for cancer within this decade: It is hereby

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that no less than \$650,000,000 be appropriated annually over the next ten fiscal years for the national cancer research program; and be it further

*Resolved*, That no less than \$250,000,000 of this appropriation be utilized to construct five new cancer research institutes in the United States during the first two years of the new appropriations.

#### GUIDELINES FOR THE \$150 MILLION SCHOOL ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATION

**HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, President Nixon sent Congress a message on school desegregation in which he requested an immediate appropriation of \$150 million and passage of his desegregation bill which authorizes another \$1.3 billion. Last week my subcommittee began hearings on Mr. Nixon's Emergency School Aid Act of 1970.

At the same time, the Senate Appropriations Committee reported a supplemental appropriations bill containing the

\$150 million. The Senate will consider this appropriation within a few weeks.

During my subcommittee's consideration of Mr. Nixon's bill, Secretary Finch provided us with HEW's draft guidelines for the expenditure of the \$150 million. Since local school control is a major national issue, I would like to share this information with my colleagues.

I believe it should be of interest to all Members of Congress how the administration plans to distribute this money. It should also be of deep concern to all Members that these guidelines put the Federal Government more into the operation of local school districts than any other school bill enacted by Congress. These guidelines completely negate assurances by the Federal Government that Federal aid does not mean Federal control. I hope my colleagues will carefully read these guidelines before they approve this appropriation.

The guidelines follow:

**DRAFT OF BASIC POLICIES FOR ADMINISTERING THE EMERGENCY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATION OF \$150 MILLION NOW UNDER PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION BY DHEW**

**I. Eligibility criteria:**

**1. Eligibility for sponsorship:**

(a) Eligibility for sponsoring of project is limited to local education agencies (LEA's) which are implementing a court ordered or HEW approved plan of desegregation for September 1970 or which have implemented a plan of desegregation during the school year 1968-69 or 1969-70.

(b) Public or private "community or civic organization," other than LEA's which are assisting a local school system in implementing a court ordered or HEW approved plan of desegregation for September 1970 or which have implemented a plan of desegregation during the school year 1968-69 or 1969-70.

**2. Eligibility for receipt of funds:**

(a) The application must submit a project which is of sufficient comprehensiveness, size, and scope to offer reasonable assurance that it will succeed in meeting the problems incident to implementation of the applicant's desegregation plan.

(b) An application must provide assurance that Federal funds made available for any fiscal year will be used so as to supplement and increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be available to the applicant from non-Federal sources for purposes which meet the requirements of this authorization, and in no case as to supplant such funds from non-Federal sources.

(c) Sponsors of projects will be expected to demonstrate that provision has been made for minority groups, parents, members of the community and others at interest to participate in an organized way in the development, review and evaluation of the project.

(NOTE.—These draft criteria are being considered for purposes of administering the special \$150 million appropriation requested and are subject to change. They have not yet been reviewed by all who might be able to contribute ideas and useful suggestions. They do not represent the same criteria, in whole or in part, that may be developed to implement the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970 or similar legislation now under consideration by the Congress.)

(d) In the case of sponsorship by public or private community or civic organizations other than an LEA, a project will be funded only when it is clearly in support of the LEA plan.

**II. Funds may be used for activities that maintain and improve the quality of educa-**

tion during the desegregation process. Examples of such activities are the following:

**1. Special educational personnel and student programs:**

(a) Special personnel:

Temporary teachers—to provide release time for regular instructional personnel to participate in desegregation workshop activities.

Teacher aides—to reduce pupil-teacher ratios in order to give more attention to individual students.

Special guidance and counseling and testing staff—to assist and counsel principals, teachers, and students in order to provide educational programs that will remedy student deficiencies.

Monitors—parents in the school community to perform services that will reduce potential behavioral problems on school buses and school grounds.

Crossing guards—to provide staff that will maximize safety precautions for children who may be taking new and different routes to school.

Administrative and clerical staff—to provide additional personnel and time for implementation of desegregation plans, e.g., additional month of employment during the summer for principals.

(b) Student services:

Remedial programs—to provide specialists, books and supplies for remediation in all subject areas in which students are deficient.

Guidance and counseling—to provide adequate guidance and counseling staff in order to deal with student adjustment problems resulting from the desegregation process.

Diagnostic evaluation and testing programs—to provide diagnosticians trained to evaluate special sight, hearing and psychological problems of students.

Work-study programs—to provide children from poverty level families with specially-designed school programs that would afford them financial assistance so as to continue their education.

Health and nutrition services—to provide specialized personnel and services for students having health and nutrition deficiencies.

Dropout prevention programs.

Student relations—to provide special programs designed to assist students on problems such as acceptance, behavior, dress codes, etc.

(c) Educational personnel development:

Seminars on problems incident to desegregation—to provide training with skills experts in the area of human relations so as to minimize problems incident to desegregation.

Seminars on teacher interpersonal relationships—to facilitate positive interpersonal relations among educational personnel through training by skilled professionals in an intercultural understanding.

Utilization of university expertise through institutes and inservice programs to deal with such problems as:

Teaching bilingual children

Teaching children with speech and dialect deficiencies

Attitudes and problems of teachers, parents and students involved in the desegregation process

Upgrading basic skills and instructional methodologies of teachers in English, math, science, social sciences, language, arts, reading, etc.

(d) Curriculum development:

Utilization of expert consultants to shape and design new curricula approaches and to introduce curriculum innovations that would serve children with multi-ethnic backgrounds.

New and varied instructional materials.

Improved evaluation and assessment of student progress.

(e) Special demonstration projects:

Projects for introduction of innovative instructional methodologies which will improve the quality of education in the desegregated school:

Individualized instruction.

Master teachers.

Team teaching.

Non-graded programs.

Special projects involving community agencies and parents—to develop joint projects between special-interest and civic groups, parents and the schools which would promote understanding among citizens. Such projects could include sponsoring citywide and countywide art and music festivals, public meetings on relevant school problems (drug abuse, behavior, etc.).

Exemplary instructional practices—to operate pilot projects which would demonstrate exemplary instructional practices suitable for systemwide replication and for other school districts involved in the desegregation process.

(f) State and local planning and administration:

Expand technical assistance capabilities at the State education agency level—to provide additional personnel to assist the local education agency in planning for desegregation.

Temporary staff at the local level to handle administrative details and clerical duties—to provide additional temporary staff to deal with the logistics of changing from a dual to a unitary system. For example, rescheduling of students and teachers, redrawing transportation routes, supervision of necessary physical changes (moving equipment, building renovation, etc.).

Staff at the local level for planning and supervising the implementation of the desegregation plan.

**2. Community participation programs:**

(a) Public information activities:

Community information programs for parents, teachers, and students—to provide factual information about the desegregation plan and school programs.

(b) Community programs:

School-home visitation programs—an activity to be performed by educational personnel to assist with dissemination of information about school programs and student progress in the desegregated school.

Special parent programs—to provide programs designed to increase parents' involvement with the schools' programs, i.e., PTA, Education Emphasis Week, etc.

**3. Equipment and minor remodeling:**

Procurement and relocation of temporary classrooms (trailers, mobile facilities and demountables).

Procurement and relocation of equipment and classroom furniture, including replacement of obsolete items.

Minor building renovation and remodeling for general upgrading of a facility.

**POSTAL ACADEMY PROGRAM**

**HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to read in a recent release from the Post Office Department that its efforts to establish the postal academy program for disadvantaged youth was proceeding on schedule. Postmaster General Winston M. Blount has announced that 52 postal volunteers will begin training for their September assignments at an inactive Job Corps center. The Postmaster General should be commended not only



for keeping this program on schedule, but also for his economical use of an inactive facility.

The text of the release follows for those of my colleagues who did not see it:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Postmaster General Winton M. Blount today announced that an inactive job corps center in Mountainair, New Mexico, is being converted into a "multi-purpose training facility" for the Post Office Department.

The site will become operational June 7 when 52 postal volunteers begin training for teaching and counseling positions in the Postal Academy Program for disadvantaged youths.

Last month, pilot academy programs began in five cities: Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Atlanta and Washington, D.C.

The aim of the academy program is to motivate, educate and train school dropouts, aged 16 to 21, as well as postal employees who have been unable to qualify for advancement within the Post Office Department.

The eight-week session beginning next week in Mountainair is designed to cultivate basic skills for understanding and expanding the limited backgrounds of potential academy trainees.

In September, the program candidates will staff additional academies scheduled to open in the five pilot cities, as well as Newark, New Jersey. The Department is considering further expansion of the academy concept beginning in January of next year.

In addition to training academy staff members, Mountainair will become another management training center for the postal service.

According to Mr. Blount, the new site is easily accessible to the western postal regions, and offers an abundance of utilization possibilities. He said the facility will soon become a vital link in the overall training operations of the postal system.

The Postal Inspection Service is studying the feasibility of maintaining a training center for all new inspectors at Mountainair. The facility is also a potential site for various postmaster and supervisor training sessions.

The Postmaster General expressed his thanks to the citizens and community leaders of Mountainair for their cooperation in helping bring the Post Office Department to their area.

The former job corps center opened in 1965 and remained operational until last summer. Since that time, the facility has been inactive.

**AN ACCURATE PICTURE OF DIRECT MILITARY EXPENDITURES AS A PERCENTAGE OF ALL DIRECT GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES FISCAL YEAR 1969**

**HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues would be interested in figures compiled at my request by the Legislative Reference Service which reflect an accurate percentage of our entire Government expenditures spent directly on military affairs.

We have often heard figures quoted as high as 60, 67, and 70 percent as representative of the military share of our yearly expenditures. These figures are

misleading, I believe, because to compare Federal military expenditures only with total Federal expenditures ignores outlays by State and local governments, both of which are vital parts of the total nationwide Government spending effort.

The Federal Government bears primary responsibility for providing national defense, whereas State and local governments share major financial responsibility in such areas as education and welfare. Taking such State and local expenditures into account, a more accurate percentage of direct military expenditures to total Government expenditures is 29.4 percent—see below. While we may still debate whether this is an appropriate share of Government expenditures to devote to military purposes, we should at least work from an accurate base.

I have purposely avoided adding indirect military expenditure—such as interest on the national debt, Veterans' Administration costs, and so forth—to my calculations since they would only muddy the waters and take our eyes off an accurate percentage that we can analyze rationally in ordering our priorities.

The figures follow:

**DIRECT MILITARY EXPENDITURES AS A PERCENTAGE OF ALL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1969**

[Fiscal year 1969, in billions]

Total Federal expenditures <sup>1</sup> .....	\$184.6
Total State and local government expenditures <sup>2</sup> .....	92.3
Total Federal, State, and local government expenditures....	276.9
Total Federal military expenditures... \$81.2	
Total State and local military expenditures <sup>3</sup> .....	.1
Total Federal, State, and local military expenditures.....	81.3

\$81.3 divided by \$276.9 equals 29.4 percent.

<sup>1</sup> Bureau of the Budget, "Budget of the United States Government, FY ending 1971, p. 591.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Economic Report of the President, February 1970, Table C-70, p. 259, preliminary figures for FY 1968. Yearly growth pattern of 10 percent added to preliminary FY 1968 figure of \$102.4 billion, less estimated \$20.3 billion in direct Federal payments to state and local governments, "Special Analyses, Budget of the United States Government, FY ending 1971, p. 226).

<sup>3</sup> Expenditures on National Guard. In FY 1969, according to the National Guard Association, Federal expenditures for all Guard units totaled \$994.67 million. Based on yearly estimates by the NGA over the last 15 years, state and local governments spend from their own fiscal sources approximately 10 percent more than the federal figure (for certain operations, maintenance and personnel costs).

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

**HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my 22d Report From Wash-

ington to the residents of California's 30th Congressional District, "Spring 1970," highlighting some of the major accomplishments and significant legislative issues considered during the early months of the 91st Congress, second session.

In addition to this series of regular reports, I have also sent out 16 special reports to cover topics and events in the Nation's Capital of particular interest to the citizens of our Metropolitan Los Angeles area.

The report follows:

**CONGRESSMAN ED ROYBAL REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON EDUCATION**

One of the highlights of the 91st Congress is our success in asserting a leadership role in beginning the process of reordering our national priorities to focus more directly on the many urgent domestic challenges facing the United States today—such as the present education crisis.

Because of inadequate local tax revenues, plus failure of many of the state governments to bear a proportionate share of the financial burden of providing every child a quality education, school systems have come to rely increasingly on federal assistance to assure full educational opportunity for all our citizens—especially in larger urban areas like Los Angeles, where an inflationary cost spiral, plus an ever-increasing demand for more schools and teachers has placed an impossible strain on existing funding capacities.

I am proud to have taken part in this Congressional initiative, and to have voted for an education appropriation that would have meant more than \$150 million in additional funds for the State of California, and would have benefited our financially hard-pressed Los Angeles Unified School District by some \$15 million—a real help to the overburdened property taxpayers of our community.

I also voted to override the President's veto of this vital education bill, because I do not think that America's urgent domestic needs can be handled on a "business as usual" basis any longer.

**CAMBODIA**

I strongly opposed the President's recent unilateral decision to send American ground combat troops into neutralist Cambodia, thereby expanding the tragic Vietnamese conflict into what now appears to be fast becoming a full-fledged regional war engulfing the entire Indochinese peninsula.

Because of my concern, I sent the President the following telegram:

Such involvement runs counter to your expressed purpose of reducing our commitments in Southeast Asia. After five years of futility in Vietnam, what policy lures us to intervene in Cambodia? This decision will result in increased suffering and loss of life, and will also increase the tensions and divisions within our own country. . . . It is clear that the end-solution in Southeast Asia can only be one that is worked out by the Asians themselves, not an American settlement.

I subsequently introduced House Resolution 986: Resolved, that, in the absence of a declaration of war, it is the policy of the House of Representatives that fiscal year 1971 defense expenditures in South Vietnam should be limited to only that amount required to carry out the safe and orderly withdrawal of all American combat and support troops from South Vietnam by the end of fiscal year 1971 (June 30, 1971); and be it further Resolved, that no funds in the fiscal year 1971 defense budget are to be used to finance the operation of any American combat or support troops in Cambodia or Laos.

## WILSHIRE CENTER

Joining with William Critchfield, President of the Wilshire Center Chamber of Commerce, in celebrating the Chamber's 50th anniversary during the annual Wilshire Center Day parade.

The Southern California Congressional Delegation also welcomed the officers, directors and committee chairmen from the Los Angeles Chamber during their Spring meeting in Washington to discuss topics of concern to all area residents, such as airport development, the California Water Plan, aid to education and mass transit assistance.

Chamber leaders emphasized the urgent need for all elements of the urban community to work closely together to help solve the growing social and economic problems that confront the United States, particularly in our major metropolitan population centers like Los Angeles.

## MALABAR READING PROGRAM

One of the most successful education projects in America, funded through the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is now being conducted at Los Angeles' Malabar Street Elementary School.

Demonstrating highly effective techniques for dramatically improving reading, arithmetic, vocabulary, and IQ scores of children, the Malabar Reading Program is listed by the U.S. Office of Education as being rated among the top 3 percent of the 1300 education programs selected as the best in the United States on the basis of an intensive 2-year nationwide survey.

I am delighted to have had the opportunity of playing an important role in the success of the Malabar project since the early 1960s, when the program was started as an experimental pilot project.

After helping secure initial federal funding from the Office of Education's Bureau of Research, I headed a 20-member bipartisan California Congressional Delegation which succeeded in obtaining federal operating support to continue the project—by getting education officials in Washington to reverse their original decision against continued funding.

This year, some 1400 children in pre-school through sixth grade at the Malabar School are participating in the program, which has raised the academic performance of the students significantly, including those children with limited English language ability.

Besides concentrating on developing reading and language skills, the Malabar project stressed individualized as well as self-instruction; curriculum change; extensive parent participation; emphasis on the child's own organizing abilities; promoting healthy self-concepts to encourage the student to view himself as a success in the school environment; plus a wide range of cultural and extra-curricular activities.

It is hoped that officials in other school systems will be able to use the Malabar program as a model to upgrade the level of achievement in their own schools.

## JOB TRAINING

Trying my hand at carpentry at the federally-funded Youth Training & Employment Project, where several enrollees are shown assisting in construction of additional classrooms and office space. The majority of these youths are high school dropouts. But at YTEP, they receive counseling, remedial education in basic skills, and vocational training to prepare them for placement in productive jobs.

I was also happy to announce a \$700,000 job training award from the U.S. Department of Labor to continue the 150-trainee "New Careers" project operated by the Mexican American Opportunity Foundation in East Los Angeles. This innovative program, offers skill training and work experience to low-income persons primarily in the social

services field. Many enrollees have been hired in departments of the Los Angeles County Government, as well as the California Youth Authority, community service centers, local hospitals and school districts.

It is encouraging to see the success of the New Careerists, who have gained permanent employment in the agencies in which they have trained, and who are continuing to serve the needs of the community as capable and worthwhile employees.

## VETERANS ASSISTANCE

Showing me a copy of the Los Angeles County proposal for a unique, new Veterans Assistance Center to be located in Los Angeles are (l to r): Bill Leone, Chief of the County's Special Services Division; Joe Pollard, County Supervisors' Legislative Consultant in Washington; Arnold Martinez, Field Representative for Supervisor Ernest Debs; and Carols Ruiz, with the newly created federal Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish Speaking.

We succeeded in obtaining federal agency approval of the project, and secured pledges of cooperation and funding support from the Veterans Administration, the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education & Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

When fully operating, the Los Angeles Veterans Assistance Center will be one of the first of its kind in the nation designed specifically to provide returning Vietnam servicemen with a new concept of personalized outreach services—to insure that all veterans, especially those recently separated, receive comprehensive educational, vocational, counseling, social services, and job training and placement assistance tailored to the individual needs of the veteran—to help him make a successful readjustment to civilian life, take full advantage of all government benefits available to him, and become a productive, self-supporting member of the community.

As a member of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, I was also happy to have been able to help secure enactment this year of Public Law 91-219, which provides an average overall increase of 35% in veterans education and training allowances.

## WELFARE REFORM

I joined with a bipartisan majority of 243 to 155 in the House to approve a long-overdue effort to reform the nation's public assistance programs.

By recognizing that welfare is a national, not a purely local problem, the measure is a step in the direction of relieving state and local taxpayers of the major financial burden of supporting the country's fast-growing public assistance programs, while attempting to establish a national minimum floor for family assistance, combined with work incentive and job training features.

The bill is now being considered by the Senate, with final details remaining to be worked out.

But, in my opinion, national welfare reform is must legislation, if property taxpayers in metropolitan centers like Los Angeles are ever to be able to look forward to meaningful tax relief.

## YOUNG SAINTS IN WASHINGTON

California's famous Young Saints musical group gave a benefit performance for servicemen at Walter Reed Army Hospital during their recent East Coast tour.

I was glad to work out details of this benefit, as well as help arrange for their appearance at the White House dinner honoring the Duke and Duchess of Windsor. It is a pleasure to encourage the development of youthful talent from our Los Angeles community.

## LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

Again this year, I sent out a questionnaire soliciting the views of the residents of the 30th District on some of the major legislative

issues of special interest to Los Angeles, the State of California, and the Nation.

Like the encouraging experience with my previous Congressional Polls, I was highly pleased at the overwhelming response to this opportunity to participate in the affairs of government by indicating your opinion on these vital issues.

The tabulated results will be made available in my next newsletter report from Washington.

## CALIFORNIA'S EXPANDING ECONOMY

Dr. Robert Connor, Director of Product Research & Development, and Senior Chemist Art Sutton, demonstrate a new piece of laboratory equipment at the internationally-known, Los Angeles-based cosmetics firm of Max Factor & Co.

The firm, celebrating its 60th year in business and providing steady employment for more than 1500 people locally, won the top achievement award of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce for "significant contributions to Southern California's economic growth," thereby helping develop a more broadly based industry to assure the future prosperity of our entire State.

A highlight of my visit was talking with Davis Factor, Chairman of the Board, who, like myself, was reared in Boyle Heights. We discussed the history of that area, the prominent men it has produced, and the outstanding contribution that many of its residents, both past and present, have made in every field of endeavor.

## ETHNIC STUDIES

As recent guest speaker for the Asian American Studies Class of Pasadena City College, I discussed with Harry Kawahara, course instructor, and students Agnes Suzuki and Jane Kawahara, details of my bill, H.R. 14910, the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act, which would assist in developing educational programs to provide elementary and high school students an opportunity to learn more about the unique cultural contributions of America's major ethnic groups in building our national heritage.

The bill would establish a number of Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers, each devoted to development of curriculum materials dealing with one ethnic group, or a regional group of ethnic cultures, as well as the training of teachers to utilize these curriculum packages as study units in their regular classes.

The studies would pertain to a particular group's history, geography, society, literature, art, music, language, drama, economy, and general culture, and encourage a greater awareness and appreciation of the group's importance as a contributor to the rich diversity of our American way of life.

## AT YOUR SERVICE

The members of my Congressional office staff in Washington, as well as those in our Los Angeles District Office, are anxious to help you in any way they can. Please continue to make full use of the many services available through our offices by contacting us whenever you feel we can be of personal assistance.

BRUNSWICK, GA., A GOOD PLACE TO LIVE AND WORK

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, we all take pride in progress in our country and as a Member of this Congress I take particular pride in growth and progress



of those cities and counties located in the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia.

I would like to include at this point an article which appeared in the *Generator*, the employee publication of Babcock & Wilcox Power Generation Division in Brunswick, Ga.

This article points out that progress can be made and industry can grow without ruining the surrounding environment. People can work and rest and enjoy recreational activities in pleasant surroundings that are at the same time productive.

The article follows:

**BRUNSWICK, GA., A GOOD PLACE TO LIVE AND WORK**

"I am convinced that God meant this land for people to rest in—not to work in." That's what Sidney Lanier, Georgia's great poet, wrote about Brunswick, Ga., nearly 100 years ago.

Today, Brunswick is not exactly a rest area. It has an estimated population of 25,500, and is the home of more than 70 manufacturing and processing companies. B&W's Power Generation division works is the third largest industrial plant in town, outranked only by Hercules Powder Company and Brunswick Pulp & Paper Corporation.

Because of the rapidly expanding market for its products in the South and Southwest, B&W in 1952 purchased outright from the Brunswick Port Authority a 110-acre former shipyard, with a two-bay fabricating shop, on the harbor side of the city.

Mean annual temperature in the area of 68.4 degrees permits both indoor and outdoor work year-round.

In addition to heavy industry, Brunswick boasts some of the largest shrimp and crab processing plants in the United States. More than 10 million pounds of shrimp are taken from Brunswick waters each year. Shrimp boats usually begin coming in with their catches around 3 P.M. each day, and visitors to the city gather along Bay Street in downtown Brunswick to watch them unload.

The first settlement in the area grew around Fort Frederica, which General James Oglethorpe established on St. Simons Island in 1736. At its peak, Frederica had a population of about 1,500 and the fort claimed the distinction of being "the largest, most regular, and perhaps most costly" British fortification in North America. It was General Oglethorpe's military headquarters for operations against the Spanish in Florida during the War of Jenkins' Ear (1739-48). Military operations in the Georgia-Florida area culminated in the Battle of Bloody Marsh on St. Simons Island where Oglethorpe's outnumbered troops defeated a Spanish invasion force on July 7, 1742. Never again was Spain a major threat to Georgia.

The Colonial Council of the Royal Province of Georgia, at a meeting in 1771, laid out the city of Brunswick and named the streets and parks. The city was named in honor of King George III of England, who was of the House of Hanover or Brunswick. Glynn County, of which Brunswick is the county seat, was named in honor of John Glynn, a member of Parliament who sympathized with the colonists in their struggle for independence.

Although Brunswick is a bustling hub of industry and commerce the adjacent Golden Isles of Georgia are ideal spots to rest. Also called "Sea Islands," this chain of lush, subtropical islands stretches from Savannah south to Brunswick. Best known of the group are Sea Island, St. Simons and Jekyll, all of which can be reached by bridge or causeway from Brunswick.

In the 1880's a group of millionaires, looking for a private winter resort away from it all, bought Jekyll Island and built homes there.

For more than 50 years it was their private playground. Then in 1942 a German submarine torpedoed a tanker near Jekyll Island. U.S. military leaders feared the Nazis might try to capture the island. The Jekyll Island Club was closed, and the Coast Guard moved in.

After the war the state of Georgia bought the island, built a bridge to the mainland and opened the island to the public as a year-round resort. Today, thousands of visitors enjoy golf, swimming, fishing, bicycling, miniature golf and tennis at the former millionaires' playground.

Between Brunswick and the Golden Isles are the fabled Marshes of Glynn immortalized by Sidney Lanier. Less than a mile from B&W's Brunswick works is Lanier's Oak, where the poet was inspired to some of his most famous poetry. At Glynco, United States Naval Air Station, six miles north of Brunswick, is the largest naval radar operators school in the world.

To travelers heading to Florida along U.S. 17, Brunswick may be just another city along the way. To the people in the B&W works on U.S. 17, Brunswick is a great place to work and rest.

**POLICYHOLDERS SOUGHT ON INSURANCE DEBTS**

**HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I introduced legislation to create a Federal Insurance Guaranty Corporation.

This agency would protect insurance policyholders against insurance company insolvencies and certain other insurance company practices which escape the censure of State insurance officials.

The analogy between my FIGC concept and the FDIC cannot be drawn too strongly. The Federal Insurance Guaranty Corporation would function to protect insurance consumers in the same manner the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation watches our banking practices.

The problem of insurance companies going under is ominous. It means people left without coverage, claims and claimants unsatisfied, and too often, innocent policyholders stuck with the bills of the failing companies.

The Senate Commerce Committee will shortly report out legislation dealing with this and other insurance problems.

Hearings have not been held in the House on my legislation.

I am sure all of my colleagues have received constituent complaints on insurance issues. Many of these problems would cease to exist if we could set some strong national guidelines for the insurance industry. The FIGC legislation will do this.

I would like to introduce an article from the June 1 Pittsburgh Press which explores one facet of the insurance company insolvency problem.

The article follows:

**POLICYHOLDERS SOUGHT ON INSURANCE DEBTS**

**HARRISBURG, May 31.**—The state Insurance Department is trying to collect more than \$22 million from some 300,000 Pennsylvanians who are responsible for the debts

of certain insurance companies which went bankrupt while they held policies with them.

The companies involved are of the "mutual" type, generally ones offering coverage at lesser costs than other companies, but who hold policyholders liable for any debts incurred.

The situation came into focus last week when the department notified 96,000 policyholders of the bankrupt Commonwealth Mutual Insurance Co. that it was initiating assessment action against the policyholders.

**RASH OF COMPLAINTS**

The notices brought a rash of complaints, leading the department to conclude that most of the policyholders had no idea of their responsibilities.

Altogether, the department has the task of collecting money from holders of 339,884 policies written by companies over the past two decades. Only about 300,000 persons are involved because some hold more than one policy.

In many cases, the task of finding policyholders is complicated by deaths, new addresses and phone numbers, and similar things. Often, cost of the dunning process is more than the debt sought.

**ITEMS BACKLOGGED**

The situation is the result of years of neglect in collecting such assessments. When former Insurance Commissioner David O. Maxwell took office in 1967, he ordered an immediate effort to clean up the records and collect all backlogged assessments.

The problem is compounded by the fact many of the policy holders are in low income groups who grabbed up the cheaper rates offered by the mutual companies, without closely reading the contracts.

**TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CLIFFORD DAVIS**

**HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleagues in paying special tribute to our esteemed friend and distinguished former colleague, the late Clifford Davis, who passed away on June 8. He was one of those people who once met is always remembered. He had a talent for friendship. He had a talent for leadership and a unique talent for being a wonderfully warm human being. I have lost a friend and I shall miss Cliff Davis.

After a successful career in Memphis, Tenn., as a municipal court judge, vice mayor and commissioner of public safety, he was elected to the House of Representatives in 1940. This was the same year I was elected to the House and it was my privilege to enjoy his friendship throughout his service in Washington. He served with distinction through 1964, a period of 24 years. During his service here he accomplished many important objectives. He was chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition of the Committee on Public Works, and was appointed by the Speaker of the House to serve as chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures for the House of Representatives for five consecutive terms.

Cliff's contribution to our country's development can also be seen in many fine projects built across this country by the Corps of Engineers. They have provided safety, insured progress, and improved recreation for millions of our citizens. It was Cliff Davis' vision and foresight and diligence and hard work that helped to make possible the magnificent flood control protection which now prevails throughout the Mississippi River system. His contributions can be seen in the Appalachia program, in its development, and in the help it has given and the hope it has created in the hearts of millions of our citizens in these poverty stricken areas.

Cliff and his wonderful wife, Carrie, were a very significant part of the community life of Washington and their own city of Memphis. Both contributed significantly to the strength of the Democratic Party. The work they did will live long in the memories of those who have known and loved them.

To Mrs. Davis, to Cliff's sons, Clifford, Jr., and Ray, and to his daughter, Mrs. George Chauncey, Mrs. Sikes and I extend our deepest sympathy.

#### NORTHERN KENTUCKY MARINE KILLED IN VIETNAM

**HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER**  
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to L. Cpl. Thomas J. Berning, who was killed on a combat mission in Quang Nam Province, on Tuesday, June 2, 1970.

Tom was the 112th northern Kentucky fighting man to give his life for his country in Southeast Asia.

Though the Nation is experiencing dissent over America's commitment, Tom Berning answered the call to duty. He paid the supreme sacrifice for his country and for those of us whom he died defending.

Tom Berning died that others could live—and remain free. I know I speak for the people of the Fourth District of Kentucky—and for all Americans—when I convey my deep sense of sympathy to the Berning family.

The front page story reporting Tom's loss, which appeared in the June 4 Kentucky Post, by Howard Raver, follows:

DUE HOME IN JULY—CORPORAL DIES IN  
VIETNAM

(By Howard Raver)

A 20-year-old Newport boy, Thomas J. Berning, has given his life in the Vietnam war.

Berning, a lance corporal in the Marines, was killed Tuesday on a combat mission in Quang Nam Province.

He was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Fred Berning of 123 W. 13th street, Newport.

The Bernings have learned only sketchy details of what happened. They were told Tom had suffered "penetrating head and chest injuries from explosives" on the mission.

"The Marine officers came to the house with the news Tuesday afternoon," the young victim's mother said. "Then a telegram came Wednesday morning from the Marine Corps."

Cpl. Berning had spent more than 10 months in Vietnam.

"Tom was supposed to come home July 30," Mrs. Berning said. "And he was always looking forward to it in his letters."

The family had received two letters from him Monday.

"He said he had been made a squad leader several weeks ago. Otherwise, he said there wasn't much to write about . . . it was the same old thing."

Cpl. Berning had enlisted in the Marines in February, 1969, and trained at Camp Pendleton, Cal.

A 1967 graduate of Newport Catholic High School, he was employed at the Frank Tea & Spice Co., Cincinnati, until his enlistment.

He is the 112th area casualty of Southeast Asia and the 29th Campbell Countian to die.

Army Pfc. Robert R. Berning, 20, of Highland Heights, was killed last week in Cambodia. The two are not related.

Besides his parents, Cpl. Berning leaves two sisters, Mrs. Larry (Mary) Rininger of Newport, and Miss Debbie Berning, at home; two brothers, John and Greg, at home, and maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Sandfoss, Newport.

His father is employed at the Lord Baltimore Press Division of International Paper Co.

Radel Funeral Home, Newport, is in charge of arrangements.

#### AMERICAN LEGION RESOLUTION ON POW'S

**HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI**  
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, at its national executive committee meeting May 6 and 7, the American Legion passed a resolution on the subject of American servicemen who are prisoners of war in Asia.

The resolution condemns the brutal treatment of prisoners by the North Vietnamese and NLF, calls for an expression of public indignation by all Americans, and requests that the United Nations appoint an independent commission to investigate the status of prisoners.

For their positive action on behalf of our POW's, the American Legion is to be commended highly. As it has so many times in the past, that organization is acting in the best tradition of humanitarianism and patriotism.

I am sure that the efforts of the American Legion, coupled with the many other organizations which are seeking to enlist public interest and concern for our captured and missing servicemen, will be helpful in gaining some measure of relief for our men and their loved ones here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the American Legion resolution deserves the attention of all Members of Congress and it is my privilege to place it in the RECORD at this point:

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING OF  
THE AMERICAN LEGION HELD MAY 6-7,  
1970—RESOLUTION NO. 8

Committee: Foreign Relations.  
Subject: American Servicemen—Prisoners of War.

Whereas, the government of North Vietnam was one of 126 signatories to the Geneva Convention of 1949 on the humane

treatment of prisoners taken in armed conflict which, by its terms, specifically covered all such conflicts whether in declared wars or not; and

Whereas, This Convention covered, among other points, provisions guaranteeing;

1. The identification of prisoners held captive.
2. The release of prisoners seriously wounded or ill.
3. The allowance of a proper flow of letters and packages to and from prisoners.
4. The protection of prisoners from injury or abuse by the public.
5. The prohibition of the use of prisoners for propaganda purposes.
6. The provision of adequate food and shelter.
7. Access to prisoners and inspection of the conditions of their confinement by the International Red Cross, and

Whereas, The government of North Vietnam and its lackeys, the Viet Cong and Pathet Lao, have systematically violated each and every one of the above mentioned rules of civilized warfare, even refusing the universally accepted right of the International Red Cross to have access to such prisoners and to report on and work for their welfare; and

Whereas, It is now definitely established that prisoners have been humiliated, starved and grossly abused physically and mentally. Furthermore, the lack of identification and mail has resulted in great mental torture, not only to these prisoners, but to their dependents and loved ones in this country; and now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the National Executive Committee of The American Legion, in regular meeting assembled at Indianapolis, Indiana, May 6-7, 1970, that The American Legion condemns the brutal treatment of prisoners by their Communist captors in Southeast Asia and demands that said Communist entities, governments, and juntas comply with requests for inspection by the International Red Cross and afford to all prisoners in their hands the rights guaranteed under the Geneva Convention; and be it further.

Resolved, That the American Legion, its Departments and Posts embark on a saturation campaign, including but not limited to rallies, petitions, letter writing and telegrams in order that the American Public may be fully informed about the status of these "Forgotten Americans" and to the end that public indignation be thunderously expressed not only to the Communist captors but throughout the civilized world that National Headquarters advise the Posts, through the Departments, of proper techniques for implementing such campaigns; and be it further

Resolved, that the President of the United States through our representation in the United Nations seek the appointment by that body of an independent commission to investigate the status of prisoners held by Communist entities in Southeast Asia; and be it finally

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each member of the Congress of the United States and to each foreign embassy and consulate in this country.

#### THE BALTIC PEOPLES MARK A SAD ANNIVERSARY

**HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.**  
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is in a sombre mood that the Baltic peoples



mark the anniversary of their Soviet occupation and the cessation of their independence as free peoples.

Those of us who are the custodians of a democratic way of life, who fortunately experience the precious essence of liberty, also have an awesome responsibility to those whose plight is less fortunate.

I salute the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia who, despite their oppressive occupation, continue to strive and support and sustain a free spirit.

I share their faith and trust that they once again will be blessed with the liberty which is the right of all mankind and that their hopes for their unique identities will come to fruition.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be associated with the cause of the Baltic peoples, for I share their goals and ideals.

The following resolution passed in 1965 expresses the sentiment of the U.S. Congress:

#### HOUSE CONFERENCE RESOLUTION 416

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### AMERICAN HUNGARIAN FEDERATION WARNS

#### HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, many have deplored and condemned the violence and illegal protest that has erupted across many of our college campuses. One patriotic group of Americans, the Ameri-

can Hungarian Federation, realizing the value of freedom and the right to disagree, perhaps more poignantly than many of today's students, warns that "utopian concern for social reform can and has been used as an effective smoke-screen for spreading communism."

Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues the full text of the Hungarian resolution:

#### RESOLUTION

Be it resolved that the American Hungarian Federation's Board of Directors meeting strongly condemns the present violent protests on the several campuses of the nation in regard to the President's limited intervention in Communist-invaded Cambodia for the purpose of protecting American armed forces in South Viet Nam.

The American Hungarian Federation considers such protests unpatriotic, seditious and potentially subversive and calls upon competent university, local, State and Federal officials and agencies to undertake a comprehensive investigation into these violent protests with particular emphasis on (a) sources of financing; (b) Communist ideological and organizational infiltration; (c) seditious and revolutionary intent of their leadership and to recommend legislative, executive and administrative actions needed to prevent and/or to control effectively any subversive, seditious and violent groups in the nation both on and off-campus.

The American Hungarian Federation condemns in strongest terms the continued codding of the protest movement by various TV and radio networks giving unduly wide and generally sympathetic coverage to subversive and seditious groups and individuals attacking our political and social system and the Constitution.

It commends the attitude of the majority of college and graduate students for their non-participation in the violent protests and student strikes which a determined and subversive minority tries to foist upon some of the universities of the nation.

It calls upon the presidents of the universities of the nation not to permit interruption of the learning process for the sake of protest and to face up to the necessity of expelling rebellious and anarchistic students and non-tenure faculty despite the monetary inconveniences this may impose upon them. The American-Hungarian Federation suggests that expulsion and dismissal procedures be strengthened and rigorously enforced by university authorities. It deplores the decision taken by a score of universities, mostly in the northeast, to suspend classes until the fall.

In condemning violent protest and unpatriotic attitudes toward the President and the armed forces of the United States and the police of the various states and cities, the American Hungarian Federation recognizes the legitimate interest of student bodies and faculties in promoting social progress and academic reform and involvement into the political process. It emphasizes, however, that such goals are in reality defeated by violence, lowering the quality of education by "open admissions" and adoption of ideologies alien and hostile to the laws and Constitution of the United States and calls upon reform-minded youth to work within the established political processes and to respect the laws and ordinances of local, State and Federal governments.

The American Hungarian Federation warns that alleged or utopian concern for social reform can and has been used as an effective smoke-screen for spreading Communist propaganda whether of Russian or Chinese variety and calls upon the Congress of the United States to declare the Red Flag, the Viet Cong flag, the black flag of anarchism and the use of clenched fist greetings illegal and punishable as a Federal offense.

The American Hungarian Federation cautions both students and faculties and the agencies of the local, State and Federal governments that the tactics used by many of the "New Left" groups closely parallel Communist Party tactics and rhetoric used after World War II in Hungary and other East Central European countries. The American Hungarian Federation, therefore, calls for increased vigilance and exposure of these subversive tactics and the rhetoric by faculty, writers and government agencies as well.

RT. REV. ZOLTAN BEKY, D.D.,  
Bishop emeritus, Chairman of the Board.

DR. LOUIS FURY ARNOLD,  
National Secretary.

PROF. Z. MICHAEL SZAZ, Ph. D.,  
Secretary of International Relations.

New York, May 16, 1970.

#### U.S. FLAG FLIES AGAIN IN RHODESIA

#### HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fitting that on this observance of Flag Day in the House of Representatives that we should learn that once again Old Glory has been raised in the Republic of Rhodesia.

It was a sad day in the affairs of the United States when President Lyndon Johnson joined in the boycott of Rhodesia and severed diplomatic relations with those friendly peoples, and no credit is to be extended to President Nixon for continuing the boycott.

But to know that the American-Southern Africa Council has again raised the U.S. flag in Rhodesia gives us hope that the misguided in this country may yet acknowledge the error of their ways.

Let Old Glory, as it flutters in the breeze in Salisbury, carry the message to Rhodesians that millions of Americans support them in severing their relations with Britain and in the establishment of their young Republic.

Following is an article from the Rhodesian Herald:

[From the Rhodesia Herald, May 29, 1970]  
UNITED STATES FLAG FLIES AGAIN IN SALISBURY

An American flag which a month ago flew over the Capitol in Washington yesterday fluttered from a building in Manica Road, Salisbury, to mark the opening of the American-Southern Africa Council's Rhodesian office.

The Right-wing Washington-based Council has set up its Salisbury office to keep an "American presence" here after the closure of the U.S. Consulate and to signify friendship between the United States and Rhodesia.

A former Rhodesian Cabinet Minister, Lord Graham, was guest of honour at a party after the opening by an American lawyer, Dr. Richard van Buskirk, who has been in Rhodesia for the past month setting up the office.

At 6:45 p.m. Dr. van Buskirk telephoned the Council's American headquarters to announce the opening of the office.

Hanging from the walls of the office are four pictures of the Rhodesian Prime Minister, Mr. Ian Smith—including one of Mr. Smith and his Ministers signing Rhodesia's Declaration of Independence in 1965—and a copy of a letter to President Nixon signed by

77 U.S. Congressmen protesting at the closure of the U.S. Consulate.

#### COMMITTEE

In an interview Dr. van Buskirk said the office would be run by a voluntary five-man advisory committee of Rhodesians and would employ a full-time receptionist-secretary.

The full composition of the local committee has not yet been decided but one member is a Salisbury businessman, Mr. Roy Boden who has been connected with the American-Southern Africa Council for the past three years.

Dr. van Buskirk said the Council had budgeted for about \$800 a month to run the office.

"But we will and can expand that budget if necessary," he said.

Dr. van Buskirk who leaves Rhodesia at the week-end, said his office had already dealt with a number of inquiries ranging from travel and admission to American universities, to copyright on American publications.

#### TELEPHONE SERVICE

"We also will run a 24-hour telephone service so that any American—or anyone else—who is in any sort of difficulty here will be able to get in touch with someone who will help him."

Pointing to the signatures of the American Congressmen, Dr. van Buskirk added: "People will be able to see that what our Government does is not necessarily what our people want—the American people are solidly with Rhodesia."

As an example of "dishonest thinking" by the American State Department, Dr. van Buskirk said the Department had recently advised two prospective tourists to Rhodesia that in view of the "unsettled conditions" in the country they should not come as the State Department could not guarantee their safety.

Arrangements for the Stars and Stripes now flying in Salisbury to fly over the Capitol were made by Louisiana Congressman Mr. John Rarick.

Asked if his Government disapproved of a U.S. flag being flown in Salisbury, Dr. van Buskirk said: "They do not approve of what we are doing but we still have a considerable amount of freedom."

### RISKS GREATER BUT PROFITS FATTER

#### HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD the third in a series of articles concerning narcotics which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor. This latest installment describes that stage of the illicit heroin traffic in which morphine is converted to heroin, and the subsequent shipment of this refined drug to the United States.

I commend this article to my colleagues for their consideration:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 5, 1970]

MARSEILLE—HUB OF HEROIN INDUSTRY: RISKS GREATER BUT PROFITS FATTER

(By John Hughes)

(Heroin chemists are extracautious people—but they can afford to be in this dirty, multimillion-dollar racket of converting morphine to the killer drug. Marseille, France, is the world's center for these men who are part of a highly organized crime

CXVI—1250—Part 15

ring. Operated by Corsicans, it has been hardly scratched by police and narcotics agents' raids.)

MARSEILLES, FRANCE.—As chill night turned to dank dawn, the narcotics agents worked their way through the French woods.

To ensure total surprise, they had left their cars several miles away.

Now, through high-powered glasses, they had under observation the isolated villa which was their target.

Inside the house they could see three men working amid all the paraphernalia of a chemical laboratory: gas burners, glass flasks and tubes, suction pumps, scales, vials of chemicals.

The men wore white coats and rubber gloves. One thing more showed they were no ordinary chemists. Each of them wore a gas mask. It was to protect them from the fumes and effect of their product: heroin.

For their highly profitable, but illegal activity, the heroin chemists had chosen their site well. Only 30 miles from the big French seaport of Marseille, the village of Notre Dame des Anges is nevertheless off the beaten track. The villa the heroin chemists selected there was on a hill, reached by a country road along which only one or two cars traveled each day.

Even so, the heroin chemists were extra-cautious. Even now as the French and American agents positioned themselves, a rare car passed by. Immediately the chemists stopped work. One came outside to check. Reassured, they continued.

#### POLICE RAIDS CURBED

Carefully, the narcotics agents checked their time. (French law bars police raids on a man's home between 9 o'clock at night and 6 o'clock in the morning.) Then they rushed the villa.

The three chemists caught now are serving lengthy prison sentences. Their heroin was seized and is one batch which will never be pumped into the veins of American addicts.

This recent seizure is one of the brighter chapters in the story of the war against the international "junk," or narcotics, merchants. Another heroin laboratory was put out of business about the same time. In this case, the illegal chemists were more brazen. They were working from a three-story house in the suburbs of Marseille itself.

Hidden behind high walls, this was a house particularly difficult for surveillance. But narcotics agents caught the heroin manufacturers in the act there, too. These chemists also are serving long prison terms.

Successful though these operations were, they but scratched the surface of a highly organized crime ring which makes Marseille the center of the heroin-manufacturing industry. Eighty percent of the heroin used by addicts in the United States is produced in and around Marseille from morphine and opium which originate in Turkey.

Controlling the ring are Corsican criminals of cunning and ruthlessness. Says one crack American agent, grudgingly:

"I guess they have to be rated the most adept criminals in the world."

#### INFORMATION IS THE KEY

The Corsicans who mastermind this ugly traffic in Marseille are tight-knit. Information is the key to successful antinarcotics operations, but from the Corsicans it is difficult to acquire. A non-Corsican has little hope of penetrating the organization.

For a Corsican to inform on his own gang members there is little inducement, but great peril. The money narcotics agents offer in return for information is insignificant compared with the money a gang member makes from trafficking. And when a Corsican is caught informing, gang retribution is instant and final.

In one of the raids mentioned earlier, one

gang member had the misfortune to be absent from the heroin laboratory when narcotics agents smashed in. His body was found next day with six bullets in it. He had been murdered by his fellow gangsters because they suspected him of having tipped off the agents, and then evaded arrest. He was not, in fact, the informant.

When information is forthcoming from within the ring it is usually from a gang member jealous over a stolen woman, or disaffected over some other affront, and bent on personal revenge.

#### OPPORTUNITIES ABOUND

It is not difficult to see why Marseille has become the hub of the heroin-manufacturing industry. Even without the Corsican underworld community, it is a city renowned for its tough and bawdy waterfront dives where any criminal transaction is easily arranged.

It is a sprawling port, cluttered with miles of gray derricks and cranes, which afford unlimited opportunity for smuggling. Ocean-going ships of every kind, and from every country, load and unload here. In and out of the old harbor there are hundreds of motor cruisers, yachts, and fishing boats with a pattern of movement through coastal waters impossible to track.

Under cover of darkness it is easy to take delivery of a shipment of yellow morphine hidden aboard a ship just in from Turkey, or to stash a parcel of heroin aboard one bound for Mexico, Canada, or the United States. A gentle splash, as a waterproof bundle is dropped over a ship's side, or a thud as a package is thrown from a dark spot over the port fence, and the job is done.

Marseille also is an easy delivery point for smugglers who move shipments or narcotics overland from Turkey. It is linked to the road network which laces the French Riviera. A truck or car carrying hidden morphine merges easily with the traffic surging across southern France.

An old World War II resistance center, Marseille is full of hiding places, crisscrossed by drains and sewers. During the war, resistance fighters led allied agents through this underground network and whisked German prisoners and bodies away through it. Today these tunnels serve the junk merchants who use them to move narcotics and the materials necessary to process heroin.

For security, supplies are dispersed and brought together only for the actual conversion. Once delivered in Marseille, morphine is cached in one spot. The laboratory is somewhere else. Acetic anhydride acid, needed in substantial quantities to make heroin, is stored elsewhere. Finished heroin is quickly moved out to yet another hiding place.

Conversion of morphine into heroin is much more sophisticated than the rough-and-ready process by which opium is turned into morphine. The heroin process demands chemical skills and is dangerous.

The chemists risk addiction through fumes and powdered heroin particles in the air. This is why they wear masks. Beyond this, a slip can cause fatal explosion.

But if the risks are high, so are the profits.

The Corsicans who run the business find little difficulty in acquiring chemists, either from their own ranks, or hired from outside, to undertake the illicit operation.

To elude detection, the heroin merchants have developed many techniques. One clue to the existence of a heroin laboratory is the vast amount of electric power it uses, far more than would be normal in an ordinary household.

So the heroin chemists tap the main power lines, stealing their electricity from the city. They are careful to pass a normal amount of electricity through the meter in their premises. Police checking consumption thus find no unusual telltale usage.



## WATER WASTE WATCHED

Another giveaway is water waste from the heroin laboratories. The chemists cannot dump it into city sewers for fear police will detect, and trace, the large amount of acetic anhydride acid in it. For every kilo of heroin produced, the chemists must use two kilos of acid. Their usual disposal method is to run it off, via long hoses, onto waste ground or, in the case of a country villa, down the side of a hill or mountain.

Police also try to keep an eye on unusually large purchases of acetic anhydride. But the acid is bought for many legitimate purposes. It is used by fertilizer and plastic manufacturers. In the United States its sale is legal. Its purchase specifically for heroin manufacture is difficult to trace.

With money and organization and ruthlessness on their side, the Corsicans are formidable foes. In challenging them, the French police clearly face some genuine problems. But in the view of many, the French Government's efforts to eliminate the Marseille heroin business has till recently lacked application and serious effort.

The French narcotics bureau is understaffed and ill-equipped. For its whole operation in southern France it has relied on 11 agents with three cars between them. Some are deskbound. Manpower available for surveillance and detection of narcotics traffickers has thus been negligible. In the French capital itself there have been hardly a dozen narcotics agents at work.

Lately there have been indications that Paris is stirring on the narcotics problem.

In part this is due to unfavorable international publicity about France's role in heroin production. In part it is due to sudden French recognition that heroin addiction is not exclusively a foreign, and specifically American, problem. Last year two French teen-agers from middle-class families died on the Riviera from overdoses of heroin.

## BUREAU BOLSTERED

With the resulting hullabaloo, and encouragement from Washington, the French have announced they will boost their anti-narcotics effort. A new chief has taken over the narcotics bureau in Marseille. New agents are promised.

Throughout the country some 350 narcotics specialists are supposed to have been assigned. But these "specialists" are regular policemen who have been given short courses in narcotics work. If, in the course of their duties, they run across a narcotics case, they are better equipped to investigate it. They are not, however, narcotics experts in the true sense, devoting their full time to narcotics work.

The real question now is whether the French are prepared to devote more than lip service to the elimination of the narcotics traffic. At least six illicit heroin factories are believed to be still in operation in the vicinity of Marseille. Experts concede there could be double that number.

Though Marseille's Corsican underworld runs the heroin racket, Corsicans are not basically in the business of transporting narcotics to the United States. They prefer to produce and sell. Principal buyer is the American Mafia which also masterminds organized smuggling of narcotics into the United States.

## UNITED STATES OFFICIAL COMMENTS

Says John T. Cusack, chief of the American antinarcotics network in Europe: "We're up against a hard-core, well-entrenched, affluent, powerful criminal element."

Based in Paris as European regional director of the United States Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, Mr. Cusack is widely credited with having masterminded the American role in persuading the Turkish Government to cut back on opium production.

Besides the Mafia, other buying rings have set up shop in southern France. They include Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and Negroes, and "independent" buyers who run their own transit routes. When the Corsicans arrange delivery of heroin in the United States, rather than France, the price is much higher.

Mafia narcotics-smuggling routes run via Canada and Mexico to the United States, and directly through American East Coast ports.

But there are many variations. Some air shipments are routed from France to the Netherlands or Switzerland, then to the Caribbean, and into the States through Florida. Sometimes narcotics couriers stop off in the Republic of Ireland. An Irish aircraft landing at Boston or New York tends to get more cursory examination than one coming in from France.

One heroin-smuggling ring used a Trans World Airlines route from West Germany to Kansas City, Mo. The couriers carried their narcotics in flight bags. Shortly before arrival in New York they hid their packages in the aircraft's toilet. Then they went through New York customs confidently.

## DOMESTIC FLIGHT TAKEN

After clearing customs and reboarding the aircraft, they retrieved their heroin from the toilet. From Kansas City they took a domestic flight back to New York, delivering their wages with little risk.

Their method was discovered when the TWA flight developed engine trouble on one occasion in New York, and the company ordered a plane change. The couriers panicked, tried to get their heroin off the discarded aircraft, and were caught red-handed by custom agents.

Another smuggling route is from Europe over the pole to the American West Coast, then by domestic flight back to New York.

There are 390 ports of entry in the United States. Through them pass 220 million travelers each year. Clearly, the smugglers' chances of getting at least some of their merchandise through are good. The standard yardstick custom agents use is that they seize about one-tenth of the contraband funneling into their country.

To move heroin into the United States, the junk merchants use scores of couriers who carry packets taped to their legs, or concealed in special vests, bags, or false-bottomed suitcases. For the junk merchants it is a gamble, but one loaded with the odds in their favor. They can afford to lose a large number of couriers and still make vast profits out of the shipments that get through.

## OPERATORS PAY NO TAXES

Those that are lost are written off to operating costs in a business in which the operators pay no taxes anyway. Arrest of a courier rarely imperils the big-time criminals behind the traffic. Most couriers are given only the skimpiest information of the operation they are involved in, and have little to pass on to custom and narcotics agents.

In one case, all eight couriers involved in a shipment of heroin were picked up by American narcotics agents. None could pinpoint the supplier or the addressee.

In another case a narcotics courier facing an Italian murder charge was desperate to cooperate with narcotics agents in a bid to prevent his arraignment in an Italian court. But he had no information of value. All he could reveal was that he had been given the narcotics to carry, in a room of Rome's Excelsior Hotel, by a man he had never seen before and whose name he did not know.

As couriers, the traffickers recruit seamen, airline crew members (one Alitalia steward had direct links to the Mafiosi of Brooklyn), respectable-looking business executives, and even diplomats. The latter are especially useful. Their luggage is usually scrutiny free when it goes through customs.

One courier ring smuggling heroin into

New York via the West Coast from Hong Kong included three former Australian police officers. Even a former "playmate" from Playboy magazine is languishing in a Greek jail for carrying narcotics.

## SURVEILLANCE PURSUED

While transporting heroin, couriers are often under surveillance by other members of the underworld network. If a courier is "busted" (arrested), the junk merchants are usually aware of it immediately. If the courier agrees to lead government agents to his contact, by the time they get there the trail is cold.

Aside from their own Sicilian dialect, Mafia junk merchants use a jargon almost incomprehensible to outsiders and eavesdropping narcotics agents.

Says one Mafia member to another, in a long-distance call from New York to Sicily: "I need a dozen white shirts. Tell Toto everything's taken care of on the mountain." Translated, that means: "Ship a dozen kilos of heroin. Tell our Corsican supplier in Marseille that I've deposited the cash for them in the usual numbered Swiss bank account."

The American Mafia lean heavily on blood ties in their native Sicily for logistical support in Europe. Thus some heroin shipments are backtracked from France to Italy, and then moved out to the United States.

Experts say actual production of heroin in Italy now is rare. For helping stop Italian production they give credit to former American Ambassador Clare Booth Luce. They also credit Italian authorities for cracking down on known Mafia members with sentences of "obligatory sojourn" in remote areas. Under this system, a suspect is removed from big-city contact and required to report daily at the police station in his area.

Even so, the Mafiosi are wily, and the movement of narcotics in and out of Italy continues.

## HONEYMOON IN SICILY

In one case, an American of Sicilian origin carried a large heroin consignment for his family without ever knowing it. His father, a prominent New York Mafia member, sent him back to Sicily for his honeymoon. With the bridal couple went a handsome new American car.

After a few days a relative in Sicily insisted on removing the car to get it washed and serviced.

Overnight, Mafia members took the car apart and fitted it with secret compartments full of heroin. Unknowing, the son shipped his car back to the States, passing uneventfully through customs.

A little later, his father asked to borrow the car. The heroin was recovered by the American Mafia, the car returned, and the innocent son took up his business unaware that for the price of a honeymoon in Sicily, the Mafia had imported a massive shipment of heroin.

Other bulk shipments come by diverse routes. French and American agents broke one ring airfreighting heroin from Paris to New York hidden in electronic oscilloscopes. Some heroin travels southward to Spain from Marseille before being moved on to the United States. One big haul was made in a shipment of canned fish imported from Spain by a Whitestone, N.Y., dealer.

## MAFIA "SCATTERS SHOT"

Earlier this year, American custom agents made the largest seizure of hashish in the history of the service at Boston's Logan Airport. Inspectors found 600 pounds of hashish in false bottoms of crates of musical instruments from India. This was a spot check, without any advance information from agents abroad.

Although the Mafia scatter their shot with couriers on planes, cars are much favored for smuggling narcotics. Thousands of them are brought in and out of the United States

each year. Though some are searched, the United States is wooing foreign tourists, and custom agents cannot tear every visitor's car apart.

The advantage to the Mafia is that a car can transport a much larger heroin shipment than can be concealed by a courier. One Volkswagen 1300 carried 54 kilos of heroin concealed in its door panels and in special compartments under its seats—in other words, a shipment about the size of a small man.

If agents seize an auto shipment, the loss to the Mafia is much greater than loss of a two or three-kilo packet strapped to a courier's leg. But the Mafia can afford to lose several carloads and still make money on the one that gets through.

From one French Citroen, agents extracted 112 kilos of heroin. That was a major haul. But the same car had successfully carried heroin shipments for five previous years.

With bigger shipments, the risks are greater, but the profits are fatter. Such are the odds that keep the junk flowing out of Marseille.

#### REMARKS FROM A SERVICEMAN IN CAMBODIA

### HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in these days when it seems as if so many efforts are being made to belittle and stigmatize the efforts of those who are keeping our country strong and free, it is heartening to receive a letter, submitted here for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, expressing that fiber on which generations of Americans have united as instruments for the right, with the courage and insight in the knowledge that freedom and peace cannot be attained by merely wishing for it.

The author of this letter, a Naval Academy graduate, is convinced that the Cambodian effort is the right step for stability, self-determination and peace, and significant in its implications for all areas of the world threatened by aggression. He believes, as history has shown us, that sometimes a man must stand with his neighbor to help his neighbor protect his home, lest he, at the end, stand alone in protecting his own home; a fundamental rule of self-protection applicable to nations as well as individuals.

The letter follows:

MAY 22, 1970.

DEAR MOM AND DAD: President Nixon certainly didn't waste any time pulling me out of Viet-nam. I'd barely gotten settled into the routine of patrolling canals on Barrier Reef that I was sent with ten boats up the Mekong into Cambodia. We were a very small part of the Vietnamese contingent, but played a very interesting role in the operation. I've just returned from spending two weeks afloat off Neak Luong, the ferry landing, and have come to realize once again the sharp contrasts evident in this war.

The two most dominant impressions were left by the newsmen and the refugees. Actual encounters with the enemy were very light and we had secured the area rather easily. What astounded me was how the news media blew up our offensive.

What they termed a gross extension of the war was actually a very simple, long-overdue short cut to ending the conflict. Ideals were

long ago violated by the VC/NVA as they fought their guerrilla war. Their strategy was merely what Mao Tse Tung advocated, "The people are the sea and revolutionaries are the fish that swim in the sea." Thus boundaries meant nothing to the enemy as they were free to choose supply routes and lines of communications. We were frustrated by an imaginary line dividing swampy rice paddies where no natural geographical, physical, cultural, lingual, or religious boundaries existed. Even with the Geneva Accords of 1954, Southeast Asia is still Southeast Asia, no nation is secure enough to call itself Laos, Cambodia, or Viet-nam.

Having previously operated in Viet-nam within easy mortar range of Cambodia, I was obviously very happy to participate in the sweep to destroy the VC/NVA outposts, arms caches, and staging areas. We will be withdrawing our forces soon, having accomplished a crucial blow to the enemies' morale and supplies which will enable the South Vietnamese to take over their part of the war much more easily and safely. Sitting Ducks only belong in carnivals. Even though some feel this conflict is a real side-show, I'm over here and I don't like being handicapped by idealistic fantasies.

Enough of the rationalities behind the offensive, what bugs me is how the students and many others have swallowed the news reports and exaggeration by the press. By hyperbolisms and capitalizing upon the misfortunes of others, they report their opinions and sell stories. I've been photographed landing marines, transporting refugees, and interviewed by CBS and NBC who called us warmongers. Their negative attitudes left me very cold. Perhaps the silent majority has something over the protesters, for as Abraham Lincoln wrote, "It is better to remain silent and be thought a fool than to open one's mouth and remove all doubt."

It all comes down to the point that wisdom must be acquired through experience. Formal education is a good start, but leaves one with too idealistic an approach to life. This education has to be nourished by experience to remove the overtones left by theory and to restore the proper perspective of common sense and the gross bare facts of life.

This brings me to the other harsh reality of this war, the innocent suffering of the civilians. I'll never forget the fear and hunger in the eyes of the children. Oh, the many things we take for granted! The very simple basic necessities of life took on the dimensions of being the most precious commodities on earth for these refugees.

We're not over here fighting for ideals, we're fighting for these people's lives. How wrong our initial commitment might have been, we can't leave these people alone to suffer at the hands of a nation where human life has no value. Once these people can defend themselves, I'll be more than happy to call my job completed.

Peace, pull out now, I'll pack up as soon as I can to return to my beautiful family and joys of living in America. However, I've got a job here and I can't advocate a hasty retreat. If this makes sense to you, why not pass along this inside view. If not, drop me a line and perhaps I'll defect. Peace.

#### A 30-YEAR FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

### HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, today is the rather tragic 30th anniversary of the Russian occupation of the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

I join with many of my colleagues in this memorial observance, not to mark that event really, but to recognize a 30-year struggle for independence by the Baltic peoples.

Some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters have died during constant skirmishes with the Russians that lasted until 1952. A long and valiant effort to regain their freedom was waged despite mass deportation of the Baltic peoples to Siberia.

These people have paid a heavy price for their refusal to submit to Russian-Communist domination. Since June 15, 1940, these three nations have lost more than one-fourth of their entire population.

Resistance continues. It is no longer the armed warfare that ended in 1952, but it is a resistance borne by pride and love of country.

As Americans, we can understand their love of freedom. We salute their valiant resistance and join with them in observance of this tragic date.

The United States has refused to recognize the Soviet-controlled government of the Baltic States and maintains diplomatic relations with the former free governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia now exiled from their homeland.

These people have never given up hope of some day seeing their nations freed. The recognition given to this anniversary is part of their fight in a warfare of conscience. History has shown that where the memory survives, freedom always triumphs over repression of the state.

Freedom is alive in the minds and hearts of the Baltic people. We join in this observance today with the fervent hope that one day their homeland will be free as well.

DR. FRANK LOWE OF SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, my close personal friend and longtime San Diegan, Dr. Frank Lowe, has excellent credentials in the field of education and young people. Dr. Lowe has served for many years on the San Diego Board of Education and has been very active in the "Laurels for Leaders" program which honors outstanding high school students each year on Lincoln's Birthday. I know my House colleagues will find his observations on the background of youth unrest and dissent of particular interest:

TRAVAILS TRACED TO EARLIER ERA

EDITOR. This current orgy of protest, even the so-called "peaceful" kind, seems to be made up of those too excited and irresponsible to stop long enough to face facts and to debate differences. This only adds to the general frustration. To make themselves effectively heard, these youthful agitators must make themselves listen to reason and reality.

Actually, the total number involved in these disturbances, gravely serious though



they be, is probably only a small fraction of that age group. Besides, the truth is that it is not their elders so much as it is these misguided youngsters themselves, who have lost contact, spurning the "due process of law" which is our priceless American heritage.

After all, however, these disturbers of our peace are not entirely to blame. They are victims of influences beyond them. The disrespect of the campus today had its beginning in some classrooms a generation ago by a few over-sophisticated professors whose strange disrespect for patriotism unfortunately took root only too well.

But this was only the beginning. In the meantime, incessantly gnawing at our vitals has been communism. Matching this constant peril has been the sad breakdown in the unity of many families.

It is the home which is the God-given bridge between the generations. Also vital in our birth and growth and stability has been religion; but now even prayer seems to have been declared unlawful in our schools. And "permissiveness" has been allowed to corrode discipline and personal restraint.

No wonder that some of our youth are confused and baffled, and in their need seek more sincerity and moral strength and a better example from their elders.

Out of the ordeal of these days, may we all rededicate ourselves.

God mend our every flaw; confirm our soul in self-control, our liberty in law.

[From the San Diego Union, May 26, 1970]

#### PERTINENT AND PERCEPTIVE

That Washington Peace Demonstration the other day demonstrated also something else: we face an epidemic of hysteria, and it is impossible to join issues with mob psychology. For example, that mass of bewildered young people missed entirely a presidential news conference which they very much needed to hear.

At the Lincoln Memorial, the President, in person and at unwarranted risk, had a meeting with youth—but not a meeting of minds. Yet this grave national situation calls for intelligent, sympathetic understanding, based on two-way communication. All protest, therefore, should be not only peaceful but reasonable and realistic.

It is not their elders so much as it is the youth, or that fragment of our total youth involved, who have lost contact. They have deliberately turned their backs on those priceless values which have made our nation great and unique. In all this, however, these temporarily misguided youngsters are not themselves most to blame.

The chief guilt for this present dilemma lies elsewhere. They are the unfortunate product of forces at work long before their time. This lawless rebellion on the campus began a generation ago in a strange new teaching in the classroom.

The forebear of the angry protestor was then that overzealous debunker, the college teacher who considered it smart to deface our revered national heroes, to bypass the Oath of Allegiance, to refashion our history and to sneer at patriotism.

At the elbow of the debunker was the ever-present and cunning Communist agent, then as now moving underground to weaken this Republic.

Worst of all has been the decline in family solidarity. Its God-given mission seems to be to bridge this dangerous age-gap in the place where it can best be prevented from starting: the home.

No wonder there is youthful confusion. And this is not all. Even the Supreme Court has taken a hand by its use of the word "establishment" as verb instead of noun, as undoubtedly intended by the Founding Fathers. Thus they raise the enigma of how

prayer can be legal in the halls of Congress and out of place in the halls of learning.

Speaking of the word "establishment"—as a noun—it has suddenly become very popular as referring to those who have authority. It seems to invite dissent. By it, "We, the People" seem to be split into two camps. Much better, the time-honored "Government, of, by and for the People," which symbolizes the national unity.

Topping all this unintentional attack upon the morale of our precious young is their own version of the reason for their rebellion: disillusionment with the status quo, and the hypocrisy of grownups about them who fail to practice what they profess. It is a grave charge and, surely, many times a true indictment.

What a paradox! Through our preoccupation with science, our "mechanics" has scared to the moon; but through our neglect of our "humanics," we have sunk to the mob. What shall it profit a nation if it gain the world and lose its own soul?

Let's hope that through this horrible ordeal may come repentance and renewal to us all, and with them the realization that freedom is not freedom from personal responsibility, that liberty is never license but is always limited—and preserved—by justice.

### THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF SLAVERY FOR BALTIC STATES

#### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 30th anniversary of the forcible invasion and enslavement of the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

The Soviet terror which began on June 15, 1940 continues to this day. Since 1940 these three small nations have lost more than a fourth of their entire population.

Despite calculated terrorism and repression, the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have waged a compelling struggle for their liberty. During the period between 1950 and 1952, 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the Soviet invaders. Even though armed guerrilla warfare stopped in 1952, Baltic resistance strengthened under the guise of "passive resistance."

Our Government here in the United States has consistently refused to recognize the legitimacy of the Soviet takeover of these small states and to this day we maintain diplomatic relations with the former free governments of the Baltic countries.

There can be no real freedom, anywhere in the world, until all men are free to determine their own destinies. Government by repression may win the initial skirmish through sheer force of arms. But the conscience of a great people will never be captivated or controlled through force. The Soviet Union knows this. The free world knows this. And the people of the Baltic States know it.

We in this great Congress pay tribute to the abiding strength of spirit which nurtures the people of the Baltic States in this dark year. We pledge ourselves to help bring their plight and torment to

the forum of the free world where the Soviets may be judged and held accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House today in paying tribute to the gallant men and women of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia on this 30th anniversary of their enslavement.

Mr. Speaker, I include pertinent material as follows:

[From the Chicago Latvian Community Center]  
LATVIA

(By Viktors Viksnins, President)

ENDURE—1940—1970—HOW LONG?

The deadly comb ran back and forth, and back again, through Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. There were no doubts however where the right lay. The Baltic States should be sovereign independent peoples . . . Winston S. Churchill.

#### TO REMAIN FIRM UNDER

The evidence is overwhelming and conclusive that Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the U.S.S.R. Any claims by the U.S.S.R. that the elections conducted in July, 1940 were free and voluntary or that the resolutions adopted by the resulting parliament petitioning for recognition as Soviet republics were legal are false and without foundation in fact." (Report of the Select committee to Investigate Communist Aggression and the Forced Incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. . . . (House of Representatives, 1954).

#### TO BEAR WITH PATIENCE—SOVIET OCCUPATION

In the spring of 1940, after the fall of France, Stalin, afraid of further German Conquests, decided that the time was ripe to throw off any pretense of defending the Baltic countries against foreign invasion. It was the hour for outright aggression. On June 14, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov presented Lithuania with an ultimatum, demanding unopposed admission of unlimited Soviet armed forces and establishment of a new government "Friendly" to the Soviet Union. Next day the Red army invaded Lithuania by force. On June 16, similar demands were made of Latvia and Estonia, and both countries were occupied on June 17. The events which followed were identical in all three Baltic states. Although the entire procedure actually and legally violated the basic laws then existing in the Baltic countries, the Moscow Supreme Soviet hastily "admitted" Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union on August 3-6, 1940.

#### TO SUFFER

The rape of the Baltic republics by the Kremlin was recognized by the Axis powers and a few neutrals. Most of the free western democracies, however, followed the lead of the United States, which, on July 23, 1940, issued a declaration by Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, declining recognition.

#### TO TOLERATE

Wherever the Soviet regime enters as invader or unwelcome guest, it inevitably introduces an "agrarian reform" as a stepping stone to ultimate collectivization.

#### TO PUT UP WITH

The first year of Soviet occupation will always be remembered in Latvia's history as a year of horror because of the constant Red terror and the first mass deportation, which was carried out by the Moscow regime shortly before the German invasion in June, 1941. Even before then, thousands of Latvian patriots, army officers and state officials, including President Ulmanis and members of his Cabinet, had been arrested and deported to Russia.

## TO SUSTAIN

On June 14, however, 15,000 Latvian citizens . . . men, women, and children . . . were rounded up at night by the secret police and loaded into cattle trucks for deportation to slave labor in northeast Russia and Siberia. Altogether, 34,000 Latvians were arrested, deported or killed during that year of Soviet occupation. The same fate befell Estonians and Lithuanians.

## TO CONTINUE

The rising crescendo of misery is voiced by writers and intellectuals who beg us to heed their words.

## TO LAST

"All of us . . . must be faithful to our conviction that peace in Europe can never be complete until everywhere in Europe men can choose, in peace and freedom, how their countries shall be governed" . . . John F. Kennedy. The Chicago Latvian Community Center, in commemorating the anniversary of the Soviet occupation of the Latvian State, suffering under the Communist yoke of oppression. In honoring the memory of departed, and imprisoned patriots, we have designed a "Seal" to be displayed on all of the correspondence in use . . . as a reminder that people are still suffering under Communism.

**RED TERROR IN LITHUANIA, LATVIA AND ESTONIA**  
(Enslavement of the Baltic States by the Soviets for thirty years)

The Kremlin is fond of saying that Russian imperialism died with the czar. But the fate of the Baltic nations—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—shows this to be a cruel fiction. The Communist regime did not come to power in the Baltic States by legal or democratic process. The Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by force of arms. The Soviets invaded and occupied the Baltic States in June of 1940, and the Baltic peoples have been suffering in Russian-Communist slavery for 30 years.

The Balts are proud peoples who have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic from time immemorial. For instance, this year marks the 719th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251.

The Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians have suffered for centuries from the "accident of geography." From the West they were invaded by the Teutonic Knights, from the East by the Russians. It took remarkable spiritual and ethnic strength to survive the pressures from both sides. The Balts, it should be kept in mind, are ethnically related neither to the Germans nor the Russians.

After the Nazis and Soviets smashed Poland in September of 1939, the Kremlin moved troops into the Baltic republics and annexed them in June of 1940. In one of history's greatest frauds, "elections" were held under Red army guns. The Kremlin then claimed that Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia voted for inclusion in the Soviet empire.

Then began one of the most brutal occupations of all time. Hundreds of thousands of Balts were dragged off to trains and jammed into cars without food or water. Many died from suffocation. The pitiful survivors were dumped out in the Arctic or Siberia. The Baltic peoples have never experienced such an extermination and annihilation of their people in their long history through centuries as during the last three decades. Since June 15, 1940, these three nations have lost more than one fourth of their entire population. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight.

Since the very beginning of Soviet Russian occupation, however, the Balts have waged an intensive fight for freedom. During the period between 1940 and 1952 alone, some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the invaders. The cessation of armed guerrilla warfare in 1952 did not spell the end of the Baltic resistance against Soviet domination. On the contrary, resistance by passive means gained a new impetus.

The Government of the United States of America has refused to recognize the seizure and forced "incorporation" of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by the Communists into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Our Government maintains diplomatic relations with the former free Governments of the Baltic States. Since June of 1940, when the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, all of the Presidents of the United States (Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Richard M. Nixon) have stated, restated and confirmed our country's nonrecognition policy of the occupation of the Baltic States by the Kremlin dictators. However, our country has done very little, if anything, to help the suffering Baltic peoples to get rid of the Communist regimes in their countries.

The case of the Baltic States is not a question about the rights of self-rule of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, since this is established beyond any reasonable doubt, but the question is how to stop the Soviet crime and restore the freedom and independence of these countries. The Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R., created by the 83rd Congress, after having held 50 public hearings during which the testimony of 335 persons was taken, made a number of recommendations to our Government pertaining to the whole question of liberation of the Baltic States. According to the findings of this House committee, "no nation, including the Russian Federated Soviet Republic, has ever voluntarily adopted communism." All of them were enslaved by the use of infiltration, subversion, and force.

The American foreign policy toward the Communist enslaved nations, the aforesaid House committee stated, must be guided by "the moral and political principles of the American Declaration of Independence." The present generation of Americans, this committee suggested, should recognize that the bonds which many Americans have with enslaved lands of their ancestry are a great asset to the struggle against communism and that, furthermore, the Communist danger should be abolished during the present generation. The only hope of avoiding a new world war, according to this committee, is a "bold, positive political offensive by the United States and the entire free world." The committee included a declaration of the U.S. Congress which states that the eventual liberation and self-determination of nations are "firm and unchanging parts of our policy."

At a time when the Western powers have granted freedom and independence to many nations in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world, we must insist that the Communist colonial empire likewise extends freedom and independence to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia whose lands have been unjustly occupied and whose rightful place among the nations of the world is being denied. Today and not tomorrow is the time to brand the Kremlin dictators as the largest colonial empire in the world. By timidity, we invite further Communist aggression.

Recently the U.S. Congress has made a right step in the right direction by adopting H. Con. Res. 416 that calls for freedom for

Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. All freedom-loving Americans should urge the President of the United States to implement this legislation by bringing the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States to the United Nations. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial in whole or in part, any place in the world, including the Soviet Union is surely intolerable.

**THINGS NEVER SO BAD IN AMERICA? TAKE A LOOK AT HISTORY BOOKS**

**HON. JIM WRIGHT**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it would be a tragic mistake to try to hide our heads like ostriches and pretend that our country does not face grave problems.

Yet, it also would be unwise to fail to see our present difficulties in historical perspective. For the plain truth is that crisis is no stranger to America.

We hear on every hand that America is a troubled land. Nightly in mournful dirge the newscasts catalogue our difficulties.

Tormented by the war in Vietnam, apprehensive about increasing crime, worried about racial violence, high prices and the plunging stock market, some Americans have approached the point of despair.

A few days ago, an old friend said in a voice that conveyed utter hopelessness, "Jim, things have never been as bad as they are now."

"America should hang its head in shame," he said. "Lawlessness and violence are at an all-time high; nobody respects the law; nobody supports the country. We just seem to be falling apart at the seams."

Another friend recently echoed the same theme. He shook his head sadly and somberly decried the loss of what he called "old-fashioned patriotism." He said there had never been a time when Americans had failed so miserably to uphold their country as they have in the Vietnam war.

Historically, for whatever it is worth, both are mistaken.

From our vantage point of 1970, the War of 1812 in retrospect takes on a rosy glow of patriotism. It was, after all, the conflict that gave us our National Anthem and established the United States as one of the great powers of the world.

But the War of 1812 was not all that popular—in 1812.

The British not only captured Washington but literally burned both the Capitol and the White House. The President and other high Government officials fled for their lives.

Today, some young people have taken up the chant, "Hell no, we won't go." In the War of 1812 the Government formally called up the militia of 95,000 men and only 7,000 responded. Can you imagine calling up the National Guard today and having only one man out of every 12 show up for duty?



The Massachusetts Legislature, recently in the news for officially challenging the Vietnam war, did the same thing in the War of 1812. It even went so far as to pass a measure urging creation of a peace party and formally declaring, "Let there be no volunteers" for military service.

The Governors of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut flatly refused to call the State militia into Federal service. New England merchants refused to buy war bonds. Robert Smith, a former Secretary of State, issued a public statement condemning the war.

Or consider another conflict—the Mexican War, in 1846. Again we hear the echo of an anguished cry from—as you might guess—the Legislature of Massachusetts. By formal declaration that august body condemned the Mexican War as a war against free states, unconstitutional and unsupportable by honest men.

Henry Thoreau protested the Mexican War and went to jail for refusing to pay his taxes. After Thoreau's aunt paid his tax, Thoreau went back to his cabin at Walden Pond and wrote an essay on civil disobedience. Does any of this have a familiar ring?

In June of 1863, during the Civil War, Gen. Robert E. Lee was moving an army ominously northward toward Washington. It appeared to many of Lincoln's generals that the Confederates would capture the Capital. The city at that time was virtually unguarded by Union forces.

About the only military unit on hand to protect the city was the 27th Maine Infantry Regiment. Its members had been conscripted for 9 months, and their enlistments were about to expire. Incredible as it may seem to us today, these men merely shrugged their shoulders to Lee's threatening advance and began packing their things to return home. They would have gone, too, except for one thing.

In wild desperation, the Adjutant General of the Army agreed to award the Congressional Medal of Honor to every man who would agree to stay. Only by this incredible bribe were 312 officers and men induced to remain and defend the Capital of their country.

Less than a year before the end of that war, Lincoln was constantly bombarded by Senators criticizing his conduct of the operation, gloomily forecasting that victory was impossible, and demanding that Lincoln sue for peace.

During the Spanish-American War, certain Members of Congress loudly denounced our intervention, declaring that it was no concern of ours and that we were meddling in the affairs of another country.

And lest we forget, World Wars I and II were not unmarred by protest. One of the protest songs of World War I was sung to these lyrics.

There would be no war today, if mothers all would say, I didn't raise my boy to be a soldier.

Many thoughtful Americans are troubled today by the wave of lawlessness which sweeps our land—and an apprehension that it may invite a violent back-

lash with attendant repressions of civil liberties. As serious as this concern may be, there have been times in our history when conditions were much worse.

The year was 1877. Dr. Joseph A. Dacus, on the editorial staff of the *St. Louis Republican*, reported it this way:

The tendency to complete anarchy has become so manifest that the Government at Washington is beginning to look at it in the light of an insurrection of a most formidable character—more dangerous indeed than would be a revolt of State governments. . . . At a meeting of the Cabinet on the 25th, it was formally decided to treat the riotous demonstrations all over the country as an insurrection, and to suppress it.

The cause of this concern was a labor strike of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. On the 23d of July 1877, Gen. Frank Reeder of the Pennsylvania National Guard was sent with two regiments to the little railroad town of Reading, Pa. Without one word of warning and without orders, the nervous militiamen fired upon an assembled crowd in the very heart of the city, killing 13 people and severely wounding 27 others.

Lamentable though it is to confess, there have been dark moments in our history when human liberties truly were suppressed. Following World War I, Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer, thirsting for the Presidency, sought personal fame and power by capitalizing on public uneasiness over the Bolsheviks and the Reds.

For 5 months, the Attorney General instituted lawless raids on homes and the headquarters of labor unions. On a single night in January 1920, his agents arrested more than 4,000 people in 33 cities claiming them to be Communists. The great majority of them were innocent. In Detroit alone, 300 Americans were arrested on false charges, held in jail for a week, denied food for 24 hours, only later to be freed as completely innocent.

While crime and the erosion or respect for law and order may be the subjects of increased attention today, the problem is not new. There have been times when it was much worse.

Consider the 1920's. Never has there been such wholesale contempt for law and such a fantastic breeding grounds for crime of all sorts.

In just 10 years, the Federal Government alone arrested more than half a million Americans. Of them 300,000 were convicted—mostly of crimes growing out of the prohibition period.

But not all criminals were convicted, even then. In one of the most notorious incidents in criminal annals—the St. Valentine's Day Massacre in Chicago—not a single person was ever punished. In 4 years there were 215 unsolved murders in that city.

We have known grief and anguish and frustration and fear, disappointment, dismay, disgust, and disillusionment. No doubt we will know them again.

This recital of dark days of America's past is not intended to minimize our present problem nor to exonerate our generation from the responsibility of solving the problems that confront us. Its purpose is to help us see ourselves in clearer perspective.

The 1970's, is launched in a sea of troubles, are pregnant with unprecedented possibilities. One gains the feeling that we are in the process of ending an epoch of history and beginning a new one.

Before us is a vast panorama of unfulfilled hopes and new dreams—a new age struggling to be born. The difficulties of the present, like those of our eventful past, can be surmounted if we but keep our perspective—and above all, keep faith in ourselves, in our system of society, and in our capacity to shape the future.

History, of course, should not be read selectively, nor distorted to prove an obscure point. It should be read as the continuing story of man's growing enlightenment, sometimes painfully slow but sometimes dramatic. And of his inevitable triumph, in succeeding ages and succeeding stages, over the problems of his society.

Seen in this perspective, our American civilization emerges in bold and thrilling colors. Imperfect though our society is, so are all others—and ours is demonstrably less imperfect than most. Man's virtue—and he does have some—lies in building not in destroying.

Our strength, as always, lies not in fear but in faith, not in despair but in hope, not in hate but in love.

#### AMERICANS OF MEXICAN DESCENT PETITION AGAINST INDOCHINA WAR

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, approximately 600 Americans of Mexican descent in my congressional district have sent a petition to me expressing their opposition to the war in Indochina.

The signers of the petition are parishioners of Iglesia de Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe, whose pastor is the Reverend Keith B. Kenny. Rev. Kenny is convinced that the opinion of his parishioners represent the views of most Mexican-Americans.

As a Congressman who is proud to represent a large population of Americans of Mexican descent, I am inserting the text of the petition because it definitely carries a message for all to read:

We, the Council, the Priests, and the Parishioners of the Church of Our Lady of Guadalupe, the Catholic Mexican church of Sacramento, California, affirm that we are opposed to the invasion of Cambodia by the armed forces of the United States, that we are opposed to the assistance given by the United States to the South Vietnamese invasion of Laos, and that we are opposed to the continuance of the war in Vietnam. This war has already been too costly in human lives—the lives of our sons of Mexican descent and of so many of the young people of this nation and of so very many lives of the Vietnamese of both South and North. We demand this war be terminated in 1970 and we promise to work for and vote for only those candidates that oppose the war.

## POSTAL WORKERS

**HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, we now find ourselves in the middle of the third month since the Nation's postal workers went out on strike. We are headed again into what by now must be considered about as predictable a crisis as a crisis can be. I do not believe there is anyone left who has studied the merits of this situation who does not know what we ought to do. Yet nothing happens. That is, nothing happens except that the postal employees continue sorting, carrying, and delivering the mail and the richest Nation in the world continues to fail to give them enough money to live decently, let alone to compensate them in a way that would be fair for the work they do or comparable to the pay they could get elsewhere for performing that same work.

Now—finally, at last—there are signs that we are moving to consider what to do about these injustices.

The delays since early April—not to mention the delays for years that preceded early April—have been inexplicable and inexcusable. Postal workers recognize this and understand who is to blame. If they must once again take their case to the people—as some groups in New York have decided to do by striking again if Congress does not keep its word soon—blame rests not with those who have kept the mail moving despite pauper's wages, but rather with those who have voiced, and then not fulfilled, an apparently endless chain of promises.

The public must understand that should the Nation find itself again in a mail crisis similar to the one of late March, they should point the finger of blame in the right direction, in the direction of the President whose concern for justice for postal workers seems somewhere near the bottom of a long list of neglected social and economic needs, and in the direction of those Senators and Representatives who seem determined to play politics with the livelihoods of dedicated public servants.

I want to repeat again what I have said many times before:

Surely it is clear how much it would help at this point for the Government to show some degree of good faith to the postal workers after so many years of broken promises and buck-passing. And before anyone says we should not now start to undo long-standing injustices because a strike constitutes blackmail, let us remember that the House adopted H.R. 13000 by an overwhelming vote last October—on its merits. The Senate passed a somewhat similar bill not long after that—on its merits. Is it not awkward to accuse someone of blackmail for asking what you have long since said is rightfully his? The blackmail, if "blackmail" is an issue, lies with those who would deny—who have denied—the

postal workers their due in hope of extracting support for other legislative proposals—as if a man's right to fair wages in the Federal employ is dependent on how he, or rather someone else, resolves other issues.

## BUY UNION GRAPES

**HON. PHILLIP BURTON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, for far too long, those of us who are concerned about those who work in fields and on the farms of the Nation, urged all who shared the concern to join with us and boycott grapes.

"Boycott grapes" became the rallying cry for those who sought social justice and who still seek to extend to farmworkers the legal rights and protections enjoyed by those who work in other industry.

I am happy to be able to note a breakthrough in the long and arduous negotiation between the growers and the United Farm Workers organizing committee. Beginnings have been made and we need no longer simply boycott grapes.

We can now urge all concerned citizens to buy union grapes.

I am placing in the RECORD articles from Time magazine and the Los Angeles Times noting the first union contracts signed in the table grape industry and the role of Catholic Bishop's Committee in this major breakthrough. The articles follow:

[From Time magazine, Apr. 13, 1970]

## CONTRACTS IN THE COACHELLA

Since 1965, Cesar Chavez has been leading *la huelga* (the strike) to unionize California's farm workers and win contracts from the state's powerful agricultural producers. He has concentrated on growers of table grapes, a product that requires intensive labor and is difficult to mechanize. Last week Chavez's United Farm Workers Organizing Committee finally dented the opposition. Three Coachella Valley table-grape producers agreed to contracts with UFWOC raising wages 10¢ an hour, to \$1.75, and adding 22¢-an-hour worth of fringe benefits. Said Chavez: "This is a very important day."

Central to the union's limited victory was the nationwide boycott of table grapes that Chavez organized two years ago. That source of pressure, plus rising production costs and a bumper 1969 crop that lowered prices, has driven more than one-third of the 85 Coachella Valley table-grape growers out of business; 1,000 of the valley's 7,800 grape-producing acres have been abandoned. The three growers who reached agreement with Chavez last week have 1,100 acres of the remainder, harvest 1% of California's total table grape crop. One of the three, *Lionel Steinberg*, was guarded about his contract with the UFWOC, which includes a union-shop clause. "I have some concern that it may not be completely workable," he said, "but I am convinced that I will try and they will try." *Steinberg* added: "It is my hope that we have commenced a historic breakthrough."

Mixed Appetites. Though Chavez and a group of Coachella growers had negotiated

inconclusively for a month last spring, this time there was an extra factor that made the renewed talks successful. In November, at the request of both growers and union supporters, a group of five Roman Catholic bishops, headed by the Most Rev. Joseph Donnelly of Hartford, Conn., intervened to appraise the issues. The prelates then took an active part in the discussions. That, said UFWOC Lawyer Jerome Cohen, "created an atmosphere for conciliation." The union has yet to reach agreement with other Coachella growers or with any producers in the San Joaquin Valley, the state's principal table-grape region, but Donnelly said that he and his fellow bishops were "confident that this breakthrough will serve as a pattern for others."

Until that happens, the strike will go on and the UFWOC will continue to push its boycott of all table grapes—except those bearing the union label of a stylized black eagle against a red background. Said William Kircher, national organization director for the AFL-CIO: "We are going to expect every fair-minded citizen to have an awfully good appetite for grapes with this kind of label, and an awfully bad appetite for the other kind."

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 2, 1970]

## TWO COACHELLA VALLEY TABLE GRAPE GROWERS SIGN UNION CONTRACTS—CATHOLIC BISHOPS COMMITTEE INSTRUMENTAL IN ACHIEVING FIRST "MAJOR BREAKTHROUGH" IN PROLONGED STRIKE-BOYCOTT

(By Harry Bernstein)

The substantial influence of the American hierarchy of the Catholic Church was instrumental Wednesday in bringing about what church leaders called a major breakthrough in the prolonged table grape strike-boycott.

It was the first time that the nation's church hierarchy has ever intervened so directly in a labor dispute, and Bishop Joseph F. Donnelly, of Hartford, Conn., and four bishops working with him are "confident that this breakthrough will serve as a pattern for others..."

The church leaders themselves took part in ceremonies Wednesday at the Catholic archdiocese offices here to witness the signing of a three-year contract between the AFL-CIO United Farm Workers' Organizing Committee and two major Coachella Valley growers.

## PUT WEIGHT BEHIND CHAVEZ

Significance of the action was not just the impact of the two contracts alone, although the Charles Freedman and the David Freedman ranches produce about 400,000 boxes of grapes a year.

It was also that church leaders including Archbishop Timothy Manning, of Los Angeles, have now thrown their weight behind Cesar Chavez' UFWOC and its efforts to sign contracts with growers in California and other agricultural states in the nation.

Last November, the National Conference of Bishops, pressed both by supporters of the union and the growers, named a five-man Bishops' Committee on Farm Labor to simply look into the issues involved in the grape boycott.

The boycott, the most widespread and intensive ever called by any union, pushed the church leaders into further action, and in February they quietly began a series of meetings with men like Lionel Steinberg, who represented the two Freedman ranches, and representatives of about 40 other large and small growers in the San Joaquin and Coachella valleys.

Bishop Donnelly said the contract signed Wednesday will be "but the beginning of a chain of such contracts so that prosperity and peace can once more descend into our fields and our homes..."



The church leaders left no doubt about their admiration for Steinberg for breaking the ranks of other grape growers who have so far refused to recognize Chavez or his union.

But the church officials also gave unstinting praise to Chavez, who, they said, is "totally dedicated to justice and sound labor relations in agriculture."

Chavez and William Kircher, AFL-CIO director of organizing, said they are not calling off the boycott of other grape growers.

#### PUSH UNION LABEL

"We are going to use our worldwide boycott operations now to promote the sale of union-label grapes, which will be clearly marked on all boxes, and will press the boycott of nonunion grapes harder than ever," Kircher said.

The new contract provides for a pay hike of 6%, or 10 cents an hour, whichever is greater, in the first year of the contract, with a \$1.75 hourly minimum wage, plus 25 cents a box; a 10-cent hourly contribution to a union health and welfare fund; a 2-cent hourly "economic development fund" to help jobless farm workers; a union shop clause so that all employees must join the union.

Other members of the bishops' committee included Bishop Hugh A. Conohoe, of Fresno; Bishop Walter W. Curtis, of Bridgeport, Conn., and Bishop Humberto S. Medeiros, of Brownsville, Tex.

#### MISSION POSSIBLE: THE MOSQUITO MAY SHORTLY SELF-DESTRUCT

### HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, last week during the debate on the Agriculture Appropriations bill, I introduced an amendment in this House to increase by \$1.5 million funds available for research in the nonchemical means of pest control, means which include the sterilization of insects, and the use of light, sound, and hormones for the destruction of insects and pests.

A short article which appeared in the New York Times on June 14, 1970, has reported that advances in this type of nonchemical research with regard to the yellow fever and malaria carrying mosquito may prove to be the undoing of this menacing pest.

It is another example, Mr. Speaker, of the usefulness of this kind of research and an indication of its eventual worth for the protection of the environment and the public health and welfare as well.

The article follows:

#### A MOSQUITO IS BRED TO CURB MOSQUITOS

SOUTH BEND, IND.—University of Notre Dame biologists say they have developed a new breed of mosquito that has a fatal flaw in its heredity. It could wipe out infestations of normal mosquitoes, they say.

Dr. Karamjit S. Rai and Paul T. McDonald, a graduate student, say in the current issue of Science magazine that they have bred a variety of the *Aedes aegypti* mosquito in which the males leave 75 per cent of the female's eggs unfertilized.

Of the 25 per cent that hatch, about 80 per cent of the males inherit the same sterility factor their fathers had.

The *Aedes aegypti* transmits yellow fever and malaria.

Mr. Rai said the new mosquito was superior to insects sterilized by radiation and then released to control pest populations.

The latter type is totally sterile and produces no offspring, he said. Also, he said, such mosquitos are weakened by the radiation while his new strain is strong and active.

#### SECRETARY OF COMMERCE MAKES COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Commerce, Maurice Stans, spoke at the commencement ceremonies of the University of San Diego on May 29.

His remarks were greeted with a standing ovation. Because of their timeliness, I insert them in the Extensions of Remarks at this point:

#### COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

(By Hon. Maurice H. Stans)

Your Excellency, Bishop Maher, Monsignor Baer, members of the faculty, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen of the Class of 1970.

I am doubly honored to be here with you today.

I am honored, first, to convey the greetings and congratulations of President Nixon to the members of the Class of 1970. He asked me to extend his best wishes to each of you, and to commend this school as a whole for keeping its stability when most of those about you were losing theirs.

The President has a warm personal feeling for the University of San Diego. As Vice President of the United States he received an honorary degree here in 1959, and he told me before I left Washington that it is one of his proudest memories.

#### HONORARY DEGREE

I am also honored to receive a similar degree from this distinguished University. I will hold it in the highest regard and will be forever proud of my identification with this great University and with the Class of 1970.

My only regret is that the degree cannot confer upon me the youth that ought to go with it. I would readily trade my position and experience with any of you, considering the exciting future that is ahead.

#### BREVITY

Now I know all of you have been sitting in school for sixteen years or more—and I do not want to be the one to keep you sitting here much longer. One of the greatest men of our time, the late President Eisenhower once told me, "The only virtue that can be presented effectively in a commencement speech is brevity."

So I shall be brief. If you will agree to really listen for just about 15 minutes, I will agree to talk no longer than that.

In that time, you may be happy to know, I am not going to review the various crises and turmoil of these past four years. Rather than look back, I prefer to discuss with you where we were and where we are going, and to offer some suggestions for you to think over.

Of course, I do not intend to ignore the recent developments.

#### CLASS OF 1970

Across the country, the Class of 1970 represents the first four years of the age of college confrontation.

The voice of challenge has been heard with great impact on all of the institutions and establishments of the nation—political, so-

cial, educational and military. Your Class, and others like it, seeks to improve the quality and the direction of American life, and I respect you for the great concern this shows for our country. But there is a right way and a wrong way to proceed from here and I would like to point out the difference.

#### WHERE WE ARE

First is the question of where we are.

There are several answers.

Certainly we are in an age of dissent. We also face some of the greatest physical needs in our history. We are in a time of unprecedented material progress. And we are in a time of tremendous promise.

Dissent . . . need . . . progress . . . promise. Let me look briefly at each of these conditions.

#### DISSENT

First, dissent itself is clearly a healthy condition in a free society. The country thrives on honest disagreement and constructive criticism.

But there are in the nation some who transform disagreement into demands, and criticism into confrontation. As they have become loud and destructive, they have damaged the confidence of one generation and the optimism of another.

Today we have all heard their strident voice of pessimism shouting across the land.

On the one hand we have heard a distinguished but dispirited public figure say the country is disintegrating. On the other we have heard the Jerry Rubins and the David Dellingers cry for the destruction of the whole system.

These apostles of violence insist that nothing is right with America, and everything is wrong. They lean on simplistic slogans and they violate the right of dissent with intolerance and disorder. They would move our political process out of the law, out of the legislatures, and into the streets. They would substitute violence for voting, and would replace institutions with anarchy.

They would sweep aside knowledge and order and decency. They would destroy in the name of liberalism, in the style of Hitler.

But those who loose riot and violence in our cities and our colleges do not say what kind of an America they would try to build in place of the one they abuse. They won't admit that they have nothing worth offering in place of the system we have today.

The pages of history are strewn with the wreckage of nations where such men have had their way.

The overwhelming majority of my generation knows these men represent a small minority of yours.

The age of dissent has taught us that violence is not necessary to achieve solutions. It cannot achieve them. Whether incited by radicals or practiced by over-zealous agents of authority, violence is counter-productive.

#### WITHIN THE SYSTEM

When we recognize our problems, we can repair them within the system. The genius of the American system is that it works, whether the problem is political, economic or social. No system ever devised anywhere has ever responded better to the needs or the wishes of more people than our democracy, and no system has ever been more productive than our competitive process.

Change may not always come as quickly as we wish—but we will become a collection of fools if we ever throw away our political and economic systems in a blind drive for instant perfection in human society.

Work within the system, build on what we have, and you can create the perfection which other generations have not achieved.

#### PHYSICAL NEED

The second condition of America is the physical need growing in parts of our society.

As a nation we have awakened to all the

terrible problems of urban blight and social decay which exist now in many places. We must become just as awake to the needs of the future.

By 1985 we will add as many new people to our country's population as we have today in all the 24 states west of the Mississippi River. Among those newcomers will be your own children.

Just 30 years from now, when you will still be younger than I am today, this nation will have to accommodate perhaps 100 million more people than it has at the present.

Eighty-five percent of them will be urban dwellers, perhaps living in solid cities hundreds of miles long, such as BosWash, from Boston to Washington—or ChiPitts, from Chicago to Pittsburgh—or SanSan, from San Francisco to San Diego—or JaMI, from Jacksonville to Miami.

If you want to talk about challenge, there it is. Pollution, education, taxation, transportation, welfare, housing—all the ingredients of living are wrapped up together.

These facts have the ominous potential of a time bomb. On the one hand we can build an anthill society, let the problems fester, and wait for the explosion of an unlivable existence.

But on the other, they offer unprecedented opportunity. The possibility of achievements in planning, in building, in creating a quality of life, are unlimited. No generation has ever had a chance to do so much in so short a time for so many.

#### MATERIAL PROGRESS

Our third condition is unprecedented material progress.

Through our economic system, we have become the envy of mankind. It has given us everything we have, and it can give us abundance for all.

Moreover, in unprecedented ways, the economic resources of this system already have been brought to bear to produce an unbelievably productive America.

At a rate faster than our growth of population, we are achieving the spread of economic abundance, the growth of scientific knowledge, and elimination of the ghettos of ignorance and poverty.

For the first time in history, there is a productive partnership between government and our private economy to refurbish our cities.

For the first time since the abolition of slavery we are making a practical effort to open the doors of economic opportunity to all the minority peoples of our country.

For the first time in the history of any nation, vast problems of the environment have been identified, and we have made an unprecedented national commitment to eliminate the curse of pollution in all its forms.

Something called good corporate citizenship is becoming a dedication in almost every community in the country, and in many areas around the world where Americans do business.

This system is simply too good for all of us to let it be destroyed.

It is in harness to meet the needs of our people and the needs of our country, and it is a major reason for the tremendous promise which exists in America today.

Let me give you some simple statistical proof from official sources of what this system can do.

To buy a suit of clothes in Soviet Russia takes 183 hours of work. In France a comparable suit takes 75 hours; in Great Britain 40 hours; and in the United States only 24 hours of work is needed for the same item. Or if you prefer to judge by another standard, in the United States one worker on a farm now produces enough to feed 42 people. In France, one worker can feed only approximately 6. The figure is about 5 in Italy, and it is one farm worker for only one other person in China.

These are not boastful figures. They are simple illustrations that what we have works better than what anyone else has. They show that our way delivers more for mankind than that of any other country.

#### PROMISE

There are many reasons why I feel we are in a time of promise.

Looking at the future from your side of the generation gap, the imperfections of our time are very clear and the needs are very sharp. The viewpoint from my side is enriched by the knowledge that the world does indeed get better, and this country will continue to do so.

Every generation has had its problems—but we have never had a generation entering the age of responsible citizenship as concerned as yours with the moral and physical condition of the country.

The future is unlimited so long as it is fueled with high principle and sincere concern. You have both.

In addition, we all have a common interest in the future of this country. Young and old alike, we share a love of our country, a commitment to improve it, and a dedication to achieve peace.

On the basis of what we have done, with all its problems, there is every reason to believe in the future. On the basis of the system we have, there is every reason for confidence.

#### SUGGESTIONS

So let me offer just these suggestions to help you seize the future with the optimism it deserves:

First, don't be discouraged by things as they are. An unbelievably better world is coming, which you will help to build, and it can hold the promise of realizing man's deepest aspirations.

Second, don't downgrade the United States or its institutions. Challenge the critics and yourself to improve them but do not let them be destroyed, because there are none better in the world.

Third, don't let others destroy our competitive system of industry and enterprise. It is superior, it is effective, it is fair and it offers just incentives to those who contribute most.

#### PURSUIT OF FREEDOM

In conclusion and in summary, let me put it all this way.

The price of freedom has always come high. It begins with eternal vigilance, and sometimes includes the risk of death.

It was achieved for America through heavy sacrifice in the past.

Twice in my lifetime it has been threatened from outside, and two generations of Americans have had to fight to preserve it.

Many times in this century it has been lost, in many places in the world.

Your generation, rich in the security of freedom won, has committed itself to the next goal, the perfection of individual liberty.

You demand universal justice. You plead for equality. You curse the darkness of intolerance and dishonesty. And you seek comfort and peace.

Men have sought these goals throughout history—but never with the advantage you have today. You are strong materially. You are secure in our system of law. You have a workable society.

You have set the highest challenges for yourself. Our society encourages you to seek your goals. But we also urge you not to do anything to kill the system which makes it possible. Do not be misled by the firebrands of your own generation who would destroy the future for you.

If there is one common denominator throughout the history of mankind, it is this: Extremists are always overwhelmed in time by the common sense of those who know there is no future in destruction.

The destroyers of today will not survive any more than the witch burners of colonial New England or the book burners of Hitler's Germany. The flag burners of 1970 will be held in history's contempt with the cross-burners of the Ku Klux Klan.

If you will deny the extremists—if you will have faith in yourself and in America's institutions—then in the days ahead you will get the greatest possible reward from the education you have now completed and from the great opportunities which await you.

And in playing your part, you can help to fulfill for your generation man's historic dream of a world of comfort and well-being at home and peace and understanding around the world!

Congratulations—and my very best wishes to each of you.

### CONGRESSIONAL REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS— JUNE 8, 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

#### U.S. HEALTH CARE SYSTEM—PART II

In my last newsletter, I discussed several of the stresses and strains on our health care system, particularly the spreading costs and the involvement of the Federal government in the system. While there may be growing dissatisfaction with health services in the United States, alternatives to the current system are not readily apparent.

The present medical care system is based on a fee-for-service arrangement. Although this is a fine arrangement for episodic care for patients with sporadic illnesses or complaints, it does not work as well for life-long programs of prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation.

Fee-for-service medicine, and the health insurance policies that are patterned after it, mean that patients tend to avoid preventive care, with the result that they are later forced by serious illness into hospital treatment. This treatment, billed on an itemized basis, is also expensive because of higher wage demands by hospital workers, and the high cost of medical manpower, equipment and supplies. At the present rate of increase, a hospital room will cost \$100 per day in five years.

Another result of the present system is that physicians favor urban areas, leaving rural areas, like Southeastern Indiana, with severe shortages of doctors. Doctors understandably prefer to practice medicine where they have access to sophisticated medical technology and research facilities. Moreover, as a result of wanting to avoid the cost of preventive care, patients gravitate toward the hospitals, which are usually in the cities. Because of the great pressures on doctors, especially the solo general practitioner, more doctors are specializing and practicing in groups, a pattern that can be established more easily in the populated center.

Critics contend, then, that the U.S. health care system is weighted toward the expensive treatment of the hospital, and that the U.S. is the best country in the world in which to have a serious illness, but not the best place for non-serious ailments.

In the growing debate over this country's health care system, increasing emphasis is being placed on health care rather than sick



care—on the keeping of people well rather than making them well after illness has struck. Such a change, however, promises to be evolutionary rather than revolutionary.

Secretary Finch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare described the likely course of change this way: "I can see an increasing reliance on prepaid group medical practice where you pay a fixed sum for total medical care by a team of doctors and specialists."

The evolution could take the course of: Group practice: Instead of an individual doctor operating his own practice, groups of doctors would pool their professional and technological resources to provide a wide range of health care, and at a lower overhead cost.

Preventive care: Medical assistants and

technicians would be assigned more and more of the health testing duties, involving the chemical and electrical tests necessary for the doctor's examination and diagnosis. This would leave the doctors free to handle true sick care and to treat disorders that show up in periodic checkups, and could be handled on a community-wide basis.

Prepayment: Pass group practice savings on to patients through set, prepaid annual premiums which would eventually eliminate itemized billing for each treatment as well as third-party payment.

It is not surprising, then, that proposals are being made to revamp the present medical system. The plans vary widely in cost, coverage, financing, extent of government participation, and administration. The AMA has proposed a voluntary system, with pri-

vate insurance companies acting as insurers and using tax credits for financing. The national health insurance proposal would be compulsory, with a combination of private insurance companies and the Federal government as insurers, and using payroll taxes and Federal revenues for financing. The costs vary from \$15 billion to \$60 billion.

The enactment of either of these plans, or any combination of them, without changes in the underlying system of delivery of health care, would only feed the problem of rising costs.

Whatever we do, we must focus on a health care system which utilizes and distributes medical manpower properly and efficiently, and which concentrates on keeping people healthy rather than on making them well.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 16, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Lawrence V. Bradley, Jr., Curtis Baptist Church, Augusta, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father: As this august body convenes this day, we pay homage to Thee, sovereign of all nations; and ask Thy divine benedictions.

Thy servants, here assembled, have been chosen to speak for the citizens of this great land—do Thou indue them with the spirit, the zeal, the courage, and the faith of our forefathers that their deliberations may strengthen the foundations of our beloved Republic in its domestic and international affairs.

Be Thou, our Father, with the President of these United States. Enable him with divine wisdom to meet the problems of our day that will result in the well-being of all mankind.

These blessings we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1732. An act to designate certain lands in the Craters of the Moon National Monument in Idaho as wilderness.

### WELCOME TO REV. LAWRENCE V. BRADLEY, JR.

(Mr. STEPHENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I want to call attention to the fact that our Chaplain for today is Dr. Lawrence Bradley of the Curtis Baptist Church in Augusta, Ga.

This church, founded in downtown Augusta in 1876, celebrated its 94th year of service in January of this year. It has the largest Baptist membership outside of Atlanta and is the third largest in

Georgia. Dr. Bradley accepted the pastorate in 1960 and during the last 10 years has seen the membership almost double in size and its building programs and property values grow to nearly two and a half million dollars.

It is a pleasure for me to welcome him here from my district. Dr. Bradley, I hope you will enjoy being with us today. We welcome Mrs. Bradley, too.

### CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 743, TOUCHET DIVISION, WALLA WALLA PROJECT, OREGON-WASHINGTON

Mr. ASPINALL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 743) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet Division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, and for other purposes:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-1196)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the Bill (S. 743) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 6 (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, for transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation, such sums as may be required to cover separable and joint construction costs of the Touchet Division, Walla-Walla project, allocable to the enhancement of anadromous fish as determined by cost allocation studies comparable to those set forth in House Document Numbered 155, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for construction of the works involved in the Touchet Division \$22,774,000 (January 1969 prices), less the amounts authorized by subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) The total sums authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) and subsection (b) of this section shall be plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes, and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain such division: *Provided*, That funds appropriated pursuant to the authority contained in subsection (b) of this section shall be expended only if the amount thereof is increased in any given fiscal year by a proportionate amount appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section."

And the House agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
HAROLD T. JOHNSON,  
THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
CRAIG HOSMER,  
LAURENCE J. BURTON,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

HENRY M. JACKSON,  
FRANK CHURCH,  
FRANK E. MOSS,  
GORDON ALLOTT,  
LEN B. JORDAN,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The Managers on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill S. 743, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, and for other purposes, submit this statement in explanation of the actions recommended and adopted in the accompanying conference report.

House amendment No. 1 corrects a spelling error. The conferees agreed to the amendment.

House amendment No. 2 designated the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife as the agency authorized to secure appropriations to cover the anadromous fish enhancement costs of the project. The conferees changed the designation from "Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife" to "United States Fish and Wildlife Service." They agreed that the policy objectives of the House language might be accomplished with less budgetary disruption to other fish and wildlife programs if the appropriations were to be requested by the broader administrative entity.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
HAROLD T. JOHNSON,  
THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
CRAIG HOSMER,  
L. J. BURTON,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*