

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A FEDERAL PROGRAM BEING OPERATED IN A MOST EFFICIENT AND PRODUCTIVE MANNER

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a copy of an article that appeared in the Bucks County Courier Times regarding the Bucks County Surplus Food Department. No matter how one stands in the continuing debate of the minds of various food programs, it is encouraging to find an excellent example of a Federal program that is being operated in a most efficient and productive manner.

Following is the text of the article:

BUCKS SURPLUS FOOD DEPARTMENT CALLED "BEST RUN IN STATE"

(By Lawrence C. Hall)

The needy need not go hungry in Bucks County, thanks to what government officials have called "The best run surplus food agency in the state."

It is the Bucks County Surplus Food Department, which has offices and two big warehouses in Newtown, under Elmer J. Waltman, director.

The late novelist Upton Sinclair is reported to have said of his book, "The Jungle," that he aimed for America's heart and hit it in the stomach.

He meant that he had tried to depict the tragic plight of emigrant families working and starving in Chicago's meat-packing industry, hoping to start a crusade to better their lives.

Instead of arousing the public to do something to aid the workers, his book created a controversy that led the Pure Food and Drug Acts to protect the quality of what the industry manufactured.

Times haven't changed. Now the country responds both in the please of the heart and stomach in wide-ranging programs to help those who need it.

Eighty boxcar loads of U.S. Department of Agriculture surplus foods a year come to the department in Newtown. The groceries go to feed a growing number of people in Bucks County who for one reason or another cannot make ends meet.

Not only the poor, but striking workers are provided for, and Waltman recently suggested to the state that all Social Security recipients also be given food.

His suggestion was approved by Robert J. Freiler, director of the State Bureau of Government Donated Food, and forwarded to Washington for further action.

Waltman is not sure why but the number of people who use surplus food is increasing. In 1967, there were 32,805 persons who consumed \$145,376 worth of food; in 1968, 34,070 obtained \$201,101 worth and last year, 47,344 took home \$385,506 in free groceries. The county has 11 distribution points: Warminster, Bristol, Kingswood Park, Trevoise, Croydon, Morrisville, Langhorne, Ottsville, Perkasio, Quakertown and Doylestown.

Applicants may apply at any of these offices or at the Newtown headquarters, 420 Centre Ave., which is open except for noon to 1 p.m. five days a weeks from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Commodities now being distributed are beef, evaporated milk, orange juice, green beans, corn syrup, potatoes, butter, cheese, peanut butter, rolled oats, dried beans, rais-

ins, corn meal, chopped meat, rolled wheat, lard (soon to be replaced by shortening), dry milk, rice and flour.

To be added this year are canned tomatoes, tomato juice, enriched macaroni and Farina, a baby food.

Eligibility for donated foods is based on a family size-income scale, that, after the second increment, increases on the average of by about \$45 in allowable income per person. One person who makes no more than \$150 a month and has no more than \$1,000 liquid assets qualifies. Two or more are allowed \$1,500 liquid assets.

A family of four qualifies if the income is no more than \$315 a month, and they get \$40.34 worth of free food. This includes such items as two 10-pound bags of flour, four 30 ounce cans of meat, eight 14½ ounce cans of evaporated milk and a five-pound loaf of cheese. In all they would take home some 65 items.

For precise information, interested persons should call the Newtown office.

Waltman is a big, rough-hewn man who worked for 19 years as a senior safety engineer with the E. G. Budd Company in Philadelphia.

He was appointed deputy director of the department in 1962, when he was furloughed from his Budd job. He worked for the county a couple of years, going back to Budd in 1964. In 1967, was given the agency's directorship.

"I always had ideas about how the department should be run," says Waltman.

He tries to vary the offerings somewhat month-to-month and he keeps his warehouses spotless. "I want people to see it clean when they come in," he says, "so they can leave with their self-respect."

In the same tenor, he refuses to distribute food in bent cans or cans with soiled labels. He withholds these items, and, after they are certified by state investigators, they are buried.

Evidently his work wins high approval. The walls of his office display letters of commendation and appreciation from government officials and union leaders.

DR. KENNETH B. CLARK CALLS FOR AN END TO SLUMS AND RACISM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Kenneth B. Clark recently delivered a most significant address at a conference of the Academy of Religion and Mental Health and the Metropolitan Applied Research Center, Inc. The conference, held on April 29-30 in New York City, was concerned with alternatives to racism, and was attended by more than 300 professionals in the fields of psychiatry, psychology, education, and religion.

Dr. Clark, president of the Metropolitan Applied Research Center, Inc., is one of our most distinguished leaders. A professor of psychology, he has devoted years as well to community programs, such as Harlem Youth Opportunity Unlimited, and the Northside Center for Child Development, to which Dr. Mamie Clark, his wife, has also devoted many years of dedicated work.

Dr. Clark's work laid much of the groundwork for the U.S. Supreme Court's epoch decision, Brown against Board of Education, to which the famous footnote 11, citing Dr. Clark's studies, was such an important key. Throughout his life Dr. Clark has been an active and dedicated leader in the civil rights struggle.

Professor Clark emphasized the responsibility of concerned professionals for imposing "on the consciousness of the American people a realization of how limited a period of time remains for the Nation to remove the shame of slums and racism." He called for ridding the Nation of slums and poverty and removing all forms of institutionalized racism.

I commend Dr. Clark's speech to my colleagues:

BEYOND THE DILEMMA

(By Kenneth B. Clark)

In terms of what has happened to the country—and to me—in the interim, it seems a very long time ago that I agreed, as a young graduate student, to work with my former teacher, Ralph Bunche, and Gunnar Myrdal on the project that was to result in an American dilemma.

Much of the data in that report is now superseded; many of the findings may seem naive in terms of our new realism about the depth of American racism. But the basic truths of that study have not been superseded and there is still an American dilemma, more frightening now than it seemed even then—and still unresolved.

The pathology of the ghetto is now clear and recognized—the statistics of infant mortality, disease, rat infestation, broken plumbing, littered streets, consumer exploitation, riot-burned buildings that have not been replaced, inefficient schools, a discriminatory system of police and court procedures. The litany of pain and despair is the same in every dark ghetto and, despite the anti-poverty programs, Title I funds, Model Cities, and so on, the ghetto is still dark and still desperate.

We must now go beyond that litany to think, and conceive, and plan alternatives. If one assumes that the ghetto cannot survive as a ghetto if our cities are to survive, and that our nation cannot survive if the cities die, we have no choice but to create alternatives. We must face certain hard questions: Should we seek to disband and disperse the ghetto or reinforce it? What will be the possibilities of choice for human beings who are now confined to the prison of the ghetto? Will Scarsdale, White Plains, Bethesda, Grosse Point, or Newton make room for them? Or will scattered site ghettos be built in the suburbs near the highways, or dumps, inconvenient to transportation lines, isolated from residential property? There is considerable evidence that the suburban Negro finds himself once again isolated or evicted in behalf of urban renewal, pushed out to another less affluent town that cannot afford to exclude him.

We need to consider all of the costs of the ghetto—whether it is more costly to retain or to abolish the ghetto; whether it is more costly to reinforce separatism—perhaps with a cordoned force—or to choose genuine integration. It may be that there is no choice between these two stark alternatives. We may well find that the answers are surprising—that the ghetto costs more than an integrated society even simply in terms of financial burden to the city—in terms of property that cannot support an adequate

tax base, unproductive land, decaying utilities, damaged and unproductive persons.

It has always been apparent that the human costs of the ghetto could not be borne. What has been less clear is the extent of the human costs of the segregated affluent suburb too often corroded by its artificial isolation. The pathology of the ghetto itself has been recorded and does not need to be recorded again. No one who knows this tragic record can accept the fallacy and glib slogan of benign neglect—to relate that concept to America's dark ghettos betrays a profound deficiency and distortion of perception. It betrays the failure of many whites to understand that the ghetto will be neglected at their own peril, that whites must cope with racial problems for their own sake. The solution of the ghetto is tied to their own survival. This is the dilemma beyond the dilemma.

The price of racism in America is high and all must pay it—the victimizers as well as the victims, for the pathology of the ghetto which could contribute to the public safety cannot be contained. The drugs which lulled Harlem youth into a false euphoria have spread to Westchester; urban blight is creeping toward the suburbs like a steady plague. The riots and disruptions that burned the heart of many of the nation's largest cities from 1965 to 1967, spread to smaller cities and suburbs in 1968 and 1969.

Racism has many distinguishing characteristics, but none among them is more deeply necessary to the racist psychology than self-deception. The black nationalist who tells himself that he is "together" and proud—but who fears to face whites in competition in the classroom or the job; the black "militant" leader who exploits the frustrations of his own people in cynical alliance with segregationists; the white segregationist who justifies his rejection of other human beings, citing alleged evidence of Negro inferiority; the white liberal who defends his double standard support of black separatism on benevolent grounds; the white public official who recommends benign neglect of the poor and the despairing—all these share in a dangerous fantasy that leads to self-destruction of the spirit, and corrupts and subverts a free society. This pattern of fantasies is the core of the contemporary American dilemma.

The American dilemma, as defined by Gunnar Myrdal, was the dilemma of ideals betrayed in practice. The dilemma beyond the dilemma is also essentially a dilemma of America's whites, who have the power to turn America around but have so far been unwilling to assume the costs of justice even in behalf of their own survival.

To focus on the dilemma as it is exemplified in the area of education: On May 17 of this year it will be sixteen years since the U.S. Supreme Court concluded, in *Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka*, "That in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."

In arriving at this conclusion, the Court cited modern psychological knowledge as to the detrimental effect of racial segregation in public schools on minority group children. It stated:

"To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."

With these words the U.S. Supreme Court established the basis and rationale for subsequent discussion of, and actions and evasions related to, the desegregation of the public schools—namely, that segregated schools violated the constitutional rights of Negro students—to equal protection of the laws—by damaging them, educationally and

psychologically. The evidence of such detriment and damage had received judicial sanction.

Nevertheless, during the fifteen years that followed, this approach failed to touch the conscience of the masses of American people—and failed to arouse the type of serious action and social change designed to save human beings from sustained cruelty and damage.

Instead, public officials and educational officials sought a variety of ways of procrastination, evasion, tokenism. Some talked of "cultural deprivation" and decided that the schools could not assume the burden of teaching reading until the "deprived culture" was transformed. Some, like President Nixon, decried the effort to "demand too much of our schools, . . . not only to educate, but also to accomplish a social transformation."

Some flirted with the speculations of the new, and regressive racial geneticists who claim to have confirmed innate Negro inferiority. Some gave priority to the racial anxieties of whites and hence opposed programs of school pairing or bussing or educational parks.

I repeat—with a sense of profound concern about the humanity and morality of my fellow Americans—that the knowledge that segregated schools inflicted permanent damage upon Negro children was not enough to compel the American people to plan and implement a massive and effective program for the desegregation of our public schools.

For the masses of white Americans, it appears that Negro children are clearly expendable.

As the desegregation struggle moved from the South to the North it resulted in white backlash and in black separatism—two sides of the same coin—and it resulted in a tragic series of urban ghetto disruptions.

Recent urban riots and racial polarization in America can be viewed as symptoms of the increased frustrations resulting from unfulfilled promises inherent in the *Brown* decision. These disturbances and more overt forms of racism are a more intense and focused sign of the detrimental consequences of the continuation of racially stigmatized segregated schools in a segregated society.

But it is my considered judgment—based upon the evidence of the past fifteen years—that American society will not effectively desegregate its schools—or mount a serious attack against racism and racial polarization generally—as long as it views these problems primarily in terms of their damage to Negroes, and to Negro children. The history of racism has prepared many, if not the majority, of Americans psychologically to accept injury to—or the outright expendability of Negro children.

The argument for desegregation of our public schools must, therefore, be presented now in terms of the damage which racially segregated schools—and racism as a whole—imposes upon privileged white children.

There is strong evidence to suggest that racial segregation—the institutionalization of racism—is flagrantly and insidiously detrimental to white children, as well as to black. And I do not believe that the masses of American whites wish to inflict damage upon their own children.

Ironically, the U.S. Supreme Court, in the *Brown* case, had before it evidence suggesting that segregation did damage white children. In the social science brief appended to the legal brief it was stated in discussing the detrimental effects of racism on white children:

"The culture permits and, at times, encourages them to direct their feelings of hostility and aggression against whole groups of people, the members of which are perceived as weaker than themselves. They often develop patterns of guilt feelings, rationaliza-

tions, and other mechanisms which they must use in an attempt to protect themselves from recognizing the essential injustice of their unrealistic fears and hatreds of minority groups."

The report indicates further that confusion, conflict, moral cynicism, and disrespect for authority may arise in majority group children as a consequence of being taught the moral, religious and democratic principles of the brotherhood of man and the importance of justice and fair play by the same persons and institutions who, in their support of racial segregation and related practices, seem to be acting in a prejudiced and discriminatory manner. These ideas were first examined in 1950 and written in 1952. They may be viewed as prophetic of the current youth rebellion.

Let us examine some of the moral confusions posed for individuals who are required to cope with the dilemma of racism in a verbally democratic society:

1. The attempt to escape personal guilt, through the use of a variety of forms of self-protection and rationalizations—including reinforcing racism and blaming the victims of racism for their predicament;

2. Moral cynicism and rejection of all values—the development of a dog-eat-dog philosophy of life;

3. The effort to avoid a sense of moral and ethical emptiness which a racist—racially segregated—society imposes upon all sensitive human beings;

4. Rejection of authority;

5. The moral and ethical conflict created when one is compelled to serve as an accessory to racial segregation and cruelty imposed upon others; when one is forced to be an involuntary beneficiary of such cruelty.

These are merely some of the symptoms of cruelty—the moral schizophrenia inflicted upon sensitive individuals as they struggle to avoid the personal disruptions inherent in this socially imposed ethical conflict.

It is a realistic and accepted tragedy that the majority of American youth accommodate to the normative hypocrisy, accept the rationalizations, the explanations, the excuses for the racism of the larger society. These "adjusted" young people function in terms of the philosophy of dog-eat-dog and every man for himself. They may experience an intensification of feelings of hostility and contempt toward minorities—and all others who are perceived as weak—and often act out these feelings in cruel, insensitive and at times immoral behavior.

On the other hand, a growing but critical minority of white American youth appear to be suffering from intense personal guilt feelings, and, therefore, seem compelled to rebel against parents, established leaders, institutions. Some of these young people sometimes adopt a cynical rejection of all moral values, all ethics as having no value other than the verbal and the exploitative. For these anguished young people, moral values and even rationality are seen as inevitably contaminated—as tools of immorality—for the hypocritical establishment and therefore must be rejected. This poses a most critical danger for a stable democratic society.

The contemporary racial dilemma, now mocking or challenging America, comes in the forms of the illusive malaise of the privileged—the affluent—white youth:

The hippie movement with its random, chaotic, search for ethical clarity and consistency;

The drug cult of the middle-class youth who seek escape from intolerable ethical emptiness;

The hostility and aggression expressed toward parents and other authorities who inflicted, or permitted this conflict to be inflicted upon them;

The new left—quasi-anarchistic movement among youth; with its hostile, often self-

destructive expressions that seek to destroy that which is perceived as a social process systematically destroying the ethical substance and potential within them.

The campus rebellions which, like urban ghetto riots, may be seen as the counter-attack by a critical minority of American youth against a system of intolerable moral hypocrisy and ethical inconsistency.

For these young people, the system is not made tolerable by their affluence—by parental indulgence, by educational permissiveness—even by owning their own car; nor is it made tolerable by the deadening law and order offered by many homogenous suburban communities in lieu of ethical substance and demonstrated democracy.

Segregated schools, and the tyranny and barbarity of American ghettos, are the institutionalized inescapable immorality of American racism. And, as such, segregated schools are stultifying and destroying the ethical and personal effectiveness of American white children more insidiously than they are destroying the personal and human effectiveness of America's black children—who, at least, understand what is done to them and many, therefore, can continue the struggle against this type of dehumanization.

If colleges and universities understood this, they would reorganize, modifying their governance structure if necessary in order to intervene directly to improve dramatically and rapidly the quality and efficiency of education for rejected black children. They would find a way to move into deprived public schools in a supervisory, accountability and evaluative role. They would demand that elementary and secondary public schools cease to be educational disaster areas.

They would, in addition, develop to help white students—the white student from the less privileged background and more privileged whites from affluent families—to help them broaden their perspective of man away from the constricted racist perspective of their parents and peers.

The anxieties and insecurities of blue collar and white collar whites are important factors in the random hostilities and cruelties of racism. Colleges and universities must assume the specific task of education to liberate white youth from this important form of moral and ethical disadvantage.

If public officials understood the special needs of ethically disadvantaged white youth, they would be less prone, I believe, to procrastinate, to equivocate and mouth the hypocrisy against "busing" or transporting children for integrated education.

If they understood this, they would be less prone to talk the rhetoric of black capitalism or white supremacy—subtle or flagrant, support segregated black studies, pay out meaningless reparations at the same time that they fail to change American society; to talk compensatory education and cultural deprivation and all other language of narrow racial identity without planning for serious change.

If they understood this, they would build an agenda for a future—their own future, a future for all Americans.

America has the resources to move beyond the stagnant dilemma of the present. An America who could mobilize resources to land men on the moon, could mobilize its financial, material, intellectual and human resources to wage a serious war against slums and poverty and eliminate all institutionalized forms of racism within the decade of the 1970's.

There could be no more fitting goal in the celebration of America's bicentennial than to make the egalitarian promises of Jefferson real for all Americans—black as well as white—by 1976. The specific targets essential for attaining this goal are:

Effective non-racial schools, with teachers who teach and children who learn;

Housing, worthy of human beings, in our urban and rural areas;

Jobs—consistent with human dignity; An elimination of the need and concept and stigma of welfare; and Health services in terms of need rather than ability to pay.

Our society can and must provide for all of its citizens such minimal symbols of the respect of human beings for human beings as clean streets, adequate public transportation, useful and stimulating parks and cultural and recreational facilities; and all of those things which are essential to eliciting those esthetic and creative and ethical potentials of man.

The costs will be high but the alternative costs of a divided, and dying and dehumanizing society will be far greater. This is the dilemma beyond the dilemma.

ADDRESS OF LT. GOV. CHARLES SULLIVAN TO 1970 GRADUATES OF MISSISSIPPI STATE COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert in the RECORD an eloquent address delivered by the Honorable Charles L. Sullivan, Lieutenant Governor of Mississippi, to the 1970 graduates of Mississippi State College for Women.

In these days of war, so-called student unrest, and an abundance of social problems, I believe those who read this address will agree that Lieutenant Governor Sullivan has approached the problems confronting our college graduates, citizens of the Nation and officials of our Government in an effective and sensible manner. I commend his address to the reading and consideration of Members of the Congress and citizens over the Nation:

ADDRESS OF LT. GOV. CHARLES L. SULLIVAN

President Hogarth, distinguished members here on the platform, graduating seniors, and ladies and gentlemen: I am not unmindful of the very high distinction you seniors bestowed upon me by permitting me to participate in this, for you, most significant occasion. I do, as a matter of fact, appreciate it very much. Of course, your presence, you seniors, your presence here, I think, is a great achievement; one of work, of study, of perseverance, of dedication. My presence, of course, and the presence of all others than the seniors, is simply to be here to participate in this recognition of a very just and worthwhile recognition of you.

Now I strongly suspect, seniors, that in the past and traditionally speakers called upon, as I am today, to talk with a large part, a very significant part, of our academic community who are leaving school to enter the world of personal responsibility, have felt inclined to comment at some length upon the critical situation which their contemporary world was experiencing at the time of their graduation on then occasions such as yours. It is entirely possible, of course, that if we could know the circumstances under which each of these speakers in the past have indulged in this tradition, we could understand and perhaps sympathize with their predicting such a critical future for those entering the world outside of the academic community.

This world in which you will now enter, this country called America, is in fact confronted with some of the most grave crises

that any group of people, any group of seniors, graduating from university campuses throughout the nation have ever experienced. But I do not suggest to you seniors that you should enter into your future with any distrust of that future. Not at all. Nor do I suggest to you that you should in any wise be afraid of what America, of what Mississippi for that matter, of what this entire society which comprises the greatest nation civilization has ever witnessed. I do not suggest that you enter it with fear and foreboding.

I do suggest, however, that a thoughtful examination of recent events, just in the span of your lifetime, would cause us to think with some gravity of the responsibility which you and your contemporaries throughout this nation must assume and you must assume it very shortly. I would assume that most of you are in the age bracket of twenty to twenty-two years. This is an incredibly brief period in the history of your country. But just in this short period of time that you have lived, moved through the elementary, the secondary schools, here to M.S.C.W., and not to graduate, have witnessed some of the most significant events that influence the very future of your country. As a matter of fact, some of these events lead now to confrontations and to problems which could, if not wisely resolved, actually determine the very destiny of this country.

At the time most of you were born, the late 1940's, your country had just three years prior to that concluded hostilities in a worldwide conflict. It was at that time, the United States was occupying a world preeminence, a role of preeminence internationally that no other civilization had ever in the history of man been called upon to occupy. This nation was at that time militarily invulnerable, it was the world's most affluent nation, and much more importantly than that, it was respected, loved, and admired throughout the universe.

Now, in the period that you have lived and reached this point, things have changed and changed very significantly. We found it necessary once again to engage in war in a little unknown place called Korea in which thirty-three thousand young Americans gave their lives. We saw great old allies like Great Britain, we saw their demise from the scene of international power. And, this final ally we saw with some sadness her recognition of the fact that she is no longer a great power and we have witnessed with sadness her resignation to that fact and her withdrawal from the strategic areas of confrontation throughout the world.

We have seen your country in this past decade of the sixties, a very significant decade, become engaged once again in armed warfare, once again in a little sad tragic chaotic country of which most of us had never heard, and in which now, as of last week, your contemporaries, young men your age, over 42,000 of them, have died in the belief that it was their responsibility to this country to do so and with the idealism that by their sacrifice they made it possible for you to be here in Columbus this afternoon.

And then, of course, we are now witnessing the international struggle for the domination of world communism between Russia and China which shall not be resolved immediately. We see the Middle East becoming once again exactly the same tense situation which caused us to become involved in Southeast Asia where it is entirely possible, if we are not careful, that your country shall become aligned with a very very small country with about two million people in opposition to the United Soviet Socialist Republic with all of the vast remaining area in the Middle East and some two hundred million people.

Domestically here at home, since you have been here, we have witnessed a growing of divisiveness among our people. We have

watched with great dismay and sadness the growing sense on the part of individual Americans that they have no responsibility for their nation, even when it is engaged in actual warfare, Vietnam. But on the contrary an indeterminate number of American people who wanted their nation to be humiliated and defeated on the battlefield.

In addition here at home, we have become extremely concerned with the vitality and with the very survival of an economic system which permitted this nation, your country, to achieve heights of economic attainment that no other civilization could even approach, nor has ever approached, tell that in short and in fact.

While I said a moment ago that I do not suggest you view your future with any distrust, it cannot be denied that as you now enter the world, in the sense that I mean it, and as you and your contemporaries from the other college campuses throughout this nation in the decade of the seventies assume the responsibility which the adult generation has borne to the present, I suggest to you that it will demand all of your intelligence, all of your integrity and moral fiber, all of your courage and all of your dedication if your generation is to preserve that which other generations gained for you.

In short, I suppose, all of these culminate in three major but related areas of concern today. They are Vietnam and Cambodia, inflation or the economy here at home, and the final gnawing concern and that is whether America shall maintain an orderly society in which people may live in freedom and in dignity or shall this great country slip over into anarchy and then if it does, inexorably lose its freedom.

Now before I comment on these three particularly, I would, I think with your indulgence like to comment on one aspect of it all and that is in this country the growing attack on the part of the so-called young activists upon the adult generation in which the so-called young activists generation suggests, in fact insists, that the adult generation of America is inept, is incapable of imaginative innovation, is immoral, and is in fact sick. Now, I would like to examine that for one moment; because as you assume your responsibilities, it is absolutely essential that my generation be able to communicate with yours and that by joining the two generations together we shall achieve, as I suggested earlier, the maintenance of the greatest nation God has ever permitted to exist.

The adult generation in America has built more school campuses, more school buildings, more universities, more educational facilities in this generation than in all the generations of history in the past. Imagine that.

The adult generation of America has accomplished more medically to relieve the suffering of humanity than all of medicine in recorded history. America's adult generation did that.

America's adult generation has contributed charitably more in the time of this adult generation, from the time it left the college campus until today, than all of the generations that lived in this country prior to this one.

This generation of adult Americans achieved absolute miracles in transportation, supersonic jets, vehicular transportation, surface transportation, subsurface transportation in the oceans, than all of the generations of history. The adult generation of America did that.

And the adult generation of America, regardless of what might be said about it, did all of this while at the same time insisting that America remain a free society in which my generation, the adult generation, refused to accept the idea that the voice of America is expressed in burning the bank of Berkeley, or in starting a war at Kent State University,

or in crowding the streets in Jackson, Mississippi mouthing obscenities and indecencies.

As a matter of fact, the adult generation very recently began man's conquest of God's limitless universe. Put men on the moon! Just a beginning! As a matter of fact, awesome thought, as a matter of fact, my adult generation comes very close to the capability to reproduce and create life itself. We have done so with the enzyme. Imagine that!

And I say all of this for the purpose which I have already mentioned and that is to ask you and to challenge you and your contemporaries throughout all of this country who have been so critical of the adult generation and have felt perhaps that it entitled them to engage in anarchy because the adults had let them down. I mention these things in passing with humility but I challenge you and your generation to accomplish more than the adult generation of America of today. What a challenge! To the young generation of America, those who leave the college campuses this week and next, to set as an objective and as a goal that you will accomplish more than the adult generation in this blessed country has accomplished before you. What a challenge! What an almost impossible task, but you could do it, and my generation wants to reach out to the activists, if you like that word, to the activist seniors who are leaving the college campuses all over America and join hands with you and say that together these accomplishments of my generation shall seem insignificant to those of yours joined with ours.

Now having said that, very briefly, the major items that I mentioned to you earlier that are going to concern you so much as you leave MSCW and as you assume the responsibilities which you simply cannot delegate, nor avoid.

In Vietnam and Cambodia, very briefly, the President of the United States decided three weeks ago that a principle which this country had adopted in Korea of the privileged sanctuary, that principle should be abandoned. And I ask young Americans throughout this country, including those here at MSCW, that although you may bitterly disagree with the decision of the President, it was his nondelegable responsibility as the President of the United States to make that decision and having made it, as the President he is entitled to the support and the respect of your generation and of mine.

One of the saddest, I think, occasions of this early part of the decade of the seventies which we have just begun, was to see this decision seized upon as a pretext for violence all over the United States. In this country, my young friends, opposition to a presidential decision is not expressed by four deaths at Kent State, not in this country. It is not expressed by a riot at Augusta, Georgia. And in America I sincerely hope you do not believe that in this country we express our disapproval of decisions such as this by rioting and looting and burning in the western state of California. I sympathize with that man.

Prior to the day that he sent the troops into the Parrot's Beak and into the hook into Cambodia, the action which your contemporaries, young people your age, I've seen them over there many, many times. In fact, I have stood by the airplanes with sadness while their bodies were being loaded into airplanes to make the last flight home across the Pacific. The action over there had been contained on the east by water and the south, on the north by the so-called demilitarized zone, and on the west by the Cambodian and Laotian borders. The President of this country sat week after week and watched the casualty list mount from twenty to thirty to thirty-five thousand to forty thousand, and finally said "Enough."

Now my challenge to your generation is, not that you young ladies will be asked to risk

your life in Southeast Asia, you will not, but I ask you to by the manner in which you responsibly respond to this particular call upon other Americans to sacrifice theirs that you respond in such a manner that it will become known once again that the young people in America feel an individual sense of responsibility to their country to the extent that they can accept the actual loss of life of their friends, their loved ones, their family, because a nation which is not willing to take this risk will have irrevocably and forever lost its greatness.

And I should say to you that in this decade, just as you really become an important part of this country in so far as responsibility is concerned, in this decade we shall disengage and withdraw from Southeast Asia. The deaths will finally terminate there and once again the struggle for men's souls, for their friendship, for the respect all over the world, will once again come to be tested not on the military battleground but by the much, much better test of accomplishment and you will be deeply involved at that time, you and your contemporaries, and when we get to that point, I assure you my young friends, on the basis of accomplishment, our system, our democracy, our people will absolutely outdo anything the Communists can ever possibly dream of you see, and be unbeatable and you will be a part of that.

Now in the economy, very briefly, many of you will enter the business and professional world and I am glad that is so. There is not time to discuss here today what made our particular economic system so great and I shall not attempt to do so with you. I would suggest to you however that two things, among others, will determine the very future of this country and that is whether or not you and your contemporaries will insist upon the maintenance of an economy, a vital virile economy which can satisfy the requirements of all of the people in this society regardless of their ethnic origin or the geography of their residence. That and secondly, that you and your contemporaries insist that we maintain an orderly society in this country in which that economy can operate, can nourish, be nourished, and can flourish. Two great responsibilities for you!

With regard to the first one item, or one suggestion and that is, young ladies, that you and the young men who are your contemporaries all over this nation, having now gained an education which means so much are by that accomplishment entitled to anything in the way of your economic security from society or from the government but that on the contrary for our economy is to remain as effective as it has been in the past, it will be because each of you recognize that your economic security, that your economic security in the future, is a matter of your own personal privilege, but more than that, your own personal responsibility. If you do not do so and if your generation should insist that it is the responsibility of society and collectively of that society as a government to assure the economic well-being of every single American, this economy cannot survive.

It is a great opportunity, you know, to be self sufficient. To know that the government doesn't owe you a future, that society does not owe you a living but to know that in this country you still will have the right, if you want it, to try, to succeed, and perhaps to fail. But once again the liberty to determine for yourself your own economic future. And in doing so, assure that the economic system which made this nation great shall continue.

And in regard to the orderly society, a perplexing question, I think the saddest development of the decade of the sixties, when you were still back in high school, some of you, and in the secondary school and then you moved on here, was the fact that the disorderly society became acceptable, that we in

some unbelievable and incredible manner misinterpreted the so-called constitutional freedom so grossly so that the right of the freedom of dissent became the right to disrupt, the right to disagree became the right to destroy, and the right of freedom of speech became the right to advocate treason and the destruction of a great, great country in fact when anarchy became an acceptable facet of the American environment.

I suggest to you and to your generation that regardless of how appealing it may be at times to just be a nihilist, not to be for anything you see, but to destroy, just "burn, baby burn", I suggest to you that if you and your generation do not absolutely insist that while every American is entitled to these so-called inalienable rights, in so doing they shall respect the right of all others to live in a free, lawful, orderly, and dignified society. Because if you do not do so and disorder becomes the order of the day, if we decide international policy and domestic policy by the number of people rioting in the street and by the decibel count of noise that they obscenely make, this nation shall surely slide into anarchy and from that into bondage in your lifetime. I am sure you know that most historians believe that society's civilizations move from bondage to law and order, to economic affluence, to dependency, to anarchy, and back again into bondage. In your country, think about it. It started out, organized a lawful society, became the world's richest nation, we then economically, as I suggested earlier, began to teach some of our people that dependency was the rule of the day. Be a parasite. You don't have to, you see the idea, in this country be productive and creative, you can be a parasite. Begin to teach our people to be dependents and then in the decade of the sixties begin to teach them that anarchy would be acceptable. If we permit that to happen or if your generation permits it, we shall surely take the final step—and that is this country will no longer be free. Well, I strongly suspect that you are more aware of that than I and I shall not dwell on it further except to say that the task is yours.

Now I do want to comment on one other item, if I may. And that is, and this may surprise you. It's because I am here at MSCW. Another movement that is quite extant in my country at this time. It's known by many designations. It's called the LIB; women's national organization; NOW, national organization of women; the feminist movement. I want to say to you young ladies that I am engaged in business, in a financial business. I am a professional engaged in the law practice, daily in our courts when I am involved in a third profession and that is a political one. And I want to say to you that in each of those capacities, as an individual and as an official, that I welcome everyone of you into each or all of those activities. And I absolutely want you to be treated completely equitably and I want you to have precisely the same opportunities in each of those undertakings that I have enjoyed. As a matter of fact, I welcome you into the political arena individually. I welcome you into the political arena as participants but not on the ballot. In the financial world to the same extent and in the professional world as well. But I do want to say to you, that if the women of America, your contemporaries, become so insistent on your liberation movement that you lose your beauty, your attractiveness, your loveliness, your very femininity, you will have done this country a great disservice. You will have. Now I hope that won't happen and I feel just as confident as I possibly can that here in Mississippi, at least, it will not. And I want you to know that reassures me greatly. Now having said that—more seriously, I do welcome you on to our level.

I defended the older generation earlier. I

did so deliberately. But we are now reaching the point, you see, where we can ask you to take part of that responsibility and in those areas where we failed you shall share part of the failure and then when we succeed, all of us together, not two separate generations, can share the sense of satisfaction and justification, not necessarily publicly recognized, that together we have accomplished something worthwhile. Because I want to assure you finally, my young friends, that in all of this together the continuation of a great society, the continuation and survival of the world's greatest nation, is for you a great, great challenge. What a wonderful opportunity it is! What a great thing you will have done when your generation becomes the older generation and then you look back and say to the younger, "Look what America, look what Mississippi, look what a free and dignified people under God have wrot." Great, great challenge and you will do it!

POWER POOL FOR NEW ENGLAND

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of the Members a development in New England which I think bodes well for the future. I refer to the recent announcement of agreement on a regional power pool which will include all electric utilities—cooperatives, municipals, and investor-owned.

This far-reaching step to strengthen the reliability of electric service in New England took nearly 3 years of intensive study and negotiation. It is a tribute to both public and private power representatives that the larger interests of all consumers in the region have been served by the successful conclusion of these negotiations.

I am particularly pleased that this comprehensive plan for the integrated operation of all generation and transmission in our six-State region includes a permanent planning committee. This committee is charged with the environmental, economic, and engineering evaluation of future electric facilities whether proposed by the public power entities or the private utilities.

While we cannot expect immediate results from this pool agreement, we in New England can look forward to the orderly development of electric power resources in the years ahead.

A pertinent item follows:

FIRST STAGE OF NEW ENGLAND POWER POOL

Representatives of publicly and privately owned New England electric utilities who have been meeting regularly as a working committee since June, 1969, have announced agreement on the first stage of a New England power pool. Their agreement will result in prompt activation of the power pool's operating arm, the New England Power Exchange (NEPEX), at West Springfield, Mass. An understanding has also been reached on some of the general principles for a broad powerpool agreement.

Approval copies of documents covering both understandings are being sent to electric utilities—both public and private—throughout New England. Organization of the first of several NEPEX committees is expected to take place in May and the target

date for activating the control center itself is June 1. Various regulatory approvals must be obtained before the center becomes operational.

NEPEX is a master control center which was built, equipped and staffed over the past two years at a cost of some \$8 million in anticipation of agreement on a regional power pool operating through four satellite control centers at strategic locations around New England (Augusta, Me.; Manchester, N.H.; Westboro, Mass.; and Southington, Conn. NEPEX is ready to start coordinating the operation and maintenance of all major electric power generation and transmission in New England. In addition, it will provide more effective coordination with other power pools and utilities in the United States and Canada.

The objective of NEPEX will be to achieve the significant practical economies of energy supply consistent with established standards of service reliability, with all participating utilities sharing equitably in both the benefits and the costs of NEPEX.

The NEPEX agreement is an interim one, drafted to provide both an immediate contractual framework for power pooling and an enabling structure of administrative committees. It would be superseded by a formal agreement on NEPOOL. Negotiations on a broad NEPOOL agreement are continuing and it is hoped that they can be concluded in time to make a full pool effective by April 1, 1971.

Utilities and utility associations represented on the Working Committee include: Bangor Hydroelectric Company, Boston Edison Company, Central Maine Power Company, Central Vermont Public Service Corporation, Eastern Utilities Associates, Fitchburg Gas and Electric Light Company, Municipal Electric Association of Massachusetts, New England Electric System, New England Gas and Electric Association, Northeast Public Power Association, Northeast Utilities, Public Service Company of New Hampshire, Shrewsbury Electric Light Department, United Illuminating Company.

Representatives of the Federal Power Commission and of the various state regulatory commissions participated in meetings of the committee.

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, having known Hon. Clifford Davis all of my life, I want to be among the first to say how much we all will miss the warmth and wit of this outstanding gentleman who served his district, his State, and his Nation so long and so well.

Although I never had the pleasure of being either his constituent or his Representative, our districts were adjoining and numbers of my friends are his friends. We were both involved in campaigning during national elections, and judge—as we all affectionately called him—was always at his best when speaking before an audience. With his sharp wit and picturesque language, he could hold an individual or a group in the palm of his hand in fascinated attentiveness.

His love of people was manifested in so many varied ways. I shall always remember the luncheon in the Speaker's

dining room he gave with me, a newly elected Member, as one of the three honored guests. But the best of all memories of judge will be of that day when I was first elected and he came up to visit me in my office. We spent 30 wonderful minutes together, with him recalling experiences of his lifetime of public service.

During his years here in Congress, he had two brushes with violent death when he was wounded during the shooting on the House floor and he and Mrs. Davis survived a plane crash. So death was no stranger to him, but I am happy that after a vigorous and tempestuous life, it came peacefully to lay him to rest in his own home.

NEW WEAPON FOR OLD CRIMES

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the relentlessness of criminal activity and rising crime rates demands nothing less than our full commitment to seeking and implementing innovative methods by which crime control and prevention can be scaled down to workable proportions without the fear of a police state. Innovation, however, need not be equated with revolutionary ideas, for to do so would risk overlooking the most effective weapon against crime—cooperation.

In this context, I call to your attention the very worthwhile efforts of the Federal Bar Association's Law Observance Committee as described in the following excerpts from the December 1969 issue of Law and Order magazine in an article—"New Weapon for Old Crimes"—by John V. Haggard. Mr. Haggard is presently the public affairs officer and historian for the Defense Personnel Support Center in Philadelphia. I am particularly pleased that he is also a resident of the First Congressional District.

Ever since representatives of law enforcement agencies and attorneys of Federal civilian and military activities in Philadelphia met in May, 1959 to exchange information on ways and means to promote better public understanding of the rule of law, the Law Observance Committee has been using the most effective weapon against crime—cooperation, described by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as "... a combining of the efforts of all law enforcement agencies with the support and understanding of the American people" . . .

In its Youth Accomplishment program, the Committee gave retired senior citizens a chance to share their spare time with children by giving them two to twelve hours of free instruction each week . . .

The Youth Accomplishment program had for its purpose to direct youthful drives into constructive channels by providing school-age children a sense of accomplishment, with appropriate recognition, regardless of their relative capabilities . . .

Even the rewards given to the children were geared to a better understanding of the rule of law—but at no cost to the Committee. In June, 1963, as a dividend for their successful completion of projects, thirty-

five Philadelphia students were selected by lot for a free trip to Washington, D.C., with a tour of Congress, the FBI and the Supreme Court . . . Each child also received a badge and a certificate as evidence of (his) participation in the program . . .

Each year since 1963, about 50,000 students in 14 schools have been involved in the project, with about 2,000 students completing projects under the guidance of 300 teachers. Dedicated teachers and principals have created special guidelines for social studies which explain the place of the child in society, the rule of law, and the law enforcement process.

A program involving police officers directly was initiated by the Committee in cooperation with Temple University. This was the establishment of a Police Science and Administration program for police officers held in summer school. Courses were offered in police supervision and leadership, criminal investigation, criminal law and procedure, and social aspects of police administration. An Associate Degree was awarded to those who completed sixty semester hours of combined professional and academic courses . . .

From its modest beginning in Philadelphia, the Committee quickly expanded nationally. In cooperation with the Philadelphia Police Department in December, 1962, it presented a 15-minute television program titled "Dangerous Stranger" over a local channel covering the entire Delaware Valley—parts of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware and Maryland. A police officer explained to children what to do when accosted by a stranger on the streets or in a movie. He also warned children about the dangers incident to go with, or accepting gifts from strangers.

The following year the Committee obtained the cooperation of a television program director in Wilmington, Delaware and the Philadelphia public school authorities in sponsoring a series titled "You and the Law", which was televised each Friday morning for sixteen weeks. The program dramatized such activities of federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies as fingerprinting, Harbor Police, Park Guards, Sheriff's Office, State Police and Customs Officers. The Committee then went to the streets, in shopping centers, to demonstrate the case for law observance through elaborate exhibits prepared by law enforcement agencies which displayed weapons, uniforms, slogans and even police dogs in action . . .

Another fund saving accomplishment of the Committee was the acquisition of free outdoor poster space. The Pennsylvania District of Kiwanis International provided the initial printing of posters bearing the Committee's slogan: "The Law Protects You, Respect It, Uphold It, Obey It". An outdoor advertising firm made twenty billboards available to the Committee in Philadelphia and the Washington, D.C. area. The Baltimore, Md. and Omaha, Nebraska chapters made similar arrangements for billboard space . . .

To further its national aims, the Committee sent a brochure to all the fifty chapters of the Federal Bar Association throughout the country detailing projects it has successfully launched for possible implementation locally.

"Today the Committee finds itself in a fortunate climate for greater expansion of its rule of law program. After a decade of constantly erupting civil disorders, campus riots and deteriorating respect for law and order, the country is beginning to stir from its apathy to face the relentless criminal and the misguided social reformer . . .

The cumulative effect of the Committee's 'no-fund' budget national program and the collateral efforts of many similar government, educational, and industrial organizations should certainly be felt by the criminal

element throughout the country. Of the Committee's efforts, J. Edgar Hoover said: "The efforts of the Federal Bar Association to develop public understanding of the relationship of law enforcement and the citizens in our society have been recognized and welcomed by the FBI. Since its inception of the national and local Law Observance Committee's activities, the FBI has given them support, and members of the FBI have participated in their Committee . . ." In the field of law observance and enforcement, one could hardly find a better endorsement for the accomplishments and goals of the "no-fund" budget Law Observance Committee.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker. I list below the results of the questionnaire sent out early in April to every boxholder in the Third Congressional District. Over 20,000 replies were received.

It is interesting to note that 69.6 percent of the replies favor wage and price controls. The combination of a recession and continued spiraling of the cost of living is an unbearable situation, and this is reflected in the better than 2-to-1 reply in favor of controls. I would like to point out also that 70.3 percent opposed lowering the voting age to 18 involving the election of the President and Members of Congress; and 77.7 percent—better than 3 to 1—favored reorganization of the Post Office Department. Both of the above will soon be considered by the House.

Although 75 percent of the replies opposed a guaranteed annual wage, a like percentage favored President Nixon's Federal revenue sharing plan. Only 38.5 percent favored continuation of the present farm program; but 76.6 percent favored a gradual withdrawal of the Government from agriculture, and a return to a market governed by supply and demand.

This questionnaire was mailed before American troops entered Cambodia, so does not reflect any change in viewpoint which may have occurred since that date. It is interesting to note, however, that 74.1 percent favored the President's policy of gradual withdrawal of U.S. forces and the Vietnamization program; and only 40.4 percent favored immediate and complete U.S. withdrawal.

In reply to my question, "Do you approve of the overall policies of the present administration," 60.4 percent answered "Yes," which is approximately the same percentage of the vote which President Nixon received in 1968 in my district.

I have introduced a constitutional amendment to provide for the mandatory retirement of Members of Congress at a certain age, and I am most gratified to learn that 84.4 percent approve of this joint resolution.

Following are the questions and the percentage replies:

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor wage and price controls?	69.6	30.4
2. Do you favor a constitutional amendment lowering the voting age for the election of the President and Members of Congress to age 18?	29.7	70.3
3. Do you favor postal reform which would reorganize the Post Office Department to a Government-owned corporation to operate on a nonprofit basis?	77.7	22.3
4. Do you favor a welfare program based on a guaranteed minimum income?	24.6	75.4
5. To take the pressure off local tax resources, the President has proposed that a certain percentage of Federal revenue be returned to the State and local governments—revenue sharing. Do you favor this proposal?	75.6	24.4
6. Farm legislation—Do you favor—		
(a) Continuation of the present farm program?	38.5	61.5
(b) Continuation of the present program plus voluntary and permanent land retirement?	42.3	57.7
(c) Gradual withdrawal of the Government from the farm picture to a market governed by supply and demand?	76.6	23.4
7. Draft—Do you favor—		
(a) A draft by lottery?	64.7	35.3
(b) An all-volunteer army?	71.1	28.9
(c) College undergraduate draft deferments?	41.2	58.8
8. Vietnam—Do you favor—		
(a) Increased military action in an effort to end the war?	57.2	42.8
(b) Gradual withdrawal of U.S. forces and Vietnamization of the war?	74.1	25.9
(c) Immediate and complete U.S. withdrawal?	40.4	59.6
9. Do you favor Federal legislation to control the dissemination of pornography?	84.7	15.3
10. Do you favor removing the limitation on earnings on those who receive social security benefits?	56.1	43.9
11. Do you favor actions of the administration to balance the budget and reduce the national debt?	94.0	6.0
12. Do you approve of the overall policies of the present administration?	60.4	39.6
13. Do you favor my joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for the mandatory retirement of Members of Congress at a certain age?	84.8	15.2

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR A TRADE SCHOOL IN EVERY COUNTY IN THE NATION

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a number of letters I have received concerning the bill introduced by me to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

JOHN W. RAY,

Manchester, Tenn., June 5, 1970.

HON. JOE L. EVINS, M.C.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EVINS: Received your letter proposing legislation concerning a Vocational Trade School to be built in all the Nation's counties.

This I think would do for the training of our young (and older) people for useful lives what the interstate highway system has done and is doing toward helping our ever increasing traffic problem. I am very much enthused about this idea and wish you every success with it. I think we have stressed the theory too long and have gone too far to think that everyone should have a college education. It might be the cause of some of our trouble on the campuses at the present, they are filled up with a bunch of "Misfits". When this legislation is set up we (Coffee County) want to be one of the first to take advantage of it.

Thanking you for your continued expert representation and with kindest regards, I am,

Yours truly,

JOHN W. RAY,
Coffee County Judge.

JAMES RHEA CLEMMONS,
Lebanon, Tenn., June 3, 1970.

DEAR JOE: Seldom do I write my congressman and take your time on my thoughts, but I wish to commend you upon your efforts to establish a Vocational Trade School in every county in the nation. This is something worthwhile and badly needed. I certainly hope you are successful.

Please do something about all this welfare giveaway, this is disgraceful and I see it every day with our tenants in low rent public housing here in Lebanon. These people should be made to work, even if just sweeping street and picking up tin cans, or cleaning out bushes in county roads, make them work.

Again, congratulations and best wishes on your efforts.

JAMES RHEA CLEMMONS.

Tullahoma, Tenn., June 1, 1970.

HON. JOE L. EVINS.

DEAR SIR: The "Capitol Comments" of June 1st which I have just received with news of your proposed bill for installing a vocational trade school in every county of the nation which still lacks one is in my opinion one of the most commendable pieces of domestic legislation suggested in recent years. It should especially be a great benefit to all Southern states. As an employee at our local A.E.D.C. from its early beginnings I could not help seeing with regret the necessity of hiring craftsmen from distant states to fill the skilled jobs which our regional people, lately displaced from farming, were not trained to fill. Another thought: After spending four years at Tenn. Tech (1927-31) and observing other institutions of higher learning, I realize that many of the students in our overcrowded universities do not belong there, but rather in vocational schools, acquiring training at the craftsman level.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. BURT.

BRADYVILLE, TENN.,
June 2, 1970.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: All power to your "vocational trade school bill"! I have long felt that there is too much emphasis on college and higher education which often does not educate, and seldom provides a reasonable preparation for future employment. After all, not everyone is college potential, and not all college graduates can start at the top of the field. In industry, there are far more jobs for mechanics than for literature or fine arts students.

Yours is a practical, down-to-earth solution to the problems of too much higher and not enough lower education. Skilled craftsmen should be just as much respected as scholars.

Success to you and your bill.

Sincerely,

Mrs. NAN HEACOCK.

WATERTOWN, TENN.,
June 2, 1970.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I received your letter today about trade schools and thought it was a very needed subject. We have so many young people that will not get a chance to enter college. The students at Watertown are taught nothing but the subjects the state requires.

We are too far from Lebanon and sure need such a program. Of course, Agriculture has to be taught according to law.

We have some pupils going to Lebanon to get foreign language; none is taught at Watertown. We think we should have a trade

school. This would help lots of common class people get a start. I think your idea is great and wonder if we could get such a program at Watertown. The children do not have much choice in their subjects. As a man of understanding this makes it very hard to pick their jobs. If you can encourage Wilson Co. to make this step, it surely will be appreciated. I am on the education committee and have pleaded with the Co. Supt. and he says we should be in Lebanon. This we do not agree. We have many boys and girls going to college and are embarrassed when they do not have the right subjects to go on, but are embarrassed and have to settle for something less. I sure hope you can read most of this. Mother used all the paper in her last letter, so I have to settle for this writing on some freight line notes, but you won't mind this. Keep your good work going. We sure appreciate a good man of your ability.

Yours sincerely,

DAVID SWANN.

MANCHESTER, TENN.

Congressman JOE L. EVINS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The only purpose of sending this back to you is to inform you that I support this type of education.

When I was still in high school, I saw several students whose efforts went to disturb the class. They had no interest in the subjects, but the law was that they must attend. These same students did have an interest in another area. It may be auto mechanic, farmer, etc. I thought then it would be better for all to single out these disturbers and send them to a trade school where they could learn a trade. A trade they were interested in. Monies appropriated to this effort is a step in the right direction. It takes all types of trades to make a society work together.

CHARLIE L. KLINGER.

OAK RIDGE, TENN.,
June 2, 1970.

Representative EVINS,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: We especially support your bill on vocational trade schools.

The best of luck on your bill.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. ELIZABETH RUPP,
ARTHUR F. RUPP.

FAIR HAVEN METHODIST
RETIREMENT HOME,
Birmingham, Ala.

Representative JOE L. EVINS,
Washington, D.C.

This is a splendid way to help us help ourselves—which is much better than any other way I know to lower welfare recipients and raise or increase self respecting, self-supporting Americans.

Yours truly,

ADELE RIVERS.

FAYETTEVILLE, TENN.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: You are no longer my representative, directly; but you are one person in government that I feel has represented me (and every other U.S. citizen) and my ideals concerning federal government to an extent that I want you to know that another citizen of Tennessee (I am sure that thousands feel as I do) believes in what you are doing and appreciates it. I think that the Trade School Bill is a great idea; its success would provide the first step in building a framework for establishing state/federal cooperative education concepts which will eventually save public education . . . financially, professionally, and most important educationally. In brief, I believe state

governments cannot afford suitable educational programs; labor union-tactics used by educators are not professional, but have been forced by conditions; and, as education suffers, the nation suffers. Some federal money must come back to the states in the form of meaningful educational programs or money to be spent on worthwhile programs already in existence.

Good luck with the bill—it would be a shame if it is not recognized as important and a good investment in American youth.

Thank You,

TOM YOUNG.

OAK RIDGE, TENN.,
June 9, 1970.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am convinced that a significant part of the national wealth and the happiness of a considerable number of our fellow citizens is being wasted each and every day that vocational education is neglected. I am pleased to learn from your "Capitol Comments" that a bill is being introduced which would establish a vocational school in every county of the nation not already having a vocational school. Though it is questionable that each county requires a vocational school to be located physically within its boundaries it certainly is required that all of our citizens have ease of access to such facilities.

The obvious problems which have probably led to the writing and introduction of this bill will not be rectified simply by construction of schools, however. We require curricula that are expanded and relevant to our times and to the predictable future. We need staff instructors who are qualified and up to date in teaching methods. We need administrators who are an integral part of each state educational system. We need a program for reeducation of students and parents who think that college is the "only way."

We, you and I and all of our countrymen, have a vested interest in all of the rest of us. That interest is economic, social and simply moral. Let's hope that this bill is passed when introduced and that when established these schools will maximize their tremendous potential for good to the individual and the community and the nation.

Very truly yours,

R. W. POOLE.

P.S.—I have been a skilled craftsman for 23 years and it's a rewarding life.

WARDS DEPARTMENT STORE,
Jamestown, Tenn., June 1, 1970.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I just received your Capitol Comments of June 1, 1970. I agree wholeheartedly with the bill for a vocational trade school in every county.

I am very happy to know that we have a person with this kind of concern serving us in our nation's capitol.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. KIRBY.

BANK OF COWAN,
Cowan, Tenn., June 2, 1970.

Congressman JOE L. EVINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EVINS: Too often when one comes forth and speaks his thoughts and ideas that would really bring about helpfulness to people he is ignored and never thanked.

When I was in high school this was strictly an agricultural county but I wondered—and wished for—why there was not a course in agriculture and manual training and related training for girls so those who did not care to specialize in teaching, medicine, law

and other related fields of endeavor could study what they wanted to do in life.

Higher education has been the hue and cry now for several years. That's fine—for those who want to specialize in about 3 or 4 fields but what about others? Everyone isn't college or university material and some who are do not want to study the courses offered.

It has always been my thinking more emphasis needs to be placed on the foundation of education, the elementary and high school. I know from my own family poor people can go on to school after high school if they really want to go, if they really want an education. Why waste space, time and money in higher education on people who are there only because they think it is "the thing to do."

After about 55 years you are about to introduce to bring into being what I consider one of the most far reaching and beneficial acts for our Nation that could be thought of.

I want to congratulate you on presenting this bill and wish for you overwhelming success with it.

If enacted and pursued it will do more for our people than all the give away non-work, sit and wait, we will bring it to you, programs combined.

Never take from man the dignity to work but prepare him for work and work he will find.

Sincerely,

B. B. LOONEY, President.

TULLAHOMA, TENN.,
June 4, 1970.

Congressman EVINS,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EVINS: I am very proud that we, in Coffee County, have a man like you to represent us today. For I see in the Tennessean that you have introduced a bill in Congress, which calls for a vocational school in every county in the United States. I have not read the bill, but it appears to me today that there would be many counties in many states which could not support one properly. I am sure, however, that you have recognized that there is a great deal of difference between Coffee County and Davidson County in Tennessee and Cook County in Illinois for that matter.

I taught school in Indiana 40 years ago and was acquainted with the schools in Missouri, 30 years ago. We had good vocational schools that taught everything from beauty operators to automobile mechanics, along with the work of electricians, carpenters and other skilled trades. I have long felt the need for this type of school in Tennessee, for it is evident that these skilled people live and enjoy life as well, if not better, today than Ph. D's.

Tullahoma and Manchester are unique towns. The Arnold Engineering Development Center has attracted to us people from all over the world, with a high level of education. Seventy per cent of the children in Tullahoma have gone to college after high school, but the statistics, however, do not reflect how many of this 70 per cent continue after their first year. We now have a vocational school in McMinnville and one in Shelbyville. Both are doing a very fine job, but are not large enough. I have read today that Tullahoma will now have a vocational school, thanks to your efforts. This should fulfill a very definite need.

It is my firm opinion that many of the students who are now raising hell in our colleges would be far better off in a vocational school, learning how to make a living, rather than fumbling around in a Liberal Arts course, not knowing where they are going.

I hope that the Congress will look favorably upon your bill.

Sincerely,

AL MOORE.

OAK RIDGE, TENN.

HON. JOSEPH EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I recently received your letter describing your bill for 3,500 vocational schools in the United States. It is exciting to hear such an imaginative and forward-looking proposal. I agree with your basic premise, that vocational training is needed and that federal funds are necessary.

If I may, I would like to disagree with one small part of the proposal, that of a county basis for the location of the schools. I am currently in Oak Ridge, but my experience for 13 years has been in California junior colleges. In California there are counties that are almost the size of the whole state of Tennessee. I have traveled through your beautiful state on weekends and holidays and have found that Tennessee counties are much smaller. I feel it would be unfair to states with large counties to be limited to one per county. One additional problem is that vocational education is much more expensive than conventional classes, labs are more expensive and classes are smaller. I am also concerned that there may be a shortage of well-qualified teachers.

I suggest that a fairer scheme might be to use representative districts as the basic unit of division, since the number of people and therefore students, will be approximately equal. Furthermore, I feel that the identity of the members of Congress with their districts' schools would be better on a district basis.

I have enjoyed this year's sabbatical leave in your beautiful and friendly state. I have never seen so many beautiful trees or so much running water. Thank you for your letters.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM E. MILLER.

ONE SERVICEMAN'S VIEWPOINT

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, I received a letter from a constituent of mine who resides in the village of Darbydale, Ohio.

The subject of this outstanding citizen's letter is campus disorders. This is one of many letters I have received from servicemen expressing, among other things, their disapproval of campus disorders and the destruction which has surrounded them.

I respectfully commend Mr. Wheeler's letter to my colleagues and am inserting his letter in the RECORD at this point:

DARBYDALE, OHIO,
June 1, 1970.

Mr. WYLIE: Not long ago my mother wrote you a letter trying to find a way to prevent my going back to Viet Nam. I can not say that I approve of this for I feel there are too many people wanting too much of this country and in return are willing to give nothing. I do however understand my mother's feelings, for while one of her sons was over there, someone else's son was burning the American flag on a University Campus. It was the first and only time my mother has been so moved as to write anyone in office. This is also my first time Mr. Wylie.

I have a brother in Viet Nam now and its because of men like my brother and myself that I write to you. We are concerned about our students at our university. Some of us

can not understand what these students are asking for or want.

They say they want peace, yet they stage riots and do battle with our city police, state highway patrol and National Guards.

They say they want to make America better yet they tear up and burn down buildings on campus, not to mention the American flag. I urge you, Mr. Wylie to do everything within your means to strengthen the confidence of our law officers and to take necessary steps to remove known communists and trouble making persons from our university, both student and faculty.

Sincerely,

H. D. WHEELER.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW ON DISSIDENT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last Monday evening, Vice President AGNEW addressed a gathering of Michigan Republicans in Detroit on the issue of dissent in our society. In reading the prepared text of that speech, I was struck by the sound commonsense, wisdom, and balance the Vice President employed in addressing himself to this most delicate issue. The Vice President reaffirmed both the right and necessity of dissent in our free society. In his words:

We cannot agree about the need for freedom without acknowledging the freedom to disagree. We cannot govern with the consent of the governed unless we respect the right of dissent of the governed.

And then the Vice President made a point which I think we should all do well to keep in mind during this troubled hour in our national history:

But remember, respect for the right of dissent does not mandate agreement with the dissent. We cannot encourage a unity of purpose without stimulating a diversity of approach.

The Vice President elaborated on this in a most eloquent and poignant manner by saying:

By demanding unity, by denouncing dissent, we might find ourselves standing united but standing still. That is not what this nation is all about—unity is not an end in itself, it is a byproduct of progress.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I include the entire text of the Vice President's speech and commend it to the reading of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

I would like to present a case tonight for progressive partisanship.

The word "partisan" has taken on an unfortunate coloration. It is being equated with divisiveness, with backbiting and acidulous personal references. This is not new in our history—James Madison, in the most famous of the Federalist Papers, warned of the "spirit of faction" that could tear the country apart.

Partisanship misplaced, partisanship overdone, can be a danger to democracy; but a progressive partisanship is at the heart of our liberty and without it, there would be no change in our society and no movement in our public philosophy.

We are entering our traditional period of intensified partisanship before an election campaign. Whether that period will be productive of intelligent challenge and debate, or sterile and conducive to angry shouting, is a test that we as a people will have to take.

I believe we will pass that test if we embrace the principle of progressive partisanship.

To do that successfully, we have to examine two slogans. One of these is rich with age and honor; the other is bright with new and conventional wisdom; both can be twisted to get us into trouble.

Slogan number one is seemingly unassailable: "United we stand, divided we fall." And slogan number two is becoming one of the most high-minded clichés of our time: "Let us de-escalate the rhetoric."

Let us begin with the first, which had its genesis in a poem written in 1776 by John Dickenson: "Then join hand in hand, brave Americans all/by uniting we stand, by dividing we fall."

That is the sentiment that brought us together as a nation, the spirit that permitted us to overcome our disagreements by acknowledging a deeper sense of common purpose.

On the great ends of liberty and justice and opportunity, that sentiment has never been truer. But we demean that spirit of unity when we try to restrict ideas about how to meet those ends. Here is what I mean:

We cannot agree about the need for freedom without acknowledging the freedom to disagree.

We cannot govern with the consent of the governed unless we respect the right of dissent of the governed. But remember, respect for the right of dissent does not mandate agreement with the dissent.

We cannot encourage a unity of purpose without stimulating a diversity of approach.

That is why every attempt to deny our diversity, to smother partisanship in an amorphous cloud of consensus, is doomed to failure. It confuses the ends with the means. United we stand in love of country, in desire for peace and progress—but divided we stand in approach, in style, in policy to reach the ends we seek.

By demanding unity, by denouncing dissent, we might find ourselves standing united but standing still. That is not what this nation is all about—unity is not an end in itself, it is a byproduct of progress.

Just as unity is not an end in itself, dissent is not an end in itself. Here is where I part company with some dissenters.

Rational dissent focuses on an issue, calls it to public attention and marshals the arguments to persuade the majority to its view. That is the essence of progressive partisanship.

Irrational dissent focuses on an emotional issue, rejects logic, and demands change without intellectual challenge, without offering a constructive alternative.

Rational dissent anticipates disagreement; irrational dissent expects its views to be adopted as a revelation of truth and is infuriated when this does not happen.

Rational dissent properly defines its right to be heard and is ready and willing to accept criticism of its point of view; irrational dissent considers criticism of its point of view to be an attack on the right to dissent.

Rational dissenters, in the tradition of Holmes and Brandeis, have never been more needed than they are today. They are with us, but their ideas are too often ignored—not by the majority, but by the emotionaries, a relatively small group of anti-intellectuals that has snatched the standard of dissent from their hands.

Some of the rational dissenters I have been

meeting with recently have pointed out that the emotionaries are not limited to their side. This is true. But we cannot abandon the public forum to the antis versus the anti-antis. We cannot refrain from speaking out in the voice of reason, both in affirmation and in dissent, for fear of becoming identified with the emotionaries of the extremes.

That, of course, brings me to the next slogan, the new favorite of editorial writers of all shades of opinion: "Let's de-escalate the rhetoric."

I think the word "rhetoric" is being badly misused. It is being defined as vituperation, as poisonous invective. But rhetoric is not that at all: Rhetoric is the use of public discourse to persuade.

We do not have to depress that kind of rhetoric at all; on the contrary, we have to elevate the rhetoric. Only in that way can we hope to enter a season of progressive partisanship.

This does not mean that affirmers or dissenters have to color their speeches gray. It does not mean that we must dwell on abstractions and totally refuse to engage in personalities.

Our history is rich in anecdote about the cut and thrust of partisan debate, and it did get a little personal at times. I recall the remark of John Randolph of Virginia, aimed at a brilliant fellow member of the House of Representatives, Edward Livingstone. Said Randolph: "He is a man of splendid abilities, but utterly corrupt. Like rotten mackerel by moonlight, he shines and stinks."

That was pretty rough. And so was labor leader John L. Lewis' characterization of one of my predecessors in office, John Nance Garner as a "card-playing, whisky-drinking, evil old man." (Some people have recently suggested that I stick to playing cards, which could contribute to the public safety.)

Governor Hiram Johnson of California did not like some of the press coverage he was getting during his administration, and he had this to say about the publisher of a major newspaper: "He sits there in senile dementia with a gangrene heart and rotting brain, grimacing at every reform, chattering impotently at all things that are decent, frothing, fuming, violently gibbering, going down to his grave in snarling infamy . . . disgraceful, depraved . . . and putrescent."

Now what have I ever said about the press to compare with that? Fortunately, the days of that kind of ad hominem blast are gone forever. But perhaps it has evolved into a less rancorous form of attack, similar to that unleashed by Winston Churchill at Ramsay MacDonald in 1933, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer: "I remember when I was a child, being taken to the celebrated Barnum's Circus, which contained an exhibition of freaks and monstrosities, but the exhibit on the programme which I most desired to see was the one described as 'The Boneless Wonder.' My parents judged that that spectacle would be too revolting and demoralizing for my youthful eyes, and I have waited fifty years to see the Boneless Wonder sitting on the Treasury Bench."

Can you imagine the wave of shock and horror that would pass through certain circles if anyone were to make such a remark today about, say, the chairman of a Senate committee? It would be an unthinkable example of the arrogance of power. The most one could get away with in these more sensitive times is another Churchill gibe at one of his opponents as "a modest man, with much to be modest about."

The purpose of this brief review of political invective is to show that we are indeed past our vituperative peak, in a sense, happily so. It is also good for us to recall that the shouted epithets we hear today are no match for the flashes of wit that lay behind some of the studied insults of yesteryear.

Were they alive today, Randolph and Wilkes, Disraeli and Churchill, Huey Long and Harold Ickes would have to temper their blasts; history might have been the less colorful, but the times have changed and the climate is wrong for slambang vituperation. In its improper definition as invective, the rhetoric has already de-escalated.

But in its proper definition as rational public persuasion, the rhetoric of our times needs to be put to constructive use. In the very act of encouraging peaceful argument, we automatically discourage violent protest. In agreeing to disagree, as reasonable people, we admit to a unity of purpose.

A Greek philosopher first laid down the rules of rhetoric. I do not presume to challenge the principles of my ancestor Aristotle, but let me try to update them for the coming campaign:

Every view is a proper target for rational challenge.

Every challenge is a proper target for criticism and rebuttal.

No view has a claim on truth by virtue of wide acceptance.

No view has a claim on truth by virtue of limited acceptance.

Every partisan has an obligation to present his position forcefully, factually and fearlessly.

Every partisan has an obligation to admit to the possibility of error.

Every man has a right to be heard to the extent he shows a willingness to listen.

No man should interpret a willingness to listen as a commitment to follow.

No argument is fair that appeals exclusively to emotion.

No argument is realistic that rules out all emotion.

No age group or minority group or income group has a monopoly on wisdom.

No majority has the obligation to be silent, or the right to overwhelm dissent.

And finally, the thirteenth rule of rhetoric for our times, and the most painful one of all: Provided he acts without violence and within the Constitutional law, every man has the right to disagree with, and to break, every one of these "rules."

In doing so, I think it would be to his loss and society's loss, but freedom is not freedom unless it includes the freedom to be wrong.

Let us, then, elevate the rhetoric; let us think through all we stand for, and then stand for it publicly and affirmatively.

Let us not be afraid to be progressive partisans for all we believe to be right, and not speak of partisanship as something unworthy or un-American.

This was a nation built by ardent advocates of popular and unpopular causes. In each generation, they triumph over the detractors who shrug in hopeless resignation, and the sloganeers of puerile obscenities, and the bookburners who try to destroy the ideas they cannot discuss.

Let us join the "happy warriors of the political battlefield," discovering new depths of loyalty in opposition, new heights of unity in our diversity, and a new spirit of respect for each other's point of view.

EQUITY FOR VETERANS

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill that would provide automatic adjustments for all veterans' benefits, based on changes in the cost of living. The legislation would direct the Administrator of the Veterans' Ad-

ministration to adjust monthly veterans' benefits payments by an amount equal to the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index each year.

I strongly believe that simple equity requires this improvement in our veterans' benefits system. Disabled veterans, widows, and others who depend upon these benefits are being hit particularly hard by inflation right now because they are living on a fixed income. In view of the fact that civil service and military retirees now receive automatic adjustments in their pensions, and the House of Representatives, with my support, has taken the first step to provide automatic cost-of-living increases in social security benefits, there is no justification for failing to improve our veterans' benefits system by taking this needed step.

MURPHY OIL CORP. HELPS TO FIGHT POLLUTION

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the Murphy Oil Corp., with home offices in El Dorado, Ark., has taken steps to reduce air pollution caused by automobiles. It has introduced 91-octane, lead-free regular gasoline through nearly 200 of its service stations in Louisiana, central Florida, Minnesota, and upper Wisconsin. It is my understanding that Murphy Oil is the first gasoline producer to supply unleaded regular gasoline in these markets. The new fuel will be called Spur APG—antipollution gasoline—and will be produced by Murphy Oil Refineries at Meraux, La., and Superior, Wis.

In a recent announcement, Mr. C. H. Murphy, Jr., president of Murphy Oil Corp., said that the suggested retail price of the unleaded fuel will be the same as that charged by major oil companies for their leaded regular gasolines. Mr. Murphy also pointed out that the unleaded fuel will contain a new detergent additive, Du Pont DMA-101, which is designed to make car engines run cleaner, thus reducing still further the exhaust emission of air pollutants.

Commenting on the company's decision to introduce 91-octane, lead-free regular gasoline into the market, Mr. Murphy said:

There is a great popular manifestation of rising expectations for clean air and water. The demands will be met.

Murphy Oil Corporation has tried, successfully we think, to always take into consideration the welfare of the communities and our neighbors wherever it has done business. We like to think we've done much more than was legally required.

Even so, it's now apparent that we, and all other industrial firms, must still do more or risk losing the right to do business at a profit to our shareholders, to the service of our customers and to the well-being of our employees.

This is why we are introducing our antipollution, lead-free gasoline—literally a new Murphy product—at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to direct to the attention of my colleagues this course of action taken by the Murphy Oil Corp. This company has clearly demonstrated that it is a responsible industrial citizen, determined to make a positive contribution toward improving the quality of our environment. Cleaning up the air is too big a task to be done by government alone. The public and private sectors must work together to solve the problem of environmental pollution. I hope that more and more American firms will join with Murphy Oil Corp. in taking measures to combat the pollution of our planet.

A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT FINCH

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Robert Finch's appointment as Counselor to the President has been the subject of much discussion. I, for one, am sorry to see him leave HEW, but particularly pleased that he will now be in a position to use his wisdom, sensitivity, and social concern in a position of such importance both to the President and the country.

His successor, Elliot Richardson, brings to HEW a competence which brought praise and accomplishment both in Massachusetts government and past and present Federal service. HEW is a demanding taskmistress, but Mr. Richardson's credentials make him worthy of the task.

Former Secretary Finch has demonstrated time and again an awareness and empathy for the pressing social problems facing our Nation. His recent commencement address to the Arizona State University graduating class is an excellent example of his perception and concern. The President was wise to seek his immediate counsel. Mr. Finch will serve the President and the Nation well.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I include the complete text of Mr. Finch's remarks at Arizona State as part of my remarks at this point:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT H. FINCH, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AT THE ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT, JUNE 2, 1970

It is my purpose this evening to attempt to put the immediate into the longer-view perspective of our entire experience as a people. And I want to make some affirmations and reaffirmations, before we're done, of an intensely personal nature.

By tradition, commencement addresses take note of the times in which we live, and of the Nation's deep dependence on our colleges and universities. Never have these two themes been more relevant than they are today.

Four weeks ago, Cambodia, Kent State, and Jackson State for most of us were just names. Now they are powerful symbols, and they have unleashed forces that may shake and transform the American political system. Headlines tell part of the story—six young Americans dead, scores of others injured, several hundred colleges and universities closed

down . . . an episode wholly without precedent in the Nation's history.

And behind the headlines there is rage and bitterness . . . uncertainty . . . and yet a passionate conviction that these events *will not* have been in vain. I visited Kent State, I held a long conversation with President Peoples of Jackson State, and these are indeed stunned communities. Hundreds of academic delegations—students, faculty, administrators—have come to Washington, and scores have come to my office, for long and searching conversations. Out of this ongoing dialogue has come fuller understanding on my own part, and I hope on theirs. The lines of communication are now open, but they must remain open and be improved.

Still further behind the headlines there have been other events and other lessons. From both extremes, the rhetoric has become inflamed . . . and inflammatory. Words *do* have consequences, and sometimes they lead beyond anger to tragedy.

From the left, we hear that "the system" is totally corrupt, that it must be brought down. From the right, it's "trouble-makers" and "outside agitators" who are to blame. Neither extreme helps to describe events—they simply perpetuate apocalyptic myths. And both, on any scale of reason, represent "cop outs."

But new changes are taking place as well. The great, diverse center has been catalyzed. There is a growing unity on many campuses, a drawing together of students, faculty, and administrators. And substantial numbers of concerned and moderate students have signaled that they are becoming fiercely committed to involvement in politics . . . *within* the system.

They are being joined by others, young and old, who find to their amazement that they have interests in common with students. Some would point to environmental concerns, to the reordering of the Nation's priorities, to the more rapid fulfillment of our commitment to racial justice.

And on the other side of the coin—disturbing signs, but no less part of the picture—old fault-lines are widening, between young and old and between town and gown . . . and also within the generations. The cleavage is both vertical and horizontal. It cuts many different ways.

Some might be tempted to play down these past few weeks—to write them off as another round of student unrest, or a particularly vigorous outbreak of spring fever. Or they might be characterized with such words as "revolt" and "revolution." Both views, I think, are wrong. The one suggests we have nothing to be concerned about . . . the other, that it is too late to be concerned at all.

It is time, instead, to face hard reality . . . to admit to ourselves the sheer fact that much *has* changed, both on and off the campus . . . and to begin engaging in the compassionate criticism that leads to constructive action.

I would like first to address some remarks to those of you who are not students . . . for it is time to understand who students are and what they want. It is time to be very careful and very discriminating about the role we think our students, and our colleges and universities, should play in our national life. It is time for reason, and sanity, and fine distinctions.

To begin with, let's all remember that students are not some sort of aliens traveling on false passports—but our *own* children, and the products of our laws, values, and customs. Let us examine our views and practices—before discrediting theirs. Let us never make them the scapegoats for our own anxieties and fears.

Indeed, it is not easy for those who have struggled against economic adversity to understand others who seem blithely unconcerned about "making it" and whose life-

style outrages accepted senses of decency. But adversity, let's remember, wears many faces. It can come in the form of draft notices and rejection slips as well as overdue bills. It can come in the absence of draft notices among those who know themselves to be privileged, and feel guilty because of it. And it can come in the incessant pressure for grades and degrees and credentials.

We must also recognize that today's students are ready to sacrifice—that indeed they have laid on the line their academic standing, their career-hopes, even their physical safety, for their beliefs. They have demonstrated courage . . . and staying power.

It is perfectly true that students have no monopoly on wisdom. They did not suddenly "discover" war, or hunger, or poverty, or discrimination. But, as it always has been through history, they are the least able to compromise with injustice. They have no tolerance for race hatreds. They have no patience with the deferral of burning problems.

The war is the issue for many of them—and many simply do not believe, as I do, that the Cambodian operation will shorten the war and speed the troop withdrawal. But that really is not the core of the issue: it is not the war they want brought home, it is the peace. They want to get on with the works of social renewal.

We should take students seriously, not because they are future voters or because they pose a threat to democratic process—but because they help voice the Nation's conscience. It slanders an entire generation to confuse a militant fringe with the vast preponderance of deeply concerned, genuinely motivated young citizens—and it throws them into the extremists' arms.

Last week in Oregon, it was the voters who lashed out—and not against individuals but against all young people, 19-to-21, who might have become voting citizens. This, in my view, was wrong . . . dead wrong. If backlash played a part, this was the wrong reason.

As I have argued for 25 years in public life, young people should have the vote—and they should have it not as a reward or as some sort of "sop." They should have the vote because they constitute a valuable resource that should be brought into our councils of state, and into the democratic process.

In other States, colleges and universities themselves have become the victim of backlash—as if the problems of our society were somehow caused by the academic community and as if that community should be punished for having failed to solve them. It would be sheer disaster if rejected bond issues and a drying up of alumni support were to bring our colleges and universities, both private and public, to their knees.

I sometimes wonder if any of us appreciates the incredible burden we routinely put upon the university. We ask that it serve many masters—government, business, the church, to name but a few—and protect its basic integrity at the same time. We ask our campuses to be centers of innovation, criticism, and creativity—the bulwarks of an exciting, pluralistic national life. We ask them to remain in some sense above the battle, and yet to dig down into the agenda of unresolved social problems. And then we turn on them, with frustration and anger, when they become focal points for all the conflicts and tensions that rage across the face of this society. This form of backlash is mindless and irrational—and it is, in the ultimate sense, self-defeating.

So let us all cultivate a sense of perspective and balance about students and the academic community—and get on with the business of making *their* concerns the Nation's concerns.

Up to now, my remarks have largely been addressed across the generation gap, and across the barrier between town and gown—

but now let me shift emphasis. I want to speak more directly to you men and women of the graduating classes—not with a pretentious guru-like ultimate wisdom, but in terms of my hopes and profound concerns, and of ideals as well.

Because it is so much in the public mind, let me begin with the so-called "Princeton Plan"—rescheduling the academic calendar so that students can have time off next fall to engage in the political process. In principle, of course, this is what we all should be doing—working within the system for candidates and issues of our choice.

Yet there can be no one formula. The Princeton Plan may be right for Princeton, and that is a decision for that academic community to make. For others, it may be "work-study" projects. There are as many possibilities as there are institutions—and in providing options for everyone, we must also include the individual who chooses not to commit himself to political action.

Nor, in broadening the channels of political expression, should we stop with students. What about housewives and businessmen, policemen and firemen, teachers and government workers? We should be thinking about greater opportunities for all to participate.

For those of you who do intend to get involved, I know you already understand that politics is a demanding and persistent pursuit. It is arduous, and there is much drudgery in it. Influence comes hard—step by step, in relatively small increments—and it comes only to those who are willing to endure the rigors of the process.

This means that "two week wonders" will not make much of a dent. There should be no expectations of easy or instant victories. Out on the hustings, you will meet with deep resistance. You will find that voting habits are deeply engrained—that "single issue" politics comes up hard against local concerns, and competing issues, and strong egos with personal followings.

And you will find no unanimity among the electorate on the issues that you see as absolutely vital and transparently clear. There will be some victories—and some defeats.

Thus you must resist the notion that if you stand in the middle of the campus quadrangle or out in the streets and blow your trumpet loud enough, the walls will come tumbling down. Political victories are made of far more than noble causes . . . or fiery rhetoric.

The real choices never quite boil down to the simple extremes of making either love or war, uniting or dying, being either Red or dead, or making just guns or just butter. Politics requires a sacrifice far harder than that of time—it requires that you sacrifice the reassuring formulas that tell you, "don't worry about the alternatives, you are absolutely right."

And I would ask you to think very hard about the point at which sacrificing yourselves to the demands of conscience amounts to self-destruction. There is a point where moral imperatives become so black and white that the alternatives are narrowed to passivity on the one hand, or violence on the other. In the personal histories of the young, we have seen too many cases of just this regression—from an intense passion for justice, to acts wholly without the sense of compassion on which all human justice ultimately depends.

You must also resist the tendency toward moral arrogance. Frankly, it turns off many of your potential allies—many of whom have fought long and hard for the things you want, and have the battle-scars to prove it.

I would ask, too, that you never forget the need for tolerance—in politics, in society, and on the campus as well. There are disturbing trends at work already, and important questions are being ignored. Are the rights of

students who simply want to go to class being abused? Are students with no financial pinch of any sort forcing others less advantaged to make unreasonable sacrifices? Are students asking their institutions to make commitments which, instead, they should themselves be making?

Freedom, in the open forum of the campus and as a principle of political and social life, is twice significant—once in the fight to attain it, and again, in the use that is made of it. If our enjoyment of freedom contemplates denying it to others, we will end up "freeing" ourselves right into 1984!

These are some of the thoughts I would leave with you. But the really important question only you can answer—and that is, *what do you want to become?* For some the question should be posed in its sharpest and most painful form: are you opting to become members of this society at all, to share in its culture and its institutions, to assume responsibility for the follies and tragedies as well as the achievements of our Nation?

I profoundly trust you will say "yes"—that with deepening perception and lengthening perspective, you will discover and rediscover your answers. But for each of you it has to be your answer. Meaning in life is not something you stumble on, like the prize in a treasure hunt. It is not something you find stashed away in the bottom of whatever "single issue" bag you may jump into. It is not something that heroes or hero-worship simply give you.

You build it out of your schooling, out of affections and loyalties—out of the experience of mankind as it is passed on to you. You build meaning out of defeats as well as victories, and out of the things and the people you love.

This past Sunday, in an East Coast newspaper, a history professor at a leading Rocky Mountain university expressed this thought with particular eloquence. Let me read a portion of his message:

"Society hangs together by the stitching of many threads. No 18-year-old is simply the product of his 18 years. He is the product of three thousand years of the development of mankind—and throughout these years, injustice has existed and been fought; rules have grown outmoded and been changed; doom has hung over men and been avoided; unjust wars have occurred; pain has been the cost of progress—and man has persevered."

For me, meaning has come in the pursuit of the political craft. But it can come in many ways, in many callings. Making our society work certainly does not mean that all of you will have to be full-time politicians for the course of your lives. If indeed your life has meaning, you will develop the balance that comes from richness and variety of experience. And then you will be able to weigh in on political issues with the kind of moral sensitivity and tough-minded judgment that our society so desperately needs.

Had this been an open dialogue rather than a formal address, one of you would surely have asked by now—But can we afford a longer view? Can we really trust that our elders will have the competence to let us survive long enough to live as you suggest?

My answer is of the most realistic sort—How can you possibly afford *not* to? It may be hard just now to have faith in the continuity and resourcefulness of our society—in old and young, students and non-students, working together. But it is a faith immeasurably worth finding.

Genuinely and without complacency . . . I think I see, arising from recent turmoil, new signs of sanity—impatience with extreme rhetoric, rededication to working within legitimate channels, and a rediscovery of the potency of the democratic process. And this sense of continuity is absolutely basic. No matter what we do, our waters and air will not be cleaned in a year or two—but

they might be in ten, if we work at it. No matter what we do, we cannot establish racial justice or redesign our society in a year or two—but I promise you, if you stay in the fight for ten years, *you will change the face of American politics.* In the lifetime of a planet or a Nation, or a generation, ten years is not too long to work.

And, of course, the Nation's problems never will be solved—once and for all, and for all time. Utopias are hard to come by. As soon as one agency is resolved, another will emerge, and yet another. But I think we can perceive a steady escalation in the plateau upon which and from which we operate—so that, always, we move from strength to greater strength . . . from justice to more nearly perfect justice. Indeed, in the sum, that really has been the American experience.

When historians write of this fantastic age, they may say, with Dickens:

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times; everything was over, and yet everything was just beginning."

But we must say:

We were there—and we wouldn't have missed it. Our lives had meaning. And we made a difference!

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS AT PRINCETON UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to attend the Princeton University commencement exercises on June 9. I was most impressed by the valedictory address delivered by Raymond J. Gibbons, a 20-year-old senior from Wood Ridge, N.J. It demonstrates a sense of balance which we do not credit our students with possessing. Valedictorian Gibbons, who majored in aerospace and mechanical sciences, is one of the class of 1970's three Rhodes scholars and is a former youth governor of New Jersey. Next year at Oxford University he will carry forward advanced study in physics and the humanities. His address follows:

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS

President Goheen; honored guests; members of the faculty; parents, friends and members of the Class of 1970:

These are not easy circumstances in which to deliver a valedictory address. Our nation is divided at all levels as never before in our short lives. Students and parents debate the value of the strike, construction workers battle antiwar forces in the streets of New York, the executive and legislative branches of the government question each other's authority. Voices are raised, tempers are aroused, the language on both sides grows more vehement, and, yes, even guns are fired, in Ohio, in Georgia, and in Mississippi. The appeals to love of country, on the one hand, and to conscience on the other grow ever more fervent, so that suddenly the peace symbol and the American flag are standards held far apart by their respective bearers, and everyone is urged to choose his side. Violence—whether by students, National Guardsmen, or construction workers—whether at home, in the Middle East, or in Southeast Asia—seems to be more and more an accepted phenomenon.

These are times of confrontation, rather than cooperation; of rhetoric, rather than

dialogue; of self-righteousness, rather than understanding. In an atmosphere where the decision to wear a cap and gown or an armband is suddenly politically significant, the educational achievements of valedictorians may not particularly qualify them to comment on the times. Yet any apolitical farewell address delivered on this occasion would be a peculiar anachronism.

The first five months of this decade have intensified the frustration which characterized most of the 1960's. The past decade began with the hope of racial equality, of prosperity for all, of peace. It began with the exhortation of a youthful, vibrant John F. Kennedy: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." This new decade begins with the knowledge that Fred Hampton and Mark Clark did not fire on the police whose gunfire killed them in Chicago, and that their fellow Black Panthers, skeptical of the legal machinery, are unwilling to assist it in achieving justice. It begins with an unsteady economy in which inflation affects everyone and unemployment threatens the lower income brackets. It begins with the longest, costliest war in our history still in progress, despite the desire of everyone for disengagement in some form.

It begins with many of our best educational institutions on "strike," whether from conscience, fear, or violence, and many buildings on fire. It begins without John F. Kennedy, or his brother, or Medgar Evers, or Martin Luther King, or thousands of young Americans, Vietnamese, Arabs, or Israelis. Finally, it begins with many holding conflicting ideas of what they and everyone else should do for their country and little tolerance or understanding for any other viewpoint.

America as a whole, and my generation in particular, had rising expectations which have not been satisfied. There has been frustration; to a large degree, this has produced the many demonstrations, much disruption, and considerable violence of the past decade. As a result, to justify every disorder, whatever its nature or consequences, by its cause is one popular approach. On the other hand, the reaction to disorder has given support to those who would condemn and suppress it in the name of law and order without even considering its origins. It seems that more and more persons feel compelled to choose one of these two stances. In good conscience, I can accept neither, and pray that others also will not. To do so is to contribute to the deepening division in this country, to line up on one side in the confrontation of young versus old, black versus white, north versus south, the radical versus the system. To do so is to be true neither to the American flag and the Country it represents nor to the peace symbol and the concept it depicts.

We all wish an end to both frustration and violence, an end to racism, poverty, war and pollution. To enlist the support of the many persons in this country who share these concerns, they must be communicated rationally and constructively to the world beyond. It is clear that this often has not been done. The Vietcong flags, obscenities, and violence of a few have made headlines and alienated many. They have generated overwhelming emotional reactions in the general public which have negated any rational consideration of the serious issues of our time. Fear and distrust of the young, the long-haired and the black have often been reflected at the polls. In 1968, the Presidential campaign was heavily flavored by the issue of law and order and nearly 10 million voters were recorded for George Wallace. In 1969, 58% of the voters in New York City supported two basically law-and-order mayoral candidates in the supposedly liberal Northeast. In 1969 in New Jersey and in Ohio and recently in Oregon, clear majorities voted against suffrage for young voters.

All too often the issue in the minds of many has become whether they are for order, traditional values, and the government or for anarchy, communism, and SDS. The deep concerns and serious moral stands of large numbers of students have often been obscured and their political effect nearly negated. Already inadequate lines of communication have been steadily weakened on the one hand by each new disruption and, on the other, by each new speech by the Vice President.

These lines must be reestablished. The recent involvement of many persons on this campus in the electoral process, as exemplified by the Movement for a New Congress and the modification of next fall's academic calendar, cannot but do so. Indeed, the personal exchange of ideas through canvassing may in the long term be more significant than the successful election of candidates. Such constructive efforts must become the rule, rather than the exception, not only for electoral movements, but also for individuals within their own families and communities, not only between voters and canvassers, but also between parents and their children, between alumni and students, and between academics and nonacademics.

Many will be neither dedicated nor energetic enough for the task at hand. It is neither quick nor easy, for years of neglect have taken their toll on both sides. Unfortunately, it will be much more convenient to be self-righteous, rather than understanding; to engage in rhetoric, rather than dialogue; to recognize the differences among men, rather than the common characteristics which unite all men as brothers. Moreover, the pace of progress will never match the immediacy of the problems.

But the campaign must be begun, not in the name of America or of peace, but in the name of, and for the sake of, both. To offer assurance of success would be to ignore the events of the past decade. But these same events should provide more than sufficient motivation, for the consequences of either inaction or radicalism are both obvious and ominous.

Thank you very much.

MRS. LOIS FUGLER

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to an outstanding public servant from my State—Mrs. Lois M. Fugler. Mrs. Fugler will retire on July 31, 1970, after 42 years of service to her fellow man, and it would seem fitting that her contributions should not go unrecognized.

Any time my office would call for assistance—and we did many times—we always received prompt, efficient, and accurate information. Always, Mrs. Fugler would be quick to give others in her office credit for such assistance; never did she ask for the spotlight herself.

Mr. Speaker, to my thinking, Lois Fugler is a rare public official. She has invested a lifetime of service to others, asking nothing in return. She is one of the giants in public service and an inspiration to everyone who serves in government. I am pleased to join her many, many friends in paying her this tribute.

Mrs. Fugler began her career out of

necessity. Early in life she was left with three small children by the death of her husband, who himself was an outstanding Texas public figure. She joined the Texas Highway Department as a file clerk, soon rose in rank, and then ran for and won the position of calendar clerk for the 39th and 40th legislatures in Texas.

When the veterans State service office for Texas was created in 1928 she was made its first secretary and later promoted to executive secretary and office manager. In 1938 due to her outstanding performance of duty Mrs. Fugler was recommended to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C., by the veterans State service office manager, Veterans' Administration regional office, San Antonio, Tex., and the department adjutant, the American Legion, Department of Texas, for official recognition as an accredited representative with authority to represent all veterans before the Veterans' Administration rating boards. She was the first woman in the State of Texas to receive such recognition. At this time she was considered, by those in position to judge, to be one of the best qualified and informed women in the United States on veterans affairs, and to be the best qualified and informed woman in the State of Texas on veterans matters.

On January 15, 1946, Mrs. Fugler was appointed assistant veterans county service officer of Travis County, Tex., and served in this capacity until September 11, 1961. As the assistant veterans county service officer she was cited three times in resolutions by the Texas Legislature, Congress of the United States, and by joint resolution of the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion, and Veterans of Foreign Wars for her unselfish devotion to the service of veterans and their problems. This devotion has made her known and loved by more veterans and their families than any other lady in Texas.

Mrs. Fugler was appointed the veterans county service officer of Travis County, Tex., on September 11, 1961, and continues to serve in that position with distinction. Mrs. Fugler will retire from this position July 31, 1970, culminating 42 years of devoted service in her chosen field. On October 2, 1961, she was cited as the outstanding business and professional woman of the year by the Austin chapter of the Texas Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

Mrs. Fugler is one of Texas' most distinguished citizens. Hers is a story of courage, determination, and success. For, during the 42 years that she has been working in veterans service work she has overcome personal loss and sacrifice to extend a helping hand and an understanding heart to thousands of veterans and their families.

It was largely through her work and inspiration that the statue commemorating the war dead of Travis County, Tex., was erected near the State capitol grounds. She has stated that she knows every Gold Star mother who helped make this memorial a reality looks upon it as a tribute to a son lost in the war.

To Mrs. Fugler the bronze young soldier is her oldest son, Virgil Fugler, Jr. He and his entire bomber crew lost their lives over New Guinea during World War II.

AMBASSADOR HABIB'S REMARKS OF FEBRUARY 26, 1970, AT THE NEW PARIS MEETINGS ON VIETNAM DISCUSSING OUR POW'S

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to point out the obvious. No progress has been made in securing just treatment for our prisoners of war in North Vietnam. The North Vietnamese delegation in Paris is certainly under no illusion in this regard. Ambassador Habib has made our position quite clear. Therefore, I commend his statement of February 26, which I thought was particularly forceful, to the attention of my colleagues:

TEXT OF AMBASSADOR HABIB'S REMARKS

First remarks by Ambassador Habib: Ladies and Gentlemen:

Today in the interest of meaningful negotiations, I propose we discuss the problem of prisoners of war, a specific issue which should be resolved without delay. Both sides in the Viet-Nam war hold prisoners of war. On both sides, men are missing in action. The treatment and the fate of these men are practical issues on which agreement should and can be easily reached.

We have sought to discuss with you the standards of treatment applied to prisoners of war on both sides. For our part, the humanitarian provisions of the 1949 Geneva Convention serve as the basis for treatment of prisoners of war held by our side.

We have also tried to discuss with you the release of sick and wounded prisoners of war as well as the more general release of all prisoners of war. President Nixon, in his foreign policy report of February 18, reaffirmed "Our readiness to proceed at once to arrangements for the release of prisoners of war on both sides." For our part, we see no reason why early agreement should not be possible on the release of all prisoners of war.

One of the most pressing aspects of the problem of men missing in action is that families on both sides are anxious to know whether their men are alive or not. This, too, is a problem easily resolved through a system of immediate identification of prisoners held by each side. Our side has notified the International Committee of the Red Cross of the names of prisoners of war we hold.

These are problems, as I said, which each side faces. If you are prepared to discuss these issues in a practical way, I am confident we can resolve them. We are ready to begin such a discussion today.

Second remarks by Ambassador Habib: Ladies and Gentlemen:

The repetition by your side of erroneous allegations and misconceptions with regard to U.S. policy is not a substitute for meaningful discussion of specific issues. Last week at the 55th Plenary Session, we sought to concentrate your attention and our discussion on some of the fundamental issues. At that time we answered your relevant questions and set forth a basis for meaningful discussion of those questions. Having done that, today again we seek to determine what mutual actions can be taken with regard to

a particular important question—prisoners of war—so as to make progress at these meetings. How can it be considered useless—as a spokesman on your side said—to discuss such an important matter? What is it superfluous—as another of your spokesmen said—to discuss the matter? Discussion of the question of prisoners of war is neither useless nor superfluous. It is urgent.

Third remarks by Ambassador Habib: Ladies and Gentlemen:

You appear to object to discussion of relevant issues in some reasonable way. Polemics do not satisfy the needs of meaningful negotiation nor do polemic questions. Let me set forth here once again our position on the issue of withdrawal of forces and on the question of a political settlement. With respect to withdrawal of forces, you repeatedly ask when the United States will agree to the unconditional and total withdrawal of U.S. and allied forces. This is not a serious proposal. It continues to demand action on our part without any indication of what you are prepared to do about North Vietnamese forces in South Viet Nam. For this reason it is unacceptable. Let me make this clear: The U.S. does not accept your demand that it alone withdraw its forces, leaving North Vietnamese troops in South Viet Nam free to carry out their armed aggression.

We have many times said here that we are willing to see the complete withdrawal of all outside forces from South Viet Nam.

You continually ask when the United States will agree to overthrow the government of the Republic of Viet Nam. That is not serious negotiation. It simply underlines your unreasonable refusal to negotiate with one of the parties with whom you agreed to meet in order to work out a peaceful settlement.

As to the question of a political settlement, we have no intention of trying to overthrow the Government of the Republic of Viet Nam. We have no intention of imposing any form of government on the people of South Viet Nam, nor will we be a party to such coercion. We are prepared to accept any government in South Viet Nam that results from the free choice of the South Vietnamese people. In that spirit, we fully support President Thieu's proposals for free and fair elections and his unconditional offer to discuss a political solution with your side.

In his report to the Congress on foreign policy of February 18, President Nixon recalled the following: "On May 14 I made a number of far-reaching proposals for a settlement. They included a mutual withdrawal of all non-South Vietnamese forces from South Viet Nam and internationally supervised free elections." The President indicated in his report that the proposals he made on May 14 still stand, and that they offer all parties an opportunity to end the war quickly and on an equitable basis.

Now let me return to the question of prisoners of war, a subject that you seek to avoid discussing.

Let me call your attention to the fact that on February 18 the United States Senate, by a unanimous vote, adopted a resolution concerning prisoners of war. The House of Representatives had earlier passed an identical resolution—also by a unanimous vote.

Let me read the operative portion of that resolution: "... The Congress strongly protests the treatment of United States servicemen held prisoner by North Viet Nam and the National Liberation Front of South Viet Nam, calls on them to comply with the requirement of the Geneva Convention, and approves and endorses efforts by the United States Government, the United Nations, the International Red Cross, and other leaders and peoples of the world to obtain humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war."

For more than five years, your side has been assuring the world that American prisoners of war in Viet Nam are treated humanely. You have adhered to that position here, despite extensive proof, including the statements of eyewitnesses and photographs, that the treatment accorded American prisoners does not meet internationally accepted standards.

This is true both in North Viet Nam and in South Viet Nam. For example, Lieutenant Frishman and Seaman Hegdahl described conditions in camps in Hanoi where they had been held which scarcely correspond to what most of the world accepts as "humane treatment." Major Rowe and Specialist Van Putten, who escaped after years in prison camps in South Viet Nam, reported that they were there subjected to long periods of isolated confinement during which they were, for much of the time, locked in irons. That is not what the world regards as "humane treatment." Similar reports have been received from South Vietnamese who have escaped from your prisoner of war camps.

If you really treat prisoners of war humanely, why do you refuse to allow access to them by impartial observers such as the International Committee of the Red Cross?

If you treat prisoners of war humanely, why do you refuse to identify the prisoners of war you hold? If you treat prisoners humanely, what have you to say about a regular flow of mail between the prisoners and their families?

If you treat prisoners humanely, what are you willing to do with respect to mutual release of sick and wounded prisoners?

Fourth remarks by Ambassador Habib:

I would simply have this to say about Laos: you cannot cover up the truth about Laos with your charges of United States' aggression. The fact is that over 50,000 North Vietnamese troops are in Laos in violation of the 1962 Geneva Agreements, and they thereby threaten the survival of Laos. Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma has repeatedly condemned the presence of North Vietnamese forces in his country and their aggressive activities there.

Having said that, let me return again to the question of prisoners of war. You continue to avoid discussion of the questions we raised with respect to prisoners of war. Therefore, let me see if you are willing to clarify your own position in this regard. You have often spoken of humane treatment accorded to prisoners you hold. Can you describe that humane treatment and relate it to the standards accepted by all civilized nations?

Fifth remarks by Ambassador Habib:

You are obviously avoiding clarifying your own positions on what constitutes humanitarian treatment of prisoners of war. Well, let us see if we can secure that clarification. Let us take one item which is a part of humanitarian treatment and is so accepted by all civilized nations.

You have said in the past that American prisoners are permitted to receive mail and packages and to correspond with their families on a regular basis.

As I have said before, families are now sending letters and packages to prisoners of war held in North Viet Nam on a regular schedule as announced by your authorities. In turn, they are expecting letters from the prisoners on a monthly basis as promised. So far, however, their expectations have not been met.

As for American prisoners of war held in South Viet Nam, we note that at the 53rd Plenary Session your side referred to statements which were made as long ago as October 1965 and May 1967 and which, among other things, state that American prisoners of war held in South Viet Nam are permitted to correspond with their families. Yet, in all these years, not one single letter has ever

been received from any of these prisoners of war. The families of these men have tried over the years to send packages and letters to them but have had no acknowledgement that any of this mail has actually been delivered to the prisoners of war.

Will you confirm that prisoners held in South Viet Nam can now, in fact, correspond with their families and receive mail and packages? If so, what instruction should families be given for sending letters and packages to their men held in South Viet Nam?

As we seek clarification of your position on treatment of prisoners of war, we hope that the answers to these questions and clarification of your attitude on those other standards of international practices previously mentioned will be provided.

Sixth remarks by Ambassador Habib: Ladies and Gentlemen:

Your continued refusal even to discuss the question of prisoners of war leads me to the regrettable conclusion that on this issue, as on other questions basic to a settlement, you are not yet ready to engage in serious negotiation.

It is not only that you avoid discussions of our proposals; you seem also desirous of avoiding discussion and clarification of your own position. It is also apparent, from your attitude, that you seek to use the prisoners as a means of applying pressure on the United States for an overall settlement. Let me just say on this point that this cruel attempt at playing upon the anxiety and anguish of the families of missing or captured men is entirely condemned by public opinion in the United States and elsewhere. We must also draw the conclusion from the evidence we have and from your actions here that you do not in fact live up to elemental standards of humanitarian treatment either for the prisoners or for the families of those who are missing or captured.

At the same time, you fail to live up to the obligations which you undertook in the 1949 Geneva Convention on prisoners of war.

As President Nixon stated in his report of February 18, "This is not a political or military issue, but a matter of basic humanity. There may be disagreement about other aspects of this conflict, but there can be no disagreement on humane treatment for prisoners of war."

"DELTA QUEEN" DESERVES THE CONSIDERATION OF THE CONGRESS

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, we have spent a great deal of money in this Nation building and developing museums to preserve bits and pieces of our heritage and history. I am in complete agreement with these efforts for the meaning to future generations can be immeasurable.

It seems inconsistent to me, however, that we should by legislative edict consign to inactivity one of the last operating reminders of our river heritage in this Nation, the *Delta Queen*, which still plies the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers on multiday trips, is now making its last voyage unless we in the Congress grant it a reprieve.

It is true that the *Delta Queen* does not meet the fire standards established

2 years ago for deepwater vessels. But it is folly to compare the *Delta Queen* with oceangoing vessels. This impressive and historic vessel is at all times within 4 minutes of land. We know this and the passengers know this.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I think the *Delta Queen* deserves the consideration of the Congress. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 17515, which would allow the *Delta Queen* to continue sailing. Others in the Congress have introduced similar legislation. But time is growing short. If the *Delta Queen* is not to die by congressional silence, then hearings must be held in the very near future and the Members of the House given the opportunity to voice their views.

The plight of the *Delta Queen* has received national attention. Uniformly, the plea of newspaper editorials and private letters has been to let the *Delta Queen* continue its voyages. Because of their relevance to this issue, I include at this point in the RECORD articles from four respected newspapers on the *Delta Queen*:

[From the Los Angeles Times Syndicate, June 6-7, 1970]

GOD SAVE THE "QUEEN"

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Unless Congress does something between now and November 2 the *Delta Queen*, the last real packet on the Mississippi River system, gets the ax from Uncle Sam.

The reason is ridiculous. A government agency has directed that the "safety-at-sea" regulations, which outlaw any ship carrying more than 50 overnight passengers if it is not built entirely out of steel, must apply to riverboats as well.

For four years the *Delta Queen* has been operating under a temporary congressional reprieve. The Queen's hull is steel. But its superstructure, in the tradition of riverboats, is wood. The noble curved staircase is mahogany trimmed with brass. The deck is hand-pegged ironwood. The 28-foot stern wheel is made of planking and the cabins are paneled in oak.

The Greene Line of Cincinnati, which sends the *Delta Queen* on cruises down the Ohio and Mississippi and up the Tennessee and Cumberland, has made a valiant effort to meet the government demands.

Only two shipyards even bid on plans for an all-steel, diesel-electric monstrosity. The estimated cost was \$10 million. Not many American river-lovers could afford the fares necessary to amortize such an investment.

The safety-at-sea regulations were designed to protect passengers hundreds of miles from land and hours from help. A riverboat runs between river banks. Sure, there's some fire danger in wooden superstructure. There is also a little danger in stacking up ten '70's over O'Hare on a night when the birds are walking. There's some danger in walking the streets of Washington in daylight.

To knock off the *Delta Queen* because of a law designed for ocean liners would be like pulling down the Tower of London because it doesn't meet city fire escape regulations for public places.

No one would think of allowing passengers to hang on the outside of a New York City bus, but people hang all over San Francisco's wonderful cable cars. If we are going to keep any flavor in America, somewhere there must be an area of common sense.

The *Delta Queen*, as all river buffs know, was not born to the inland rivers at all. She started life in 1926 on the overnight Sacramento-San Francisco run. Still, she looks like a riverboat except to us purists who

would prefer the pilot house farther aft behind twin smokestacks abreast. She has a calliope, so she's really a hybrid of the Eclipse and the Cotton Blossom.

The *Delta Queen* goes eight miles an hour. She would drive the jet set bats. In his "Life on the Mississippi" Mark Twain claims that he served as pilot on the John J. Roe, a boat so slow that they changed watches three times in a five-mile stretch. When the boat finally sank, he swore it was five years before the owner heard of it.

Even the Robert E. Lee, in its record-breaking 1870 race with the Natchez, took three days, 18 hours and 14 minutes to run the 1,218 miles from New Orleans to St. Louis.

The river is not for speed, but for an experience unlike any other travel adventure. On a boat breasting a stiff current go-go types glare at the banks and chew their nails. River-lovers are relaxed. Steamboat captain Fred Way puts it this way:

"They exist on a continent of their own, secure and steadfast; the boat is stationary; the shores do the moving, advancing, sliding by, retreating. The mountains slide apart and close again. You will wonder as you step ashore, suitcase in hand, whether you are entering the world of reality or departing from it."

I never rode the *Delta Queen*, although I've been aboard her at Cincinnati and New Orleans. But once I helped pilot 600 feet of gasoline barges from Louisville to Baton Rouge and by the time the five days ended I was a mainline addict.

The Ohio and the Mississippi above Alton are a series of beautiful slackwater lakes divided by dams and locks. But the lower Mississippi is a fractious beast for which charts are useless—gnawing at Tennessee, building up Arkansas, eating islands, piling up reefs, cutting new chutes, leaving isolated oxbows.

Most of the time you float through utter wilderness, for the flood plain between the levees is chancy land, given over to cypress and cottonwood, mysterious pools and Spanish moss. Beyond the levees there may be cities and super roads and locomotive horns and people standing in line. The river hears only the call of the heron, the splash of the muskrat, and the gurgle of brown waters around the snag.

We need these things.

God save the *Delta Queen*.

[From the Cincinnati Post and Times Star, May 8, 1970]

GUEST EDITORIALS: "STEAMBOAT 'ROUND (LAST?) BEND"

(From the Christian Science Monitor)

We are saddened to hear that after a hundred and umpteen years, one of the most glamorous eras in American history is drawing near its close.

The *Delta Queen*, that last high-decked gingerbread-bedecked beauty of the once-mighty Mississippi riverboat fleet, will come 'round the bend no more after this summer unless there is special legislation in Congress.

The trouble is that antifire legislation, passed to protect ocean-going craft, will inadvertently beach the *Delta Queen*, even though river conditions minimize the fire danger. Only Congress can save her.

The Mississippi River boat is one of the few authentic tangible relics of the rip-roaring days of America's youth. Like the covered wagon, the cattle drive, the sod cabin, the riverboat instantly calls to mind days now bathed in the golden haze of historical imagination.

Even if, as one riverboat skipper says, Mark Twain was only an amateur river pilot, he still speaks to a hundred million American males.

We therefore wish to join the growing number of other American newspapers which have called upon Congress to find ways of

saving a boat upon whose decks we have always wished to travel but have not yet, alas, found time to do.

(From the Lexington Herald)

Thursday's race between the Belle of Louisville and the *Delta Queen* may be the last because of a problem not of the latter's own making.

That problem grows out of troubles that arose a long way from the Ohio and Mississippi rivers on which she travels. In 1966, after two disastrous fires aboard ships in the Atlantic Ocean, Congress passed a new ship safety act.

Since the Coast Guard classifies the *Delta Queen* as an ocean-going vessel, and we suppose she could go on the ocean if she wanted to, she has to meet the standards of that act.

Unfortunately, her 44-year-old superstructure simply doesn't meet the fire safety standards. As a result, this is her last summer unless Congress gives her an exception.

According to the *Delta Queen's* owners, fire isn't the threat on a river boat that it is on a ship out in the middle of the ocean. The *Delta Queen* is never very far from shore, four minutes at most according to her crew, and she could be run aground if fire broke out.

If that's right, Congress ought to do what is necessary to give the old ship a reprieve. Maybe we have a hangup about the past that leads us to oppose saying goodbye to such things as river boats and passenger trains. But we like the *Delta Queen* just as we fancy the Belle.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Apr. 27, 1970]

EXEMPTING THE OLD STERNWHEELER

The last of the river sternwheelers, the *Delta Queen*, an historic vessel well-known in New Orleans, may get a reprieve after all from law which would banish her.

To protect passengers of cruise ships on the high seas, the Safety at Sea Act was voted by Congress in 1966, but, equipped with safety devices though the *Delta Queen* is, she can't meet the specifications of the law drafted for sea-going ships.

Two two-year exemptions were granted to the *Delta Queen* by Congress and now a bill by Rep. Leonor Sullivan of St. Louis would provide perpetual exemption. An alternative faced by the vessel if the measure falls of adoption is to enter service on Brazil's Amazon River.

But rugged going is not unknown to the 1,837-ton *Delta Queen* which was built in Scotland, 46 years ago. After use on the Sacramento River and then used by the Navy to ferry troops in San Francisco Bay during World War II, she came to the Mississippi via the Panama Canal.

If Congress has been willing to say on two occasions that the sternwheeler should be exempt from the Safety at Sea Act, a reiteration for keeps seems reasonable to expect.

[From the Courier-Journal, Apr. 30, 1970]

STEAMBOAT RACE: A YOUNG TRADITION CONGRESS CAN SAVE

The most imaginative addition to Derby Week festivities in recent years came in 1963 with the inauguration of the Great Old Time Steamboat Race between Louisville's own Belle and the *Delta Queen* of Cincinnati.

Each year since then, except in 1967 when the race wasn't held, thousands of Derby visitors and Louisvillians and our neighbors have lined the banks of the Ohio to cheer their favorite as the two mighty paddlewheelers churned upstream and back, each captain straining his boilers to win the golden antlers that symbolize supremacy on the river. The contest has received national attention and is an object of civic pride, even though the Belle has won the race only twice in six years.

But now the future of the competition is threatened. Unless Congress acts to exempt the Delta Queen from the Safety at Sea Act of 1966, today's race probably will be her last and a young tradition will not be permitted to mellow with age, as traditions should.

CLASSIFIED AS "OCEAN GOING"

The problem is that the Delta Queen doesn't meet the fire safety standards the law requires for ocean-going vessels, which is how she is classified by the Coast Guard. Her 44-year-old superstructure is made of wood, and is considered a fire hazard. She must conform to the new law by November or stop overnight operations. Her owners say this means that the Delta Queen will have to become an excursion boat like the Belle, which is not permitted to venture far from home, or perhaps a "floating restaurant," a sad end for a proud river queen.

Legislation to exempt the Delta Queen from the law has been sponsored in the House by Representative Leonor K. Sullivan of Missouri and in the Senate by William Saxbe of Ohio and Marlow W. Cook of Kentucky; Senator Cook was instrumental in purchasing the Belle of Louisville and establishing the steamboat race during his first term as Jefferson County judge.

There are good reasons for exempting the Delta Queen from the law. In the first place, the Delta Queen doesn't operate at sea even though she is classified as an "ocean-going vessel." And there is a considerable difference between the dangers of fire at sea and a fire on a river, where a boat can reach the shore quickly; the Delta Queen's owners say she is never more than four minutes from the shoreline wherever she steams.

So we hope that reason—as well as nostalgia for retaining worthwhile symbols of the past—will prevail, and that Congress will respond to the pleas of Representative Sullivan and Senators Cook and Saxbe. And may the Delta Queen thus continue to steam upon the rivers and, to be a trifle partisan, perhaps to lose to the Belle of Louisville more often than she has in the past.

BALTIC STATES SUFFER FOR 30 YEARS

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, June 15, 1970, marked the 30th anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, when these peace-loving republics lost their freedom and independence.

The Balts are proud people who have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic for many centuries. Because of their unfortunate geography, however, they have suffered from invasion of the Germans from the West and the Russians from the East. It is interesting to note that the Balts are not ethnically related to either the Germans or the Russians.

The Baltic people have suffered under the repression of the Soviet Union for the last 30 years but have continued to wage an intensive fight for freedom. Despite efforts to suppress the national traditions of these proud people, their spirit, and their devotion to the principles of justice and liberty have endured.

In 1966, the 89th Congress unanimously adopted House Concurrent Resolution 416. A copy of this resolution follows, and I respectfully urge the President to implement this legislation by bringing the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States to the United Nations:

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 the 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:

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 resolution of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

Passed the House of Representatives June 21, 1965.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS, Clerk.

The people of the Third District of Pennsylvania join me in saluting the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and in expressing the hope that these courageous people will soon be free to determine their own political fate and to freely pursue the development of their cultural interests.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 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?

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, in all my years in the Minnesota Legislature and since I have been here in Congress, I have been a champion of vocational education.

I hold that every young person need not be a college graduate. Not all of them are comfortable to be in the academic world.

As the years go on we are finding an ever greater shortage in the vocational field. Skilled artisans are almost impossible to find.

Mr. Speaker, Minnesota has a developing system of vocational schools of which we are justly proud.

How these schools affect the areas in which they are located is illustrated in the following editorial from the Canby News edited by Richard S. Olson. I insert it in the RECORD at this time and urge its reading by my colleagues:

VoTECH IS IMPORTANT

We enjoy "harping" on this subject because it is getting more publicity during the past year than ever before and the subject is vocational-technical training and VoTech schools, which we are fortunate to have located in Canby.

The value of having a vocational school here is becoming more noticeable daily. The Governor's Conference on Vocational Technical education held recently in Minneapolis pointed this fact out.

The Vocational Technical Education Conference is one closely associated with the Department of Economic Development and one equally close to the heart of Commissioner J. Kimball Whitney. So it was not coincidental that he was one of the speakers at the meeting, which marked the 25th year of existence for Minnesota's vocational-technical education program.

"As you know," the Commissioner said, "1945 was the year that the Minnesota State Legislature wisely wedded industry, labor and government in a program designed primarily to train our post high school people for fuller, more productive lives. Every day we in the Department of Economic Development see what old-time relevancy means.

"We see the jobs that are created, the taxes that are paid, the growth that is accomplished because we have this marvelously flexible, well organized, very relevant vocational-technical education system."

The Minnesota vo-tech system has attained nationwide attention and businessmen from all over the country are amazed at the responsiveness of the program, which truly is unique.

For instance, industry is openly invited to request specific training when and where it is needed.

As Commissioner Whitney said, "This is not pie in the sky training."

Minnesota's vocational-technical people may even use the company's own machines and their own people to help in the training.

A key point the Commissioner made was this:

"Yesterday our Department personnel was discussing 20 active search files, that is, we were considering 20 different companies who wanted new or expanded facilities in Minnesota. Seventeen of these 20 have specifically requested information on vo-tech

education. They wanted to be near an existing school. In some cases, companies won't even consider locating in towns that do not have vo-tech capabilities."

He cited the fact that Staples was able to attract a 3M machine shop simply because the vo-tech school was there to help staff the shop. And the Electric Machinery Manufacturing Company started its new 600-employee facility in St. Cloud with the vo-tech school there as the key factor in the decision.

This training program, now deeply entrenched in Minnesota's economic and industrial picture, is just another point in favor of industry locating here.

MILITARY GOVERNMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, how should one interpret the new military regimes in Latin America? There are three possible interpretations. The first is Latin American backwardness. Second is the class explanation—tension between the ruling oligarchy and rising masses. The third is a more thoughtful explanation. The military juntas serve as protectors of the fragile institutions of government which are developing the economy while combating subversive movements.

Are the new military regimes of Latin America logical successors to earlier ineffectual attempts at democracy? The development of Latin American political structures is analogous to the development of vertical structures. It is based on a system of patronalismo—workers on the hacienda are in a patron-client style relationship. The great masses of poor, uneducated Latin Americans look to a dominant figure to guide them.

In order to better understand the new militarism in Latin America, the violent nature of the Latin American society must also be considered. Latin America has long been shackled by traditional institutions which have kept economic and social growth stagnant. Violence, then, has often been used as a shock device to break down these traditional structures.

As is clear now in several countries, the traditional Latin military government has been transformed into a new political force. The armed forces no longer simply intervene as an agent of the oligarchy, but rather have gone in to stay as representatives of the lower classes. The fact that most of the military officers originate from the same humble background of the masses lends authenticity to their claims of understanding social problems and seeking to institute social justice. The decline of confidence of the people in ostensibly liberal democracy has also served to mitigate resistance to the juntas.

This assumption of political responsibilities has resulted in certain problems for the military. The old notion that the military is above politics has been sacrificed. Military leaders have also lost a great deal of luster with the decision

to use their power for traditional political ends.

One of the difficulties the United States faces in adjusting its foreign policy to the military governments in Latin America is distinguishing the new military regimes from the old traditional ones. Peru and Brazil are the most prominent examples of this distinction. Whereas Peru, the vanguard of the new militarism, has espoused ultra-nationalist policies which discourage foreign capital investment in favor of national industry, Brazil discriminates against their national industries in favor of internationalizing its economy.

Some of the points discussed above are explored in greater depth in a New York Times dispatch from Buenos Aires by Malcolm W. Browne. The article, which follows, was written before the challenge against President Juan Carlos Onganía by the Commanders in Chief of the Armed Forces of Argentina:

THE OUTLOOK FOR LATIN AMERICA: PERSISTENCE OF STRONGMAN RULE

(By Malcolm W. Browne)

BUENOS AIRES.—The rule of the strongman in Latin America, once thought to be on the decline, seems more pervasive than ever.

Widespread police excesses, including the torture of political prisoners, have been reported frequently. Newspapers in many Latin-American countries are suffering from repressive measures.

Power is concentrated in the hands of such men as Fidel Castro of Cuba; Dr. François Duvalier of Haiti; Gen. Emilio Médici of Brazil; Gen. Juan Velasco Alvarado of Peru; Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos Herrera of Panama; Gen. Alfredo Ovando Candia of Bolivia; Gen. Alfredo Stroessner of Paraguay and Gen. Anastasio Somoza Debayle of Nicaragua.

Masses of poor people throughout the region reject traditional democracy as merely a game played by Tweedledum and Tweedledee and having no relevance to their needs.

Instead, the demagogues say, it is better to have truly "participatory democracy," or perhaps "democracy by plebiscite." Dictatorship is probably the most popular form of government in Latin America.

"The odds are that Latin America will one day be entirely dominated by state socialism," a high official said recently.

"There will be many teething problems along the way, and the results, both in the short and long terms, are likely to be undemocratic and anti-American. But it is equally sure that the United States will not be able to affect the process of change one way or another.

"After all, Latin America was pro-Axis in sentiment during World War II but still sided with the United States.

"As long as Latin America stays reasonably friendly, does democracy down here really matter to Washington?" the official asked.

A United States Congressman visiting Argentina asked to be driven past the imposing stone Congress Building that stands in the center of Buenos Aires. He left the car for a moment to muse on the steps of the building, which has been locked and vacant since the military coup d'état of 1967 ended elective government in Argentina.

"SO MUCH FOR DEMOCRACY"

"Well, so much for democracy in Latin America," the legislator said finally. "Now let's go look for that steak house you were talking about."

The visitor's tone was flippant, but analysts on both sides of the Rio Grande are wondering whether democracy still has a chance in Latin America. There are ques-

tions, for that matter, about whether democracy ever really existed in Latin America.

For North Americans, the important question is whether the United States should nudge Latin America toward liberal constitutionalism, the outlook for which offers little cheer to its adherents. Not everyone thinks there should be any nudges.

"It's both pointless and hopeless," a North American observer said. "At root, Latin America always has been and always will be anti-democratic. The United States neither can nor should waste words or money trying to change the unchangeable. What matters to us is keeping Latin America on our side and not on the side of our enemies. We can't hope for more than that."

While most Latin Americans manage to get along comfortably without Congresses or elections, other symptoms of the decline of democracy have been harder on people.

The torture of political prisoners has always been a feature of caudillo rule, but there are indications that the problem has become epidemic in recent years.

THE EXCEPTION: COSTA RICA

According to Amnesty International, an organization whose objective is the release of all political prisoners throughout the world, the only nation in Latin America that does not currently hold such prisoners is tiny Costa Rica, which has no army and is regarded by many analysts as the most democratic nation south of the Rio Grande.

In many other Latin-American countries, a predawn visit by political police agents followed by months or years of detention, torture and even secret execution is a real threat to many people.

The press in half a dozen countries has been severely hampered. The Inter-American Press Association declared at its last annual meeting that suppression of the news media in Latin America was worse than at any time since World War II, when press freedom was practically nonexistent.

Since the war, and particularly during the Administration of President John F. Kennedy, United States policy toward Latin America has been specifically to the bolstering of Democratic ideals and institutions.

Applying carrot and stick in varying mixtures, the United States has prodded and pushed Latin-American nations with the help of diplomats, aid-mission officials, Peace Corps volunteers, military men, Central Intelligence Agency operatives and private citizens.

WIDE RANGE OF TARGETS

The efforts have been directed at national and local governments, universities, churches, labor unions, armies, and every other conceivable social unit.

The approach has been direct, as in the refusal to grant aid to some governments that came into being by force. The approach has been indirect, by piping money into educational facilities.

Somehow the ultimate objective—a Democratic Latin as ever.

Perhaps the most discouraging recent case history, from the standpoint of United States political objectives, has been Colombia.

For decades Colombian democracy had been a kind of game played by rival teams, whose players were nearly all wealthy, well educated and born of good families. (In theory anyone can aspire to a career in politics in Latin America, but in practice few people have been eligible.)

Soon after World War II, after traditional nominal democracy and the two leading parties—Liberal and Conservative—began fighting with rifles instead of propaganda, tens of thousands were killed in an 18-year civil war. In 1953 Gen. Gustavo Rojas Pinilla swept to power as a dictator.

ALTOGETHER INCOMPETENT

Hubert Herring, a leading scholar on Latin America, has described the 1953-57 period as

"one of the most savage, venal and altogether incompetent administrations in the history of the nation."

General Rojas was deposed and constitutional rule was restored. The Liberal and Conservative parties settled their old feud. Colombia became a primary target of the Alliance for Progress and the major Latin-American recipient of United States aid.

Many Americans believed that Colombia, at long last, was becoming safe for democracy. Then General Rojas, running in a free election in April, came within a hair of victory. To be on the safe side, the civilian politicians placed him under house arrest. Since then even the most optimistic United States officials no longer mention Colombia as a democratic showcase.

Some analysts and politicians have taken to wondering aloud why democracy does not seem to work in Latin America. It has even been proposed that governments appoint commissions to study the matter.

There is surprising agreement among students of the problem that the Spanish-Portuguese heritage is still a major reason for the failure. Spain and Portugal were backward, beaten nations by the time the banners of independence were raised in Latin America, but their feudal traditions and their church had taken deep root.

BOLIVAR A PATERNALIST

Simon Bolivar is often compared with George Washington because of his campaigns against Spanish Armies to win Latin-American independence. But Bolivar, who was influenced by the United States Revolution and its Constitution, wrote in 1815: "The American States need the care of paternalistic governments which can cure the ulcers and wounds of despotism and war."

Such attitudes prevail. Latin America evolved Constitutions and laws that have the solid ring of freedom and egalitarianism. Most are patterned, at least partly, on the United States Constitution. But nearly all also have escape clauses, particularly state-of-siege provisions permitting a Chief Executive to rule by decree.

Nations in which various forms of the state of siege currently apply include Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay, Bolivia and Peru and even relatively democratic countries such as Uruguay and Chile.

Elected governments have never provided a guarantee against police terror.

NAPOLEONIC ORIGINS

While an Anglo-Saxon judicial system was implanted in North America, Latin America fell heir to a hodgepodge of laws and codes mostly descended from the Napoleonic Code.

While North American democrats believed that the "firmament of law" served as a protection for the people, it became common in Latin America to say that "the law is for our enemies."

Today it is possible, even in the relatively democratic climate of Chile, to spend years in jail without coming to trial.

Legal machinery has become so cumbersome that enormous numbers of lawyers are needed. Many universities graduate more lawyers than anything else, and one liberal priest was moved to describe lawyers as "the arthritis of Latin-American society."

In any case, an enormous gap has always existed between the enormous class of the poor and the nominally democratic institutions pre-empted by the rich. The wealthy man rarely had problems with the courts but the poor man could end up in jail for life.

The wealthy man could send his children to school, and his children could at least learn to read and later could vote. Most Latin-American nations have permitted only their literate minorities to vote, and this has effectively limited political participation.

ENTIRELY DIFFERENT WORLD

On the economic plane, Latin America has taken some gingerly steps into the 20th century but remains an entirely different world from that of the United States, Western Europe and Japan.

While most nations have a middle class, the poor still predominate, and they are as widely separated from the founts of economic power as they are from political action. Many a factory worker or tenant farmer is up to his ears in debt to the company store; the competition between wealthy political clubs seems utterly extraneous to his existence.

Accordingly, when President Ovando of Bolivia speaks of the "pseudo-democracy" of Latin-American constitutions and elections, he strikes a responsive chord among many millions of people.

Fidel Castro does not expose himself to popular election, but he goes before rallies of workers to ask: "Shall we reduce our weekly sugar ration in order to earn more foreign exchange?" The crowd roars "SI!" and democracy—in a certain sense—has been served, though United States liberal constitutionalists may condemn such things as contemptible demagoguery.

In recent years, indeed, Latin-American dictators have often been deposed by military force only to be restored in free elections. The people remember their former dictators as benevolent fathers, not as corrupt despots.

FORMATION OF SLOVAK WORLD CONGRESS

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention that members of the various Slovak organizations in this country and throughout the world will be meeting in New York, June 19 through June 21, for the purpose of forming the Slovak World Congress.

I should like to point out to my colleagues the aims and objectives of the Slovak World Congress, which were recently brought to my attention by Mr. Joseph C. Trubinsky, an appointed representative of the Organization Committee of the Slovak World Congress—which includes the Slovak League of America, the Canadian Slovak National Association of America. The objectives follow:

1. To aid and assist in the united effort, the Slovak people behind the iron curtain in the achievement of regaining their freedom, democracy and independence.
2. To promote among the Slovaks throughout the free world a concentrated effort in taking a greater part in the public life and contribute in every way possible, of their talents, to the countries of which they are now loyal citizens.
3. To contribute to the continuing struggle of the free world in the protection against the Communist threat in all democratic countries.

Mr. Speaker, these objectives indicate to me the deep concern which members of this organization are trying to show to the free world.

The cultural heritage of the Slovak peoples is a part of the roots of our own country's history, and as such, their

efforts are comparable to those of our ancestors whose initial struggle began 194 years ago. This struggle is still going on today and spreading to other peoples seeking freedom from oppression; to peoples enslaved by tyrannical and totalitarian governments behind the Iron Curtain and elsewhere.

I think it is well that while a part of their objective is to create a better understanding with the rest of the world about the Slovak culture, customs and traditions, they also appeal to the citizens of all countries who are of Slovakian descent to express interest in promoting the welfare and security of their own countries and of all peoples seeking self-determination in government.

INCREASING DANGER OF ANTI-TECHNOLOGY BACKLASH

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, during my years of investigation of computer technology I have often referred to the clear possibility of an antitechnology backlash which could cripple our national power and prosperity. The most recent expression of that fear was before the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development when I testified in favor of the Technology Assessment Act of 1970. I was pleased to cosponsor the legislation introduced by its distinguished chairman, Congressman DADDARIO.

In the Washington Star of June 16, the widely read business columnist, John Cunniff reports rising worries within the business community over the actions of neoLuddites and the obvious vulnerability of computer centers to hostile attack. There is, of course, considerable danger to business firms and to universities and that is one of the major reasons why I have been trying to transplant a human heart into computer applications. And just let me add that the task of my proposed Select Committee on Technology, Human Values, and Democratic Institutions would be to assure that the new technology is truly used in the public interest and to ameliorate the conflicts which so clearly are beginning to be felt in all segments of our society.

Mr. Speaker, I introduce Mr. Cunniff's column and my testimony of May 20, 1970, into the RECORD at this point:

DANGER OF SABOTAGED TAPES GIVES SOME COMPANIES FISTS

(By John Cunniff)

NEW YORK.—There are a lot of Luddites around these days, and the data processing manager of a company whose production depends to a large extent on the healthy operation of its electronic computers.

It seems you can't tell a Luddite from any other worker, and so that makes them doubly difficult to defend against. Sometimes the only way you know they're even on the premises is to note a succession of suspicious computer snafus.

Are Luddites from another planet? Judging from the fear of them expressed by electronic processing managers you might believe they're like little green men. But they are terrestrial, although their origins are in another continent.

The term is borrowed from the name given to a group of early 19th century English workmen who tried to delay the industrial revolution by smashing up the machines they believed were taking away their jobs.

ERASING THE TAPES

Now, it is claimed, some workers want to do the same thing to the computer and the information revolution. How? One method is to hold an inexpensive magnet over the computer tapes, thus erasing the records thereon.

Modern tape reels may contain 100,000 records which one magnet can destroy in seconds. More than 900 reels were so destroyed by protesters angered by the Dow Chemical Co. participation in the Vietnam war.

The ease with which such sabotage can be accomplished is making EDP managers increasingly concerned with the security of their computer operations, whose success or failure can mean the same for the entire company.

Sabotage, in fact, is only one of their worries. Fire, fraud, student uprisings, improper ventilation, smoke, power failures, earthquakes and, simply, employe accidents, pose constant threats.

At a recent seminar on catastrophe prevention, held by the American Management Association, a Bank of America official described how his computer facilities are surrounded by bullet proof glass.

FANCY PRECAUTIONS

Guards allow only one person at a time into the foyer. The person seeking entrance finds himself in a small "mantrap," with the door behind and the door ahead closed tight. While thus imprisoned, he is examined by a television camera.

Despite such precautions, some companies are finding that the damage often can be accomplished from within.

By ingeniously rigging a computer, five men stole more than \$1 million from two New York banks. In another case, a programmer set up the computer to bypass his account when reporting overdrafts. He then cashed checks freely.

The possibility of power failures in wide areas of the nation this summer could cause damage not only to the machinery of computers but to the records stored in them, despite the growing use of backup power.

Such threats of absolute chaos to a company's operations are causing some EDP managers to be concerned enough to provide duplicate storage facilities in their own homes, where they feel they can personally keep an eye on them.

These measures do not, however, resolve the problem of computer protection in a society that many feel is growing more violent and destructive. The dupes can be rushed into service, true, but some damage already has been done.

RELAXATION FAR AWAY

Moreover, some EDP managers feel it will be a long, long time before they can relax. As one of them put it at the AMA conference:

"The kids playing with drugs today will be your employes tomorrow."

In fact, many of the security measures now being employed are designed specifically to thwart the goals of young radicals who have learned that the way to stop a university may be to destroy its computer.

Ten students were convicted in recent weeks in the burning of a computer center at Sir George Williams University in Montreal. The students first tossed tapes and pieces of equipment out the window. When police tried

to oust them they smashed a powerful computer with axes.

Fortunately, duplicate student records and payroll tapes were stored outside the building, and work thus continued on other computers. But the event was enough for most colleges to check their own security systems.

The ultimate in security, of course, is in Vietnam, where Marines come on duty with rifles and ammunition, and sometimes leave the console to check for the enemy on their perimeter.

Luddites and Viet Cong. On guard computermen!

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER ON THE TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT ACT OF 1970, MAY 20, 1970

I am delighted to have this opportunity to submit this statement to the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development and I want to pay a moment of special tribute to its distinguished Chairman, Mr. Daddario. History will undoubtedly record that your five years of careful and sound work on the concept embodied in the Technology Assessment Act of 1970 were among the most significant achievements of these troubled times.

On May 18, 1970 I introduced a companion measure to your bill, Mr. Chairman, for I am very pleased to have my name attached to such a reasonable and absolutely essential strengthening of the legislative branch. The bill which I co-sponsored will establish an Office of Technology Assessment within and responsible to the Congress, provide a mechanism to weigh both the good and the bad effects of proposed technological innovations, and permit us to offer viable alternatives to Executive branch policy choices.

Before I turn my attention to the "new"—the new technology, the newly popular science of ecology, the new crisis in confidence in representative government, and the new affronts in the continuing campaign against the constitutional prerogatives of the legislative branch—let us briefly dwell upon the "old."

Gertrude Stein has said that the United States is the oldest society in the world, for we were the first nation to enter the technologically dominated 20th Century. I think that is true and of equal importance to the Technology Assessment Act is that our Constitution is the oldest written document defining a currently operating system of government.

This means that we are not so very young and we see a number of rigid attitudes and hardening of the intellectual arteries now afflicting the body politic. While we should be entering a period of confidence as a society, there is strong suspicion that we will be the only Nation to go from infancy to senility without passing through a period of maturity.

Another difficulty in successfully grappling with the environmental deterioration is suggested in Lynn White's essential essay, *The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis*. Not only did religion provide a framework for self-centered capitalism but, as White points out, the destruction of paganism eliminated a passionate affection for natural surroundings.

I would expand White's solid thesis slightly and say that the agonies which our society will experience in dealing with present pollutions will rival that felt by the established church during the Copernican Revolution. While we now understand that the earth is not the center of the universe, our generation is being forced to confront the wrenching thought that even the earth does not revolve around the whims of man. We can no longer commandeer and exploit our natural resources; we are partners on a voyage in a frail and fragile craft. Barbara Ward's *Space Ship Earth* which has become McLuhan's *Global Village*.

Man's disharmony with nature caused Wordsworth to write:

The World is too much with us; late and soon,
Getting and spending, we lay waste to our powers:
Little we see in Nature that is ours.

Mr. Chairman, man is currently on the verge of being even further alienated from his environment, for everything we see in Nature will soon be ours: our individual garbage and our society's unsightly and unhealthy excrement. While our technology is propelling us to touch the very hem of the heavens, we lay the wastes of our power over Nature.

We must also recognize that many of those who are opposing the Establishment in such flamboyant fashion and who work just as hard to stay out of American society as our generation fought to get in, do so in some measure because of the clear inability to use our innovative energy in the interests of all our people. They vigorously resist the widely held thought that the quantity of technological accumulation is more important than the quality of life. While it was considered somewhat sophomoric to bewail the materialism of our culture, it is now a major rallying cry for all disenfranchised segments, including most specifically those who drop-out and turn-on.

Over a century ago, that most perceptive critic of emerging America, De Tocqueville pointed to "a kind of virtuous materialism may ultimately be established in the world, which will not corrupt, but enervate the soul, and noiselessly unbend the springs of action." It is hard not to say that he made a most accurate prediction of the life style of some of our fellow Americans.

I make these introductory remarks, Mr. Chairman, not to castigate any group but to point to the powerful historical, philosophical, and pragmatic evidence suggesting an extremely gloomy forecast for our efforts to manage the environment and to make representative democracy work.

But I see a strong ray of hope in the reaction to the most recent Executive Branch incursion into Congressional sanctuaries. Every Member of the Congress has recently been visited by hundreds of students and professors urging us, as their last resort, to take positive action to resist the Cambodian episode of the War in Indochina. While this is not the place to discuss the merits or demerits of that adventure, I believe it points up the fact that the time is right to strengthen the legislative branch and to reassert a sense of balance in our government.

We have authorized and appropriated billions of dollars for the Executive Branch and yet we are extraordinarily tight fisted and short sighted when it comes to giving ourselves the ability to remain relevant. Nothing more clearly demonstrates this than the truly appalling fact you disclosed, Mr. Chairman. When the Technology Assessment Act is passed, it will establish the first new Congressional arm since the General Accounting Office was created in 1921. No wonder the world is too much with those of us in the Congress; we have had to look through other eyes and rely on other expertise for half a century! We public men who must answer to the public just do not have equal access to the expertise involved in modern decision making. The private men who do are seldom identified. All too often we are merely presented with on-going policies and we must spend our energies attempting to explain them to the public, without the benefit of the tools which created them.

In a very real sense, we have become a ceremonial confirming body, supinely acquiescing in Executive Branch dicta. We may still be able to pull shut the purse strings, but we no longer can assemble the evidence to permit us to tug at the reins.

I regard Sec. 2(e) of the bill under con-

sideration this morning, Mr. Chairman, as a massive understatement:

"It is therefore, imperative that the Congress equip itself with new and effective means for securing competent, unbiased information concerning the effects, physical, economic, social, and political, of the applications of technology, and that such information be utilized whenever appropriate as one element in the legislative assessment of matters pending before the Congress."

I would regard this increased congressional capacity to assess the intricacies of the new technology as a valuable component in the restructuring of mechanism now underway in the Congress. The Technology Assessment Board could provide essential services to a Joint Committee on Technology and the Environment, which I hope will soon be created. In addition, its role in commissioning technical studies can be of great benefit to every existing committee.

While ecology is now the most discussed new scientific discipline, Lynn White's essay disclosed that the word first appeared in the English language in 1873. Triggered by that provocative piece of trivia, I have learned that the dictionary has two definitions of ecology:

1. the branch of biology dealing with the relations between organisms and their environment.

2. the branch of sociology concerned with the spacing of people and institutions and the resulting interdependency.

The first definition has become the focal point of those concerned with the pollution of the natural environment, and the second leads me to a discussion of the pollution of the political atmosphere. The ground rules governing the physical and intellectual spacing of people and the bounds of that interdependency are basically what I have been attempting to define in my six-year study of privacy. I believe that in addition to providing accurate and timely information suggesting policy alternatives in the application of the myriad technologies which clearly threaten the physical environment, the Technology Assessment Act will also enable Congress to better understand computerized information systems and their impact on the social environment.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the hearings conducted by the Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy in 1966 on the proposed National Data Bank could serve as a model for the new Office. We assembled computer experts, civil libertarians, and proponents of the Bank from the Bureau of the Budget. The result of that prototype "technology assessment" was to find that the dangers of the proposed Bank far outweighed the assumed potential benefits.

I was pleased to note that the January 1970 panel seminar of this Subcommittee focused upon the computer and the management of knowledge. Far from being a "supportive tool," as is mistakenly claimed by some members of the scientific community, the computer stands at the center of the information explosion and, most important, makes possible the invasion of personal privacy on a scale never before contemplated.

While we have been able to repel some of the privacy invaders by the actions taken by my Privacy Subcommittee, I believe that the interdisciplinary nature of the attacks on constitutional rights demands a fully-funded, fully-staffed congressional effort. I have proposed the creation of a Select Committee on Technology, Human Values, and Democratic Institutions to provide a credible counterweight to the incredible sophistication of the assaults on the cohesive nature of society. It would certainly be expected that the Technology Assessment Board would be an essential partner in reaching the goals envisioned for the Select Committee.

I would like to conclude this morning, Mr. Chairman, by wholeheartedly endorsing both

the concept of the Technology Assessment Act of 1970 and your statement of April 16. You said that the Act is "... among the most important long range pieces of legislation to be introduced in modern times."

Quite so, for if there is to be a long range experience for the American experiment beyond the short range disasters which are so threatening, if there are to be any times beyond these modern times, we must exercise the toxic elements from the tonic of technology. If we are to lessen the clear danger of an anti-technological backlash which could cripple our power and our prosperity, we must make sure that our tools serve us, and do not enslave us.

This is not a flight of personal fancy, nor is it an exercise in the currently popular art of doomsdaymanship. We have already witnessed attacks on computer centers at such universities as Stanford, California and McGill, as well as the recent erasing of magnetic computer tapes referring to Napalm at Dow Chemical. Computer rooms all over the country may soon become confrontation rooms and by assuring beneficial results from our new technology, we can take some of the fuel from the fire which feeds the new Luddites.

And the most logical place to work toward a liberation from what may seem technological totalitarianism is in the Congress and most particularly in the House, historically regarded as being the closest to the people. The political art—if I may be so bold—is to convince our constituents that we all have a vital stake in our common future. We are looked upon as the people who must bring the often hot voice of humanity into the often chilly corridors of power.

This may sound slightly frivolous when compared to the many weighty arguments offered to this Subcommittee in the past, but I have always been struck by the fact that people traditionally say "the President" and "my Congressman." This close identification with the voters means that we are especially vulnerable to a failure of Federal policy. Yet, as the whole thrust of my statement is intended to indicate, we are frequently unable to influence meaningfully those policies. And, of course, if we lose our influence, what will happen to those who have reposed their trust in us?

To sum up, Mr. Chairman, I deeply believe in the concept embodied in the Technology Assessment Act, not only because of its potential for curbing ecocatastrophes but also because it will reassert congressional capability at a crucial time. There must be some alternatives to current trends in America today and, by allowing the Congress to develop its own, technology assessment should help to turn the American dream from what seems to be a nightmare of despair.

If civilized society, based upon the crown of political creation—the Constitution and the Bill of Rights—is to remain relevant in these revolutionary times, we must know what we are doing. In the area of the applications of science and technology, we do not know what we are doing now. The wise provisions of the Technology Assessment Act may give us the knowledge to work for the salvation of our democratic institutions and the preservation of the unique American experiment.

ANOTHER POSTAL STRIKE?

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the following New York Times

editorial pointing up the urgent need to guarantee to postal workers the same bargaining rights Congress has previously made available to the balance of the Nation's workers.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, June 17, 1970]

ANOTHER POSTAL STRIKE?

Interunion squabbling confronts the country with the dismal threat of a second postal strike. The central issue this time is the formula for union representation that the House of Representatives seals into the proposed postal reform bill.

The militant independent union that now speaks for Manhattan and Bronx postal clerks threatens to strike if the House freezes it out. The nationwide unions involved in the original strike settlement with Postmaster General Blount threaten to strike if it doesn't.

Nothing would contribute more to souring the public on collective bargaining in the Federal service than the calling of a strike on such an issue. Theoretically, all the unions and their respective friends on Capitol Hill agree that the determination of bargaining units in the new postal service should be left to the National Labor Relations Board.

But, for all practical purposes, the deal made by the national unions with Mr. Blount—and now backed by the A.F.L.-C.I.O. and the Nixon Administration in the logrolling in the House—would face the N.L.R.B. with a *fait accompli*. Full certification rights would be automatically delivered over to the national unions by the terms of the reform legislation.

The Manhattan and Bronx union, which had no direct voice in the strike settlement, is understandably outraged over the prospect of legislative annihilation. Its champions are pushing a bill that would assure the local unit's survival. The right course would be enactment of a bill that would put all determinations in the hands of the N.L.R.B., without advance fixing of the boundaries by Congress.

The Federal Government is properly eager to avoid a fragmented bargaining structure in a postal system that is supposed to achieve greater efficiency, but it cannot wipe out the democratic right of postal workers to make their own choice of bargaining agents.

BALTIC STATES FREEDOM

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 30th anniversary of two events of major historical significance: The loss of independence of the Baltic States, and their absorption by the Soviet Union. Between June 14 and June 17, 1940, the Soviets presented the three nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania with ultimatums. In turn, these were followed by Russian invasion, occupation, and domination.

In the process of Soviet aggression, hundreds of thousands of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were murdered, tortured, or deported to slave-labor and prison camps. In addition, the Soviets attempted to colonize the three countries by moving in thousands of Russian citizens and making their heretofore self-reliant industries totally de-

pendent on Russian economic resources and raw materials.

Mr. Speaker, the dream of liberty still remains for the beleaguered men and women in the Baltic nations. Despite the unrelenting pressures which have been exerted through the years, the Baltic peoples still find the will to resist and the will to retain their national integrity. The Soviet overlords have not succeeded in weakening their ethnic identity or swaying their basic allegiances. I am confident the pressures will be withstood as long as freedom-loving people continue to encourage them to take heart and persevere. For this reason I urge my colleagues to give these valiant peoples the aid and comfort of our great country. I urge them to reaffirm their opposition to repressive Soviet domination of the Baltic States. The Baltic peoples should have the right to freely choose their own government and freely pursue their own national destinies.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF RUSSIAN
SOLIDARISTS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on May 30 the American branch of the National Alliance of Russian Solidarists, which has chapters in most big cities of the United States, held its annual congress in New York.

On the occasion, which also marked the 40th anniversary of their organization, a resolution was unanimously passed to send President Nixon a letter of support.

All members of the American branch are citizens of the United States, and they feel it is their duty to do their utmost in encouraging their fellow citizens to stand up wholeheartedly behind the President in these troubled times.

While the resolution and letter to the President was released to the newspapers in New York and Washington, no mention was made of it in either location. As I sincerely feel many thousands of Americans would be proud of this fine organization for the firm position it has taken, I insert their letter in full at this point in the RECORD:

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF RUSSIAN
SOLIDARISTS,

May 30, 1970.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: From the Annual Congress of the American Branch of NTS, we respectfully send you our best wishes and the expression of our unflinching support of your policies in Southeast Asia, and domestic. We admire your courage and moral fortitude.

We are all American citizens. Most of us came to these hospitable shores as mature men and women. Some were brought by their parents as children, some were born in America. It is in our capacity as citizens of this Country that we venture to address you these lines.

The aim of our organization—celebrating this year its 40th anniversary—is to help the peoples of Russia to regain their freedom; to build in Russia a truly democratic society, based on social justice, law, genuine respect for human personality, solidarity among men (as opposed to class war), abolition of all forms of exploitation and domination of the individual by society or vice versa.

In addition to this, we—members of the American Branch—believe it to be our foremost duty also to serve as interpreters of the goodwill of the American people toward the long-suffering peoples of Russia, and to explain the plight and the true aspirations of the Russian people to the citizens of this Country. It is our profound belief that only harmony in relations between a free and democratic Russia and the United States will bring stability to our restless world.

Many among us have seen—from the inside—the watchtowers and barbed wires of Soviet and Nazi concentration camps. Through personal experience we've learned the cruel workings of totalitarian dictatorships, and understood the unsatiable lust for power of Fascist and Communist rulers. And this is why we so profoundly appreciate the warm hospitality offered to us by this Nation, its generosity, its tolerance, and its courage to stand up for the noble principles which made it great.

Our political education was both empiric and scholarly. We, therefore, are not inclined unduly to exaggerate the threat of the Communist menace (we are well aware of the processes developing in Russia), but neither do we underestimate it. One thing we know for sure: weakness invites Communist aggression.

The war in Vietnam is a disaster. Yet, it is not the United States who started it. This is a crucial fact which should always be borne in mind. The war has bereaved many American families. It has caused untold sufferings to the population of Vietnam. But a hasty American withdrawal from Southeast Asia would be a far greater disaster. Its consequences for the cause of freedom everywhere would be calamitous. And, then, moral obligation and national honor are, indeed, not mere trifles to be lightly brushed aside.

It is with concern—yes, deep concern—that we observe the activities in this Country of the lunatic fringes, both rightist and leftist. But the extremists of the right are pretty well subdued. It is the anarchical radicals from the left—those who exploit the idealism of the young, those who foment violence, engage in bombing, commit arson, and then claim protection of the Constitution of the United States, which they brazenly violate, and whose flag they desecrate—it is these elements among the students and, alas, among some of their professors that cause us to worry.

We observe certain phenomena dangerously reminiscent of those which developed in Russia in 1917 during the short period between the bloodless Democratic Revolution and the treacherous Communist coup. Political opportunism, demagoguery, distortion of facts in the name of the purest ideals, demands for immediate unconditional peace, clamor for precipitous far-fetching reforms—all this we have once witnessed.

There is an ideological vacuum in America today. People have grown apathetic, indifferent, too deeply involved in their personal affairs. It is this situation that the subversive radicals exploit by default.

Yet, we have faith in America, the wisdom of her people, her deeply-rooted, age-tempered traditions. Of course, the Government should not muzzle dissenters, no matter how unfair, how provocative their ravings, so long as they do not resort to crime. But it is the duty of the citizenry in a free democracy to condemn them vigorously. And we are determined to respond to this duty to the best of our ability.

Mr. President, we know how awesome is the burden of your responsibilities. We know how hard it must be for you to keep your hand firmly on the helm of the ship of State. But we also know that you will steer America clear through the stormy seas to a safe and peaceful haven.

We trust you, Mr. President, and we wish you Godspeed!

Very respectfully,

C. W. BOLDYREFF,
President, U.S. Branch, NTS.

REPEALING THE INDIAN TERMINATION
RESOLUTION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives last major statement on American Indian affairs was issued in 1953 when the 83d Congress adopted House Concurrent Resolution 108, the "termination" resolution. This legislation declared the intent of Congress to terminate Federal responsibility for the administration of Indian affairs.

Since its adoption, the termination resolution has been surrounded by controversy. Supporters have contended that the resolution would enable American Indians to enter the mainstream of American life for the first time, while opponents have claimed that the resolution was merely license to exploit the Indian's resources, to get his land, his water, and other assets at a bargain price.

Strong opposition to the new policy began to develop in the years following 1953 as major tribes in Wisconsin and Oregon were terminated. Between 1953 and 1958 certain tribal land was transferred to private ownership and Federal health, welfare, and education services for designated tribes were ended.

Finally in 1958 the termination period was brought to a partial halt when Interior Secretary Fred Seaton announced that no tribe would be terminated without its consent.

Despite Secretary Seaton's statement, the threat of termination still hangs over the heads of the Indian. Each new Indian policy developed in Washington is often viewed as just another termination device in disguise. As recently as 1969, the National Congress of American Indians declared:

The current alleged policy of the federal government enunciated in House Concurrent Resolution 108 is a policy for the eventual termination of Indian tribes and reservations and serves as an obstacle to the development of our tribes and reservations.

Recent administrations have attempted to allay the Indians' fears by rejecting termination as the keystone of Federal Indian policy and proposing in its place a new emphasis on Indian self-determination.

In his April 1968 message to Congress, President Lyndon Johnson stated:

I propose a new goal for our Indian programs, a goal that ends the old debate about termination and stresses self-determination.

The current Secretary of Interior, Walter Hickel, declared in an October 1969, speech:

This administration is dedicated to improving—not destroying—that special relationship that exists between government, the Indians, and the land. We are not a pro-termination administration.

The executive branch has indicated its opposition to the termination emphasis but the House has not spoken since 1953. I feel, therefore, that the time has come to repeal House Concurrent Resolution 108 and I am, today, introducing legislation to accomplish this purpose.

Joining with me in cosponsoring a termination repeal resolution are the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS), the gentleman from Montana (Mr. OLSEN), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE).

A copy of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas House Concurrent Resolution 108 of the Eighty-Third Congress declared a congressional policy to terminate federal responsibility for the administration of Indian affairs within the territorial limits of the United States; and

Whereas the termination policy declared in H. CON. RES. 108 has been strongly opposed by numerous tribal councils and Indian organizations including the National Congress of American Indians; and

Whereas spokesmen for all administrations since 1953 have stated that termination *per se* cannot and should not be the major objective of the federal government in its dealings with the American Indians: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That termination policy declared in House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eighty-Third Congress, no longer represents the policy of Congress and termination is not a congressional objective in legislating on Indian affairs.

BILL DELHEY HONORED

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, our law enforcement system is under concerted attack these days from many quarters. Although some of the criticism is justified, we must not lose sight of the great contribution made to freedom in this country by law enforcement personnel. There are certain outstanding individuals who make that system effective and whose example provides genuine hope for constructive improvement. Such a man is Mr. William H. Delhey, prosecuting attorney for Washtenaw County in my district. He has received the distinguished service award from the National Prosecuting Attorneys' Association. Mr. Speaker, I believe Bill Delhey deserves our gratitude for the dedication, ability, and performance that led to this award. He is in the front line of action in this rather difficult period. Without such men to make our system of justice function, there is little chance that we can work out the problems that so divide us. Bill Delhey is an exemplary public servant, an inspiring individual, and a great American.

CENTRAL TEXAS MOURNS THE LOSS OF "MR. BASTROP"—WILL ROGERS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, at 3 p.m. on June 1, all the people of Bastrop, Tex., paused and bowed their heads for one of their own—Mr. Will Rogers' funeral was in process and the town stood still in his memory.

No man so richly deserved or earned the respect of his fellow man. Mr. Will Rogers has his mark indelibly stamped on every piece of progress in Bastrop since shortly after the turn of the century. His list of accomplishments reads like Genesis: Will Rogers, among other things, served as mayor for 22 years in two tenures of office. That is tangible evidence of his stature.

In many ways, I consider myself to be "one of Mr. Will's boys." Our warm and deep relationship goes back to the beginning of the days of the CCC and the NYA. At that time, Mr. Will gathered around him a group of young men who were destined to become leaders in their own time: men such as John Connally, Cliff Carter, Charles Herring, Joe Kilgore, Willard Deason, and many others. Mr. Will provided the proving ground and the direction for this energetic, but inexperienced group of young men.

I have many wonderful memories of the times we would gather at the administration building at the beautiful Bastrop State Park to enjoy a fried catfish dinner, complete with plenty of food for thought from Mr. Will. If he figured we were caught up in our work, sometimes he would take a group of us to relax on the golf course at the picturesque Lost Pines Park and when we would return to the job of building projects for the benefit of the people of Bastrop and Central Texas—we would return refreshed.

Mr. Speaker, that group of friends never lost its loyalty to Mr. Will. If ever we needed something done in Bastrop, we would contact Mr. Will and he would begin work immediately. First thing, he would draw in his cluster of such friends as Bud deGlendon, Bower Crierder, Cecil Long, A. A. Sanders, Ed Standifer, and others—then get to work on a solution.

Always, Will Rogers was loyal to his friends. Always, Will Rogers was responsive to their needs. He never "traded" by asking things like "can you do this?" or "would you do that?" Rather, it was "what do you need?" As long as Mr. Will thought his people of Bastrop would profit, he set about the job at hand with amazing vigor and wisdom. His heart was in Bastrop; he loved his town and the people in it.

I hope you can see, Mr. Speaker, why I consider myself fortunate to call Will Rogers my deep and close friend. He and his wife and family were like my own family. I know them that well.

Mr. Speaker, I have been wistfully reminiscing about the unfathomable character that made the man, but I am not alone in these thoughts.

I would like to quote from his home-

town newspaper, the colorful Bastrop Advertiser:

William Jones Rogers was born in Llano on October 23, 1885. He came to Bastrop as a young man and became a rancher. Destined to become a leader, and a power of progress in the town he chose to make his home, he made many friends, including President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, the Bastrop Advertiser has developed an outstanding profile of the man and his accomplishments and I would like at this time to reprint the article in the RECORD:

FUNERAL SERVICES FOR LONG-TIME CIVIC LEADER HELD HERE JUNE 1ST

Funeral services for former Mayor Will Rogers were held from the United Methodist Church at 3 o'clock Monday, June 1.

Mr. Rogers died at Bastrop Memorial Hospital Saturday night, May 30, at 10:22 o'clock, a victim of cancer. He was 84 years old.

The Rev. J. Troy Hickman officiated at the services, and Mrs. E. F. Pearcy, organist, played a background of special music. Burial was in Fairview Cemetery, and pallbearers were W. B. Townsend, Lovell Yoast, Russell Edwards, Vernon Eskew, Cecil Long, Alex Waugh, A. A. Sanders and Monroe Sanders.

Surviving him are his widow, Mrs. W. J. Rogers; two sisters, Mrs. B. H. Camp of Temple and Mrs. C. E. Bowman of Houston; two brothers, Ford Rogers of Smithville and Raymond Rogers of Llano, and a number of nieces and nephews.

Dignitaries attending the service included Judge Homer Thornberry, Judge Herman L. Jones, Senator Charles Herring, Bob Phinney, Sherman Birdwell, Sam Winters, Ed Bluestein and Cliff Drummon, all of Austin;

Congressman J. J. Pickle of Washington, D.C. and Austin; Jack Mills of Houston, Fleetwood Richards of Lockhart, Howard Rivers III of Elgin, and from the LCRA Main Office in Austin were Sim Gideon, G. E. Schmitt, R. A. Lucksinger, Harris Young and Art Anderson.

William Jones Rogers was born in Llano on October 23, 1885. He came to Bastrop as a young man and became a rancher. Destined to become a leader, and a power for progress in the town he chose to make his home, he made many friends, including former President Lyndon B. Johnson.

He served on the city council for two years, then was chosen mayor and served 14 years until 1948, then returned to serve until 1964.

He also had served as Precinct 1 County Commissioner and was a member of First United Methodist Church and had been a member of the Lions Club, the Chamber of Commerce and the Volunteer Fire Department.

Among the major accomplishments of his tenure as mayor were development of Bastrop State Park, establishment of sanitary sewers, construction of Camp Swift, voter approval of a \$225,000 bond issue to tie in the municipal water system with the vast reservoirs at Camp Swift after it was abandoned by the Army, his successful fight to acquire the electric utility system from Texas Power & Light, and a vital part in the Lower Colorado River Authority's choice of Bastrop for a multi-million dollar steam plant.

Of his friendship with President Johnson, Rogers said in 1964: "I have never asked Lyndon to do any personal favor for me, but I have asked plenty for the City of Bastrop and he has always responded."

Congressman Pickle issued a statement Sunday evening which said: "Any significant civic project that occurred in the city or county of Bastrop during the last 40 years bore the mark of Will Rogers. He was a tireless worker for his community . . . an energetic mayor for many years, and later continued his efforts for a better Bastrop. He was the driving force behind the Bastrop

State Park, and Camp Swift . . . but two examples of his continuous work for Bastrop . . . I am honored that I can be counted as one of his close friends also."

Interviewed in 1964 by Wray Weddell of the American-Statesman, Rogers recalled how he met his wife: "I was feeding out a bunch of hogs down at Alum Creek in 1909 and she was teaching school there." Four years later they married.

A saddened Bastrop mourned the loss of the man who served so faithfully and so long. The offices in the City Hall were closed all day Monday, business houses on Main Street were closed during the funeral service, and the flag on the United States Post Office flew at half mast in memoriam. Will Rogers was cut from a pattern all his own; there will never be another quite like him.

Mr. Speaker, this great man kept his town on steady course through the good times and the bad. "He served as mayor during the chaotic days of Camp Swift, when Bastrop became a boomtown overnight," says the local newspaper. And he did.

And we will always remember Mr. Bastrop, Mr. Will Rogers.

Let me echo the last paragraph of the news article:

Will Rogers was cut from a pattern all his own; there will never be another quite like him.

He was our trademark, our inspiration, our leader.

BABE RUTH BASEBALL—A GREAT PROGRAM FOR YOUTH

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, baseball is a game beloved by millions of our fellow Americans and is generally regarded as our National game. It is difficult to dispute baseball's prominent position among American sports, when one considers its deep roots in American life, its great appeal to the young, and the tremendous popular interest that develops each year in the major league pennant races and the World Series.

As a Baltimorean, I take special pride in the fact that one of our own local boys became a baseball great. I refer, of course, to the one and only "Babe" Ruth who was named George Herman Ruth. He was born in Baltimore City in the 200 block of Emory Street, which I am happy to report, is now preserved as a national museum to inspire our fellow Americans.

In the life of Babe Ruth we see a true example of what one can accomplish despite handicaps. Here was a boy born in extremely moderate circumstances and raised in an orphanage who became a truly great man. He was endowed with fine human qualities and became a famous athlete, a tremendous hitter, and for a while, also an excellent pitcher. As a result of his 714 hits and home runs, his name became a household word for over half a century.

In these days when we are made aware of the importance of physical fitness, I

am delighted with the program of Babe Ruth baseball for teenage young men. I am also very pleased that Babe Ruth's name will thus be perpetuated and his memory kept alive.

Babe Ruth baseball is dedicated to developing in its participants a genuine respect for accepted traditions of sportsmanship, firm moral foundations, and a thorough understanding of the democratic and competitive spirit so that they may grow into better American citizens.

It was a great pleasure for me to attend a breakfast yesterday as the guest of Mrs. Babe Ruth, widow of the alltime great professional player. I also commended her for her interest in recognizing the problems of youth in America today, and calling public attention to the urgent need for a quick solution to the recreational facilities problems that plague our Nation, particularly our large cities.

I congratulate President Richard Case and Vice President George Riemann as well as those volunteers who are supporting the various Babe Ruth baseball leagues located throughout the country and wish them continued success with this program on behalf of our young people.

TOP FIREFIGHTERS NAMED

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives the brave and courageous conduct of four firefighters from my congressional district. Firemen Thomas P. Petzy, Chanel S. Pellerin, and Alfred G. Fortier of Lawrence, Mass., and Lt. John F. Shaw of Methuen, Mass., have demonstrated great valor in service to their communities. These firefighters were recently honored for their extraordinary service, and I am proud and pleased to present the following article from the Lawrence Eagle Tribune describing their bravery in saving several human lives:

TOP FIREFIGHTER NAMED

"These men were directly responsible for saving several human lives," said Frank McDonald of the Lawrence Exchange Club yesterday.

The awards luncheon, of which McDonald was chairman, was held to honor three fire fighters from Lawrence and one from Methuen who were responsible for saving lives during the past year.

The four chosen by the Exchange Club were Chanel S. Pellerin, Thomas P. Petzy and Alfred G. Fortier, of Lawrence and Lt. John F. Shaw of Methuen.

Pellerin, one of the fire fighters responding to a fire last Nov. 9 at 5 Hazel Place, found a boy unconscious in the hallway of the building. He carried him to safety.

Petzy, during the same fire and off-duty at the time, responded to the call and discovered a woman and her children stranded on the roof of a porch. He talked her into dropping the children to him.

Fortier found a woman unconscious on the floor of a house at 11 Green St. during a fire there April 1.

Lt. Shaw, on June 5, 1969, had responded to a fire at the Malden Mills.

While at the mill, a call came that a building at 3 Ingalls Court was on fire. The fire company left the mill. Upon arriving at the scene, the third floor was engulfed in flames and the second floor was heavy with smoke. Lt. Shaw was informed that an invalid woman was on the second floor.

With disregard for his safety, Shaw entered the second floor and carried the woman to safety.

Presenting the Fire Fighter of the Year Awards was the club's president, Robert Garland.

The speaker at the ceremonies was Leo Laughlin an FBI agent for 27 years and now an executive officer of the Hundred Club of Massachusetts.

He explained to the club members and families of the four fire fighters, that the Hundred Club was formed to aid dependents of fire fighters and policemen killed in the performance of their duties. "It's our way to pay a public debt to public servants," he said. The motto of the Hundred Club is "We care for those who care for us."

He told the gathering that already the Massachusetts club had given over \$58,000 to dependents of the public servants who had given up their lives that others may live.

Also present at the luncheon were Lawrence Fire Chief William J. Mains, Methuen Fire Chief Otis E. Baker, Alderman Phillip C. DiAdamo and Methuen Selectman Chairman Wilbur Hyatt.

ASIAN ALLY CALLS FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM CAMBODIA

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the invasion of Cambodia has hurt the United States in its international standing as a member of the community of nations. Even our staunchest allies have criticized its wisdom. Now a guest at the White House has found it necessary to call for our withdrawal immediately from Cambodia. This guest was President Suharto of Indonesia who has been one of our strongest supporters in Vietnam and Southeast Asia. The following editorial from the May 29 New York Times makes some very important comments about this event and its meaning for the United States' policy in Asia:

[From the New York Times, May 29, 1970]

AN ASIAN POLICY FOR CAMBODIA

Extension of the Indochina war to Cambodia has been sharply criticized by one of the most important Asian leaders friendly to the United States.

President Suharto of Indonesia startled a White House dinner the other evening when he declared: "We cannot afford just to wait for the sake of peace and stability in Southeast Asia. All efforts should be taken to prevent the war from widening and to insure the preservation of Cambodia's right to sovereignty and neutrality, among other things, by effecting the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Cambodian territory."

The Indonesian leader later made clear that, in calling for the withdrawal of "all foreign forces," he included the South Vietnamese, who have declared their intention to remain on Cambodian soil after the scheduled American withdrawal at the end of June.

President Suharto's opposition to any widening of the Indochina conflict and his emphasis on diplomatic, rather than military, measures to preserve Cambodia's fractured neutrality merit respectful attention because of his position as leader of the largest nation in Southeast Asia as well as his impeccable anti-Communist credentials. President Nixon himself laid great stress on the leadership role he expected Indonesia to play in Asia during his visit to Jakarta last summer shortly after he enunciated his new Asian Doctrine at Guam.

The Suharto remarks gain in significance because they reflect views also expressed in the communique of eleven Asian nations which met in Jakarta two weeks ago to discuss the Cambodian problem. It is especially noteworthy that these views are also those of Japan, which shared with Indonesia a principal role in that conference.

If President Nixon's Asian Doctrine is to have meaning he cannot ignore the advice of these important and friendly Asian states which are plainly deeply disturbed by the thrust of recent American actions in their part of the world. Certainly such Asian neighbors as Indonesia, Japan and the Philippines, which has recently turned down a Cambodian request for military aid, can be no less concerned than the United States about the prospects of a North Vietnamese or Communist conquest of Cambodia.

The Jakarta conferees have initiated a broad effort to reinstitute the International Control Commission for Cambodia and to convene a new Geneva Conference on the broader Indochina problem, both directly with former Geneva participants and through the United Nations. If this move could gain enough support from other nations in Asia and Africa and perhaps elsewhere, it might help persuade the reluctant Russians to join Britain in reconvening the Geneva Conference. The United States could give a push in this direction by reconsidering the ill-advised attempt to "save" Cambodia through the use in that country of troops of Cambodia's traditional enemies South Vietnam and Thailand.

SENATE AMENDMENTS TO VOTING RIGHTS ACT

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today in the consideration of House Resolution 914, two issues were presented: the lowering of the voting age to 18 by statute rather than by amending the Constitution; and, whether to adopt the Senate amendments to the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

In the past I have supported lowering the voting age but believe this should be done by amending State or Federal constitutions rather than by statute so that the people may have a voice in this important decision. This is particularly so in the State of Colorado, and other States that have this proposition on the ballot this year.

Accordingly, on the vote on the previous question, I voted to enable House Resolution 914 to be referred to a conference committee to accomplish this purpose.

While I still doubt the constitutionality of the 18-year-old vote provision, and

believe it to be vulnerable to attack in the courts, I voted for the resolution on final passage, believing as I do that the Senate amendments to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in other respects are workable, necessary, and in the public interest.

"THE NEED FOR A REASONABLE DIALOGUE"—WORDS OF WISDOM FROM A HOUSTON RABBI

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the causes fanning the flames of violence sweeping our land.

Rarely, however, have I had the opportunity to read such words of calm and reflected wisdom as those recently preached by my distinguished friend in Houston, Rabbi Robert I. Kahn of Temple Emanu El. Because I believe his message should be shared with my colleagues and the American people. I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

THE NEED FOR REASONABLE DIALOGUE

(By Rabbi Robert I. Kahn)

Four young people died by violence in Kent, Ohio, and a nation is shaken. Young people identify with them. Parents identify with their grieving families. Flags fly at half-staff on many a campus and in many a heart for those four young people who died in Kent, Ohio.

Who killed those four young people in Kent, Ohio?

It was the National Guardsmen who killed those four young people in Kent, Ohio.

It was fifteen hundred students who stoned the National Guardsmen who killed four young people in Kent, Ohio.

It was the President of Kent University who called in the National Guard whom the students stoned who killed those four young people in Kent, Ohio.

It was a mob of Kent University students who went on a rampage last week breaking windows, setting fires, whom the President sought to control by calling in the National Guard whom the students stoned who killed those four young people in Kent, Ohio.

It was the administration of Kent University who . . .

But why go on? There is no end to it. There is no end to the chain of cause and effect which led to the death of those four students in Kent, Ohio. And each of us has his own choice of causes. "It was outside agitators," cry some. "It was Viet Nam and Cambodia," shout others. It is the "affluent society," it is "racism," it is the "permissive parent," it is the "Establishment," it is "Dr. Spock," it is "Spiro Agnew," there is no end, and there will be no end, if all we seek is a scapegoat.

The time has come for a cease-fire in American life. The time has come for an end to the chain of violent action and reaction which can only end with a whirlpool sucking us down the drain of history. The time has come to stop, to think, to talk. The time has come for reasonable dialogue, between youth and their elders, between students and teachers, between government and people, between every group in our society, reasonable dialogue about our problems, about our goals, about our priorities.

And I want to speak to this need tonight. I am not going to talk about solutions—that

would be monologue—but about reaching solutions through the process of thoughtful and earnest and honest and continuing and, above all, reasonable dialogue. What are the prerequisites, the premises, the requirements, upon which reasonable dialogue can be built?

First, of course, reasonable dialogue rules out violence. It rules out guns, it rules out tear gas, it rules out stones, it rules out bottles, it rules out mobs, it rules out fires, it rules out forcing doors, or breaking windows, or burning papers, or clubs, or nightsticks, or blocking entrances to buildings, or any action by which we seek to hurt or coerce our neighbor or to destroy his or our property.

There is another kind of violence that must be ruled out and that is violence in language. There can be no dialogue when we call each other names. There can be no dialogue when we shout epithets. There can be no dialogue between people inflamed by violent language.

I attended commencement at Rice University last year. I was shocked when a student in the graduating class shouted a foul word at the speaker. I was equally shocked when a member of the Board muttered to that student when he passed to get his diploma an equally foul word.

It is violence when a policeman shoots a demonstrator. It is also violence when the demonstrator shouts, "Kill the Fascist pigs!" It is also violence when a public figure in high office will use terms like "effete snobs" or "pointy heads." This is not the language of reasonable dialogue, this is the language of violence, and it can only beget violence.

I hear people say, I hear youth say, that public servants, policemen, soldiers, must be controlled in the face of abuse, of foul language, of being spit upon, but they fail to add that freedom to assemble peacefully does not include freedom to abuse, freedom to use foul language, freedom to spit on people. Controls are everyone's obligation.

The only way to prevent violence is to set up avenues of communication, ways by which dissatisfaction can be expressed, and problems be discussed, and reasonable solutions sought and found.

This is the way we always end up anyway, isn't it? One of the reports from Watts was a visit there by Martin Luther King, who, devoted as he was to peaceful protest, was distressed by the violent riot. Black leaders in Watts laughed at him. "Look what we've accomplished," they said. "We've got a social worker on every block, we've got a new playground for our kids. We've got a new bus line to take us to work. We've got a factory to train us in jobs. We've got a committee where we can sit and talk to 'the man' about what we need. What did your non-violence get?"

How tragic that we must wait for violence to wake us up. It has again. Let us wait for no more, let us set up avenues, permanent and continuing avenues for dialogue.

The second prerequisite for reasonable dialogue is that we must go into it with the desire to understand each other. Therefore we have to listen. Adults have to listen to youth; youth have to listen to adults.

We adults say to each other, "What bothers them? What problems can they possibly have? It's the best time of their lives. Why are they so dissatisfied?"

Do you want to know? Then listen. This week, *Time* magazine carried a letter from a nineteen year old girl in California. Listen to what she writes:

"The hatred and the bitterness you see are because things are essentially the same as five years ago. No, they are worse.

"What happens to a human being who was once full of hope and confidence that he can make his presence felt in the world in a useful and healthy way? What happens when he is scorned and criticised and laughed at?

"We marched, O God how we marched and sang and tried to turn from death to life.

"We made mistakes. Sometimes we were rash and arrogant. We felt horror and grief and rage. We wanted to shake President Johnson and tell him to stop, stop! And the more we spoke out, and marched, the more the killing grew. Finally, a few more people joined in the protests and we were no longer cowards or traitors. But we were still helpless. We were drafted and trained to kill and sent to a very far-away place to die. And our parents watched their children go to this insanity and did not seem to mind. Even when we came back in boxes.

"We watched our cities crumbling and dying. We saw people of black and brown and red skin being denied their humanity. We went to the South and cried out to the government for help and got nothing—a little here and there, but mostly it amounted to nothing.

"We watched men whom we loved and had hope in (though they were not saints, but tainted with inhumanity like we all are) shot and buried.

"Nixon had a chance and he did not act. The Viet Nam war is not ending. The cities are dying, the defense budgets for the major countries of this earth are staggering.

"What are we supposed to do with our lives? How do we go about solving the complex problems of our world?

"There comes a time when pure frustration builds and breaks out and is ugly. You throw a bottle and it feels good. You say an ugly word and it feels good. We feel horror at death, and find ourselves planning it.

"Violence? I abhor it, but I wonder if people will work in any other way. Our hopes simply grew old and died."

Listen to that girl! Hear her anguish; and beneath it hear her longing not for violence but just to do something constructive. We adults have to listen.

And young people have to listen, too. Let them listen to the difficulties and the frustrations, the heartaches and the problems of those who have responsibilities. It's an absurdity to hear youngsters say, "You can't trust anybody over thirty." It's a tragedy when young people turn off anyone who tries to share years of experience. It's a tragedy when youngsters will listen only to those who agree with them. This is not dialogue.

Dialogue requires openness. We must listen.

Dialogue requires honesty from all of us, young and old. Dialogue is not for the purpose of accusing the other while excusing ourselves. Dialogue is not for the purpose of rationalizing our own actions while attacking others.

In dialogue we cannot use labels, we cannot call names like Communist, Fascist, kook, racist.

In dialogue we must be open to everyone. It's a strange thing. All our lives we tell our children: Don't judge by appearances. And then, if others grow their hair long, or wear beads, or sandals, we simply shut our ears. Dialogue should be open.

But above all, dialogue, we must remember, is only a means, not an end. There is no purpose to talking unless we arrive at a program of action. Too often, we think of talk as a substitute for action. If we just get it off our chest, we feel better. And there may be some life-situations in which that is all we can do. But most of our problems will yield to intelligent dialogue, and will offer solutions in action.

A father told me this week, with anguish in his voice, "My son is concerned, so deeply concerned with all that has happened. He's turned to me and said, 'Dad, you've got to help us, you've got to do something.'"

That father will do something; I know him. But what would be ideal would be that they do it together. Sit down together and work out a telegram to the President or to

their Congressman. Sit down together and talk out all the possibilities for action on a common goal.

You know, so many people in our congregation are working for human welfare, for community improvement. So are a lot of our young people. But they ought to be doing it together, thinking together, planning together, working together. Dialogue ought to lead to action and action to dialogue.

There is another prerequisite to dialogue, and that is the recognition that compromise is not a dirty word. You see, dialogue in itself implies that no one is all right or all wrong.

If we want a meeting with the thought only of putting across *our* ideas, and, if they are not accepted, breaking up the meeting, this is not dialogue at all. When we explore ideas together, we shall have to meet somewhere, and that meeting is called compromise, and it is the only way people can live together peacefully. Honest differences can only be resolved by compromise.

More than this, when people continue in dialogue, when they, even after the crisis is past and the current problem solved, continue to meet and to talk and to think, they get to know each other, they learn to understand each other, they learn to trust each other, so that gradually they move from processes of compromise to processes of consensus.

All of this is terribly important because the stakes are so high. The stakes are the survival of democracy and freedom. There are clouds in the sky no larger than man's hands. You can see them. On the horizon there are the violent energies of youth, led or misled by anarchists and nihilists who are preaching revolution without program.

On the other horizon is the backlash and reaction to youth, to blacks, to disorder and to violence, which in the name of law and order can bring a man on horseback to power. William Shirer (and others who, like him, have studied the rise of Fascism) has warned us that unlike Germany, where a minority seized power, it is very possible that the American people will use their freedom to vote into power those who will end it.

The stakes are high. The clouds can become a whirling storm unless we are now aroused to save our freedom, and our democracy by what is at the very heart of that democracy—peaceful and reasonable dialogue.

Every time we are tempted to pick up a gun, let us remember those four who died in Kent, Ohio.

Every time we are tempted to throw a rock, let us remember those four who died in Kent, Ohio.

Every time we are tempted to call names, to use violent language, to act and react in senseless and reasonless violence, let us remember those four who died in Kent, Ohio.

Their death was caused by our fragmented society.

Let their death bring us together in a continuing, honest, peaceful and reasonable dialogue. Then they shall not have died in vain.

May God spread the tabernacle of His peace over them, and comfort their bereaved families. And may God's spirit be among us, and join with us, as we talk to each other and work with each other toward a world free of poverty, free of prejudice, free of violence, free of war. Amen

ALLIANCE COLLEGE

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to call to

the attention of my colleagues the timely and stirring address delivered by Dr. Walter L. Dworakowski, of the Polish National Alliance and chairman of the Alliance College Board of Trustees, to the 1970 graduating class on May 24.

The Polish National Alliance of the United States, an outstanding fraternal and civic organization, has proudly sponsored this institution of higher learning since 1912 when it was first established, and since that time Alliance College in Cambridge Springs, Pa., has helped many underprivileged young people to complete their college educations.

By helping these young people to obtain training in the professions and by encouraging them to take their rightful place in our society and to become productive and responsible citizens, the Alliance College is serving the vital interests of our Nation.

I want to congratulate Dr. Dworakowski, as well as the officers and members of the Polish National Alliance of the United States, for the leadership and support they have provided to Alliance College and for the part they have played in making the facilities of this institution of higher learning available to our young people.

The Polish National Alliance, whose headquarters are located in Chicago, has made a meaningful contribution to education in America, and as a Member of Congress from Chicago, I am indeed proud of this contribution.

An article which includes the commencement address follows:

DWORAKOWSKI STATES: ALLIANCE COLLEGE SERVES VITAL INTERESTS OF OUR AMERICA

CAMBRIDGE SPRINGS, PA.—Following is the text of an address delivered by the Censor of the Polish National Alliance and the Chairman of the Alliance College Board of Trustees, Dr. Walter L. Dworakowski to the 1970 graduating class on May 24:

"We are always looking to the future," states American playwright, William Hooker Gillett, "the present does not satisfy us. Our Ideal, whatever it may be, lies further on."

You, young ladies and gentlemen of the 1970 graduating class of Alliance College, are well prepared for the tasks and challenges that lie ahead of you. Here you received more personalized instructions and guidance than are possible in huge centers of mass education. Excellence in all fields of student and faculty endeavors is the guiding star of your Alma Mater.

As a liberal arts college, Alliance has taught you that the rapidly exploding technology, fragmented into many special knowledges and skills, needs humane directions, if it is to serve the total man, his cultural as well as material needs, and his environment in our modern society.

It has been said that humanities "are the language of free men" and that language has been extensively and creatively used during the past four years of your education here.

As you leave these educational facilities which were wisely provided by the Polish National Alliance pioneers 68 years ago, and among whom were, perhaps, grandparents of some of you, I would like to instill in your young hearts and imaginative minds the awareness of certain unique features of this college, that should endure the Alma Mater to you more enduringly than would the sentimental remembrance alone.

The international realities of our times are such that the balance of nuclear terror between the super-powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, minimizes the possi-

bility of a global war and concomitant atomic holocaust. However, it flaunts a new set of challenges to concerned men and women on both sides of the ideological and political division of the world. Those are not merely technological rivalries as exemplified in the conquest of outer space. Above all, those are the rivalries of cultural, spiritual and sociological nature.

Whether the humanistic precepts will prevail, or whether the Orvellian nightmare of a regimented humanity becomes a reality, this in a decisive measure depends on your generation. You are the vanguard of the 21st century.

Because the rivaling power, the Soviet Union draws much of its intellectual and technological resources from its fundamentally Slavic powerbase, it is apparent that Slavic studies are among the prerequisites for the survival of America, and thus, for the survival of the free world.

Your alma mater is unique in this respect by the virtue of its Polish-Slavic heritage, and shall become even more so, as the Department of Polish and Slavic Studies is expanded. This puts Alliance College into a historically significant position in the American education.

Why, you might ask, is Polish study so overwhelmingly important in the general program of Slavic studies?

History and geography provide the best and final answer to that question. Poland, with her millennial development as an important member of the western family of nations, and as an equally significant contributor to the development of western civilization and culture, occupies a strategic position between the West and the East. In terms of international relations, Poland is a halfway house between the cultural and ethical values we cherish and the foreign concept of totalitarianism which threatens us.

In this frame of reference, the Junior Year Abroad Program under which the first group of eleven Alliance College students will study at the six-centuries old Jagiellonian University in Krakow gains in special significance. This type of cultural exchange program is vitally important to America. It gives new dimension to the uniqueness of your Alma Mater.

As a liberal arts college, your Alma Mater is an integral part of the web of American culture. To the question as to which aspects of American culture should Alliance College seek to transmit and perpetuate—I find an eloquent and convincing answer in the statement of the Chairman of our Education and Psychology Department, Dr. Walter Smetana who in a recent position paper explained that the Polish American culture is considered part of American culture.

Thus we serve vital interest of America when instituting new relationship between Alliance College and the Jagiellonian University; when we perpetuate the mother tongue as the all important ingredient in the survival of our Polish American culture and cultural understanding with the land of our ancestry.

These special emphases do not retract in the least from the general requirements of college education. On the contrary, they immeasurably enhance this area of education and add to the Alliance College stature and uniqueness among American colleges.

These, I believe, are the particular values which should make your ties with your Alma Mater singularly rewarding and enduring.

You are standing on the threshold of future. You are the future of our nation and of America's destiny.

Remember, then, the word of American

lecturer and author, Henry Ward Beecher, who states:

"We should live for the future, and yet should find our life in the fidelities of the present; the last is the only method of the first."

BALTIC STATES

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, in 1966 we in the Congress unanimously approved House Concurrent Resolution 416, calling on then President Lyndon Johnson to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the Baltic nations and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights.

The sense of Congress remains the same, and, as we solemnly observe the 30th anniversary of the loss of freedom in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, I urge President Nixon to implement this very important resolution.

The Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States has sent to me a very thoughtful essay, "Red Terror in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia." As a proud member of the honorary committee working to aid the Baltic nations, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD this essay and a memorandum concerning the annexation of the Baltic republics by the Soviet Union:

RED TERROR IN LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA: ENSLAVEMENT OF THE BALTIC STATES BY THE SOVIETS FOR 30 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 people 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 oc-

cupations 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 seizures 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 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 extend 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 the whole or in part, any place in the world, including the Soviet Union is surely intolerable.

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING THE ANNEXATION OF THE BALTIC REPUBLICS BY THE SOVIET UNION, JUNE 1940

Thirty years ago, on June 14-16, 1940, the armed forces of the Soviet Union invaded the territories of the three independent Baltic Republics: Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. One month later, after having staged illegal "elections" in violation of the Constitutions and Electoral Laws of these three States, the Soviet authorities forcibly annexed Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania contrary to the sovereign will of their peoples.

The occupation and annexation of the three Baltic Republics by the Soviet Union thus constituted an act of aggression and a flagrant violation of numerous international treaties and agreements, as well as the inalienable rights of the Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian peoples.

The treaties and agreements violated by the Soviet Union are:

(1) *Treaty of Peace between Russia and Estonia*, signed at Tartu on February 2, 1920;

(2) *Peace Treaty between Lithuania and the Russian Socialist Federal Republic, and Protocol*, signed at Moscow on July 12, 1920;

(3) *Treaty of Peace between Latvia and Russia*, done at Moscow, completed and signed at Riga, August 11, 1920;

(4) *Treaty of Non-Aggression between the Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, signed at Moscow on September 28, 1926.

(5) *Treaty of Non-Aggression and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes between Estonia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, signed at Moscow, May 4, 1932; extended in 1934 for a term to last until December 31, 1945;

(6) *Convention for the Definition of Aggression*, signed at London, July 3, 1933, between Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Persia, and Afghanistan.

(7) *Convention between Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the Definition of Aggression*, signed at London, July 5, 1933; extended in 1933 for a term to last until April 4, 1943;

(8) *Treaty of Non-Aggression between Latvia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, signed at Riga, February 5, 1932;

(9) *General Treaty for Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy*, signed at Paris, August 27, 1928, to which 63 States are parties among them the Soviet Union and the Republics of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania;

(10) *Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes*, signed at The Hague, October 18, 1907, to which 49 States are parties among them the Soviet Union;

(11) *Convention relating to the Establishment of the Conciliation Commission and*

Conciliation Procedure between Latvia and the U.S.S.R., signed on June 18, 1932;

(12) *Mutual Assistance Pact between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Estonia*, signed on September 28, 1939;

(13) *Mutual Assistance Pact between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Latvia*, signed on October 5, 1939;

(14) *Mutual Assistance Pact between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Lithuania*, signed on October 10, 1939;

(15) *The Covenant of the League of Nations*, came into force on January 10, 1920. Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania became Members of the League on September 22, 1921 and the Soviet Union on September 18, 1934.

As the forcible incorporation of the three Baltic Republics by the Soviet Union constitutes a violation of international treaties and of generally accepted and recognized principles of international law, the Soviet regime in the three Baltic States lacks any legal basis and should be regarded only as a temporary military occupation.

The legal existence of the Republics of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania still continues despite the military occupation. Consequently, the major nations of the world, the United States included, have refused to recognize the illegal incorporation of the Baltic Republics into the Soviet Union. The diplomatic and consular representatives of these three Republics are still recognized as the only duly authorized legal representatives of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

One of the avowed aims of the United Nations has been to pursue "the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples," as expressed in the United Nations Charter and the General Assembly Resolution 1815 (XVII) of 22 December 1962. It is therefore appropriate to remind the world community today that the above principle should also be applied to the peoples of the three Baltic Republics, who were forcibly and illegally deprived of their independence and self-determination by the Soviet Union thirty years ago.

PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT THE LAND

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a resident of my district has recently called to my attention a most impressive sermon delivered on Memorial Day by the Rev. David L. Larsen of the First Evangelical Covenant Church of Rockford, Ill. Rev. Larsen choose as his theme the future of liberty in America, and made some remarks which are most timely and well taken.

Warning that "something is gnawing away at the vitals of America today" he suggested that only a genuine "spiritual renewal" can deliver us securely from our present difficulties. I commend this fine sermon to all of my colleagues in the House and include Reverend Larsen's sermon in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT THE LAND

On this Memorial Day Sunday I should like to take as our text those amazing words found in Lev. 25:10. "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." These words have had a very interesting bearing upon American history. You may recall that they are inscribed

on the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia, to be seen even this day in Independence Square in that city. Here is an ancient word, a powerful word: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

I want to talk with you about liberty, and first I should like to consider with you *liberty as the design of God*. Every 50 years the children of Israel were commanded to observe the year of Jubilee. There is no parallel in the ancient world, or in the modern world for that matter, to what the children of Israel were instructed to observe during that year of Jubilee. The entire 25th chapter of Leviticus describes what that 50th year was meant to be in the experience of the commonwealth of Israel. Every 50th year the trumpet was sounded and the year of Jubilee was observed. During that year, there was a great gathering of families. That in itself is a very interesting thing to consider. At least once every 50 years, God made provision for a great gala family reunion. The family structure was of great importance in the eyes of God and he wrote into the very calendar of his ancient people a time for the gathering together of families.

This was a year when the land rested. Here is concern about ecology many centuries ago. Indeed, every 7th year was a year when the land rested. Every 50th year would mean, at that time there were two consecutive years when the land rested. The 49th year was a Sabbath year and the 50th year was a year when the land was rested; so for two years, every 50 years, the land rested and was refurbished.

In this year of Jubilee, the land reverted in title back to its original owners. People would lose their property, but God is concerned that there continue a basic equality. God does not want too much power, economic or political, concentrated in too few hands, and every 50 years title reverted back to the original owners of the land.

Every 50th year when the trumpet was sounded, all indentured Hebrew servants or slaves were released. Anyone who had lost his liberty and had been sold in bankruptcy into servitude would be set free. Slavery was universal in the ancient world. In fact, slavery was a part of the root pattern in classical Greek and Roman civilization. Aristotle as much as said that a slave was hardly a human being. Over against this ancient attitude toward slavery is God's attitude as set forth in the year of Jubilee. God made man in his own image and gave him the power of self determination, free moral agency, free will and liberty. Every 50 years God reminded his people that man could best exercise the power of self determination as a free man.

Can you imagine what that 50th year must have meant to God's ancient people? You will find nothing like this anywhere in the ancient world. This whole concept of liberty is virtually unique in this sense to our Hebrew-Christian background, in which each man was to be accorded the dignity of his person because he was made in the image of God and was to have the right to choose his own destiny. With what anticipation and expectation the sound of that trumpet must have been awaited! "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." God has opted for liberty, and this very striking provision for emancipation and for freedom was given for those who had lost or forfeit their liberty.

Freedom and liberty are always a risk, but God chose to take that risk. Liberty is a very precarious and risky thing. It is so much safer not to grant it, to withhold it, to limit the franchise. After the Second World War there was a city in France which had just been liberated. There was to be a great celebration. Every citizen was to bring a flagon of his choicest wine and pour it into a common vat and on the day of celebra-

tion everyone would draw a flagon of wine to which he had made a contribution. The great day finally arrived, and do you know what happened? When they opened the spigot, out poured pure water. Every citizen had the same thought. Why should I bring a flagon of my choicest wine? I'll bring water and pour into the vat. No one will know the difference. They had all done that and out came water. This is the risk of freedom. This is the risk of liberty. You let people decide, do it on their own, and there are times when you regret it. Frankly I wonder if there haven't been times when God himself has regretted giving man liberty, the power of self determination, but God is all-knowing and all-wise. God said, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof". Liberty is the design of God. It is the will of God.

I want to take a second step and consider next, *Liberty as the Dream of America*. Those who came to these shores, came with a dream. The dream of those who founded this nation was a dream of liberty, to embody in our form of government, liberty under law. Abraham Lincoln alluded to this in his Gettysburg address: "Our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal". When the Pilgrim Fathers came to these shores to escape religious oppression and tyranny, they joined in the cabin of the Mayflower and formed the Mayflower Compact in which they covenanted together "to seek and to establish a kingdom for our Lord Jesus Christ". It is virtually unique in the annals of history to find a nation which in its founding documents so dedicates itself to the achievement of liberty and freedom for all of its citizens. Find me a parallel, if you can. I know of none.

Here was a nation which at its establishment dedicated itself to the achievement of liberty. This has been the American dream. The framers of the Declaration of Independence confessed their conviction when they said, "All men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness". Study the great documents of American history, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and see in them the effort to bulwark and to safeguard the liberties of our citizenry.

This has been the American dream, that in this land there would be liberty, the power of self determination, the preservation of the right of free choice. Now I would be the first to confess that this dream has been imperfect in its realization. In all honesty, we must face this fact. To our sorrow, to our shame, and to our chagrin we must recognize that there have been some very dark, dismal and dreadful chapters in our history. Some of these tragic chapters in the abridgment and denial of liberty have been written in our own time. It is a blemish and it is a blotch upon America today, that black citizens of our land who could fight for us and face death for us on the battlefield have come home and not been permitted to vote, not been shown common decency and dignity, been denied full justice under law. My friends, there is no defense for this hypocrisy and sham. Marian Anderson, that great Negro contralto came to Minneapolis a few years ago. In the hotel where she stayed, Marian Anderson was asked to ride in the freight elevator, not the passenger elevator. She was looked upon more as cargo than as a person. My heart cries when I face that kind of prejudice and bigotry and wickedness in America.

The Nisei, Japanese Americans, in the Second World War were uprooted from their homes, stripped of their possessions and shunted into concentration camps without due process of law. My friends, this has happened in our country. There are sad, tragic

and pitiful chapters which have been written in America, in this land of the free and home of the brave, in this city and in our own hearts.

But the dream of America is right! The ideal of America is right! This is what we've got to affirm in this hour. We have not succeeded in achieving the American dream of liberty, but the dream is right! The ideal is right! The desire is right! We have only to look about us in this world to see the oppression and the tyranny and the police state methods under which so many millions of our fellow human beings live today, to appreciate how greatly this land has been blessed with liberty.

These shores have represented for untold millions, not only a haven of hope, but in fact, the reality of liberty. How many have come to this land to find opportunity and hope and freedom. The Statue of Liberty has stood as a symbol of what this nation aspires to be. 3500 years ago God ordered that the trumpet should be sounded, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof", and I submit to you this morning that this has been the will of God for mankind. This has been God's will for America, and to the degree that this ideal has been embodied and experienced in this land, to that degree God has blessed this land.

I want to bring you to a third consideration: *Liberty as the dilemma of America*. Something is happening in this land we love. (Something is knawing away at the vitals of America today.) I'm not talking about dissent. However shrill and strident the voices of dissent are in our own time, this has been a part of the American tradition, and you and I have been vociferous in our dissent on more than one occasion. I'm not talking against disagreement with American policy, but I refer to something that is new and ominous and sinister, I'm referring to what is exemplified and expressed when our flag is desecrated; when draft cards are burned; when patriotism is passe; when violence is cheered and applauded by so called intellectual leaders in our land. This is what very deeply disturbs me.

As I look on our America this Memorial Day Week-end, something is happening in America. Not long ago, Dr. Arthur Shenfield, a British economist, delivered some very thought-provoking lectures at Rockford College. These lectures are entitled, "The Ideological Warfare Against Western Society," as profound an analysis of our situation today as I have recently read: Dr. Shenfield calls upon his hearers to distinguish carefully between social criticism, which has as its object the correction of our evils, and the social criticism, which has as its objective the destruction of our form of government. What so deeply disturbs this gifted analyst is the mounting crescendo of social criticism which seems to have as its objective, the destruction of our form of government. Dr. Shenfield points out that there is today an assault upon alleged evils in our system and in our society which would deprive us of our self-respect; which would deprive us of any rightful pride in our past, of any honest recognition of true achievement or attainment in America, and would take away from us the will to resist aggression.

I am deeply distressed in my heart to hear a bright intelligent young man say, "We do not want to take over the government, we want to destroy it." What is this? What is this mood in multiplied sectors of America today which would destroy and demolish our government? Our form of government with all its failures notwithstanding, has preserved on these shores for these 200 years, liberty and freedom without parallel in the world. It would certainly seem that we are now reaping the bitter harvest of 60 years of humanism in our educational institutions. We are now reaping the harvest of our pleas-

ure-mad adult immaturities, in which you and I have been implicated and involved, in the selfishness and greed for gain, which have so often characterized the adults in our society.

Nicholas Johnson of the FCC made an observation not long ago. He said the verbal impact of TV on the children of America is greater than the combined verbal impact of schools, church, neighbors and home! The average boy and girl by the time he begins first grade has already spent more hours before TV than he will spend in the college classroom. Now my friends, is it any wonder we are in trouble? That blasted boob tube; that one eyed monster; that visual alcohol constantly jamming, jabbing with its perverted value system. Too often have we let the TV be our baby sitter, plunked our children down before it and said, "Oh well," and little by little we have all absorbed the twisted system of values which relentlessly bombards the TV viewer.

It would be worth your while to read the report given by the President's Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. It points out that some of the ills we face in America today must be attributed to the unwise and injudicious use of violent entertainment media. Just what is it that we watch hour after hour? What a soul deadening, mind destroying blight. But tell that to church people today. Tell that to young people. We're enslaved and we're entrapped.

What's happening to America? What can we do in this hour? I believe that every single one of us, under God, should ask some very serious questions of himself. What kind of spiritual and moral impact is my home having on my children? That's where we've got to begin.

I know we're very few, just a handful when we think of the masses of our nation, but where can we get a handle on this situation? What can I do? What can you do? Where can we start? Liberty is the design of God and it is the dream of America, but we face a critical dilemma today. Will there be any liberty worth shouting about for your children or for mine, or will the revolution come, of which we hear so much? *What can we do?* We've got to begin with our own homes. We've got to begin with an analysis of the spiritual and moral impact which our own homes are making upon our children. Then we've got to move to our church and begin to ask, what kind of a spiritual and moral impact is our church making upon our youth? Are we scoring? Are we registering? Or are we just playing spiritual Tiddly Winks? This is an hour which must summon us to seriousness, of purpose and self-searching in our hearts.

What is developing in America today is not something we can ho-hum away. There are some very ominous and sinister signs. It is time for us to face reality, to wake up before it is too late. We cannot count on our children having the opportunity, freedom and the liberty which we have had, unless something happens to avert the spiritual disaster and debacle which hangs over us. 3500 years ago God commanded the trumpets to sound, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof"; in 1776 a bell rang in Philadelphia proclaiming liberty in this land. What is the future of that liberty? What is our hope? Will it survive?

It was 1861; it was a dark hour for America. America was at war. There was a galloping inflation. Everyone felt it. The cash outflow in the U.S. government treasury was many times the cash inflow. There was a wide spread suspicion that the poor bumbling storekeeper from Springfield was not a big enough man to help America in the hour of her tragic destiny. There was a little preacher out in Pennsylvania by the name of Wilkinson. This little preacher was burdened for America, for liberty, and for what he saw happening to the land that he loved. He wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Treas-

ury. Mr. Salmon P. Chase. He said, "Mr. Chase, I'm burdened for America; I'm praying for my country. I don't want to see it be destroyed. Somehow, we've got to bring to the attention of our country that all of our material prosperity and our whole hope must rest upon a spiritual foundation. Mr. Chase, couldn't we put some kind of a motto on our coins and on our money"? Salmon P. Chase was a Christian man and the suggestion struck a responsive chord. He took the words from the "Star Spangled Banner", "And let this be our motto, in God we trust", and shortened them to "In God We Trust". Then he ordered that this be struck on the coinage and legal tender of our country.

Fellow Christians, somehow we've got to lift this up. The foundation of our hope is spiritual renewal. Somehow your life and mine, this church, this community must lift it up—In God do we trust. There is something we can do. Let us dedicate ourselves, with God's help, to the doing of it.

Prayer: Oh God, so long ago you told your people to proclaim liberty. We love our land, this wonderful land of America. With all its weaknesses and its imperfections, we believe that it has wanted to do the right thing; it has wanted liberty. Oh God, we face dilemma as to what our future course will be and whether this country we love will move toward revolution and disaster and anarchy and chaos, or whether, trusting in God, this land will move toward liberty and freedom for all of its citizens. Help us to see, dear God, we are not inconsequential and unimportant as individuals, but that as in our hearts there should be borne by the Spirit of God a deep burden of concern and of prayer, and a dedication to these ideals and to this dream, to implement it and experience it in our own circle and in our own neighborhood and in our own community of Rockford. Oh God, bless America as she places herself in a position in which thou canst bless her. In Jesus' Name, Amen.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE IS WEAK ANSWER TO NATION'S ECONOMIC CRISIS

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's Message is totally inadequate for the economic crisis facing the Nation.

It is a weak statement which sounds so much like an echo of the remarks we used to hear from President Hoover in the late 1920's and early 1930's.

The Nation needs action—firm action—by a strong President willing to use his powers in the public interest. The appointment of vague commissions and boards on wages and prices is a dodge, an effort to hide the real issues and to avoid the hard decisions.

The people want real action to roll back interest rates, to lower prices, and stop the rising unemployment. They want something done to provide housing. A vague commission will not answer the problem.

And the President's rosy statements about the future will not answer the problems. We need action, not more words.

If the President does not think we are in a crisis, he should talk to the man who cannot find a job; a family who cannot

buy a house because of high interest rates; and the housewife who cannot stretch her weekly budget to meet the high prices of the Nixon administration.

President Nixon is fond of talking about what he inherited on the economy. Well, he inherited a near full employment economy with an unemployment figure of only 3.4 percent. Since then, the Nixon administration has run the unemployment figure to above 5 percent with more than 4 million people out of work. He inherited a housing industry that was building new homes at a rate of nearly 2 million new units a year. Since then, the Nixon high-interest policies have pushed this down to 1.2 million new units annually and the figure is expected to drop more.

RED TERROR IN LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, 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 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 non-recognition 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 83d 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 extend 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 89th Congress took a right step in the right direction by adopting House Concurrent Resolution 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.

A FORESTER LOOKS AT ECOLOGY

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, for many months now, we have been hearing much rhetoric about ecology and the environment. Fortunately, there are those who are able to define ecology in a way that is easily understood by all.

Ray Spencer, forester for the Willits Redwood Products Co. of Willits, Calif., spoke recently to students at Willits High School and I feel his words do much to "clear the air" regarding the practical aspects of ecology.

I would like to congratulate Mr. Spencer for providing us with a much needed definition in very down to earth and practical terms.

I am placing his article in the RECORD at this point with the suggestion that my colleagues take the time to read his words about what ecology, in a practical sense, really means:

FORESTER SPEAKS AT WILLITS ON ECOLOGY

Within the last year or so everyone has become aware of the words ecology and environment. Ecology is a word that has been in use for over 100 years, and means the study of living things in relation to their environment and to each other. All living things are tied to their home by a multitude of invisible strands. These strands are the various physical conditions found on the surface of the earth. They are also found in the relationship competition, co-operation and even disinterested neutrality between species living alongside one another.

In the few minutes I am here I would like to examine the ecology of a forest and the

changes that take place when a forest is logged. In a mature virgin forest we have these conditions: Most of the trees have stopped growing and are in the process of dying. Many are diseased and susceptible to attack by insects. The young trees are dominated by the older trees and grow very slowly. The actual net growth of the forest may be on the minus side when you consider the volume of trees that are falling over.

The forest is in a state of stagnation. Trees are competing for sunlight, moisture and nutrients. Competition is greatest among like species which make similar demands upon the same supply at the same time. Therefore the greatest competition is between Redwoods and Redwoods and Fir and Fir. There is less competition between trees of different species and much less between species of different form such as trees and grass or trees and brush.

However, when a tree first starts to grow there is a fierce battle between the seedling and grass for soil moisture, and in many instances the seedling will die because the grass has taken all of the available moisture. This is the reason we clear land when we hand plant. Clearing gives the seedling time enough to get its roots deep enough to get moisture before the grasses start growing.

In a mature virgin forest there are few seedlings because usually the seeds do not hit the soil but instead fall upon the forest litter and therefore, do not germinate. Most of those that do survive die because of the competition with established plants. If they do survive this early competition they are immediately competing with established trees and their rate of growth is very slow.

From our knowledge of a mature virgin forest we can make the following statements. The forest has passed its peak in a rate of growth and may even be showing a negative growth rate. The majority of the trees are over-mature and there is much rot and insect damage. There is little reproduction because of the competition from established plants. The environment has changed so that it is detrimental to the forest. And this has taken place without any interference or effort on the part of man.

Now, let's look at the forest as it is being logged. In selective logging trees are either marked for cutting or only trees above a specified diameter are to be cut. Trees that are marked are usually the largest trees in the stand, the dead and dying trees and trees that are stunted or deformed because of the competition. After the logging you have a forest that is free of the dominant trees, and the dead and diseased trees are no longer taking valuable growing space. The environment has been completely changed—and it is a change for the better as far as the trees are concerned.

There is now sufficient space for trees that have been dominated to grow. An examination of the growth rings will show a rapid increase in diameter growth. The trees are now getting sufficient light, moisture and nutrients. In a Redwood forest this increase in growth can equal the volume removed within a few years. The environment for seedlings has also improved. The soil has been cultivated by the passage of the tractors and the debris on the ground has been piled or burned.

Conditions are ideal for seed germination. Within a year or so there are hundreds of seedlings per acre. In addition the redwood stumps have sprouted, and soon there are 6 more trees growing from the stump. The ecological cycle is ready to be repeated.

WILDLIFE

Now lets see what has happened to the wildlife. The first time I walked through a mature forest I was amazed at the stillness. I did not realize for a moment that the stillness was caused by the absence of birds. One

rarely sees any squirrels or rabbits; any good hunter knows that it is useless to hunt deer in a mature forest because they are scarce. Evidently the birds and animals have moved out of the forest because of lack of food.

The birds cannot find seeds, and brush and trees that the animals eat have either died out or grown so high they cannot be reached. The animals either have to eat unpalatable species to survive or move out of the area. They usually move out and go to freshly logged area because the man-made environment is more favorable for them. There is an abundance of knocked down tan oak and madrone, stumps are sprouting tender shoots and birds have no problem finding seeds.

Most of the unfavorable criticism against logging occurs in the 10 year period immediately after logging. In order to get the logs out heavy equipment is necessary. Tractors move a lot of dirt to get to the logs. Hill-sides are crisscrossed by skid roads. There is debris left or the ground composed of tree tops, rotten logs and broken chunks. For a short while, the area sometimes looks like a battle ground. Winter rains may wash debris and soil into the creek channels and they get muddy. In some cases, no doubt, some fish are destroyed.

But it is common sense for lumber companies to keep the damage to a minimum. They do not want their valuable timber soil to end up in the ocean. Through good logging practices the damage can be kept to a minimum. The number of skid roads is reduced. Skidroads are crossditched at short intervals to reduce the runoff. Truck roads are located high enough above the creek channels so that side casting of soil will not run into the creek. Tractors are kept out of the creek. Logging debris is piled and burned.

RECOVERY

The time a forest spends recovering from the effects of logging is just a short moment in time when compared to the length of time a forest is growing. Within a few minutes drive from here there are examples of mature virgin forests that were logged and the environment changed by man. They have healed the scars of logging and presently are growing a young vigorous crop of new trees. Brooktrails which was first logged beginning about 60 years ago and relogged until 15 years ago, is but one example. Who can say that, it is not an attractive forest with plenty of wildlife living within it?

Another example is on Jackson State Forest on Highway 20. Casper Lumber Co. logged there in the early 1900's. The equipment was quite primitive and the devastation extreme. With their cable yarders they knocked down every tree. The debris was burned repeatedly. Now there is such a thick stand of young trees that it is difficult to walk through them, and the volume per acre of the present stand exceeds the volume per acre of the original stand.

In closing, while we are thinking of environment and ecology, I think it is worthwhile to remember that man is not all bad and nature is not always perfect. There are some fields where man's knowledge of ecology can improve the environment for both mankind and nature.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

HON. EARL B. RUTH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, in the span of one single hour, the House of Representatives made a decision on voting privileges that should have been made

by the States. The States and their citizens have no recourse under the House action but to accept another mandate from the Congress.

It also was most unusual for the House to accept the Senate bill on extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, H.R. 4249, which completely subordinated the legislation the House had passed. Under the guise of expediency, the traditional conference with the Senate was eliminated.

The focus of debate in that short hour was not on the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, but whether the Congress of the United States should give the voting privilege to 18-year-olds. Many strong advocates of reducing the voting age were forced to vote against the bill because of the unusual procedure, the departure from States rights, and its constitutionality.

Regardless of how one feels about lowering the voting age, the House, by passing the Senate version, ignored its history, precedents, and constitutional responsibility. State ratification, for instance, was required before women in America received the privilege to vote.

The House should have remained consistent with its legal actions of the past, and not gamble with what appears to so many as an interference to State rights and our constitutional procedure.

It is obvious that some were less concerned with consistency, precedence, and constitutional process, than with accomplishing an immediate goal.

If the U.S. Supreme Court is to be consistent with its actions of the past, then the next steps should be their's—one which declares this bill unconstitutional.

A LOADED PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Nixon finally announced his Commission on Financial Structure and Regulation.

As anyone could have predicted, the President decided that the financial community would be the best expert to study itself and to recommend changes. This is in keeping with the Nixon philosophy that every industry should regulate itself.

It appears that at least 11 of the 15 members of the Commission have close ties with banking and/or other financial interests. Commissions are questionable institutions, and they become totally worthless when they are loaded up with the industry that they are purporting to study. If a Presidential Commission has any value, it is to provide new ideas, fresh approaches, and objective analysis. It is too much to expect industry representatives to come up with an objective view of the very business on which they depend for a day-to-day livelihood.

The financial leaders the President has placed on the Commission will undoubtedly

bring the traditional views of the financial community to the Presidential study. The report that they turn out will be a rehash of existing practices and viewpoints.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal that needs to be done in the area of regulation of financial institutions and it is sad indeed that the President of the United States could not rise to the occasion in the appointment of this Commission.

Members of Congress should be on the alert for attempts by this new Commission—loaded as it is with industry representatives—to lobby for weakened regulation of banks and other financial institutions. This is a great danger.

For example, Mr. Speaker, one of the people named to the Commission Tuesday is Alan Greenspan, who was a Nixon adviser in the 1968 presidential campaign. Mr. Greenspan was involved in the now-famous Nixon letter which was secretly passed to the securities industry in the fall of 1968. The letter was intended to reassure the securities industry that they would face easier regulation if Nixon were elected President.

Mr. Greenspan's views are well-known and I suspect that they will be a dominant force within the Commission. He is President Nixon's man on the Commission. In 1968, Mr. Greenspan wrote an article entitled, "The Assault on Integrity," in which he blasted the concept of regulation and claimed that consumers are better protected without Federal regulation.

In outlining his views on regulation, Mr. Greenspan wrote:

A fly-by-night securities operator can quickly meet all the S.E.C. requirements, gain the inference of respectability, and proceed to fleece the public.

In an unregulated economy, the operator would have had to spend a number of years in reputable dealings before he could earn a position of trust sufficient to induce a number of investors to place funds with him.

Protection of the consumer by regulation is thus illusory. . . .

These remarks should be a firm indication of the direction that President Nixon plans to push his new Commission on Financial Structure and Regulation.

Amidst the many bankers on the Commission is one K. A. Randall, who is listed on the White House press release as vice chairman, United Virginia Bank-Shares, Inc., Richmond, Va. This is the same K. A. Randall who served as Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation until March of this year. Mr. Randall's government career was marked by weak regulation, poor administration, and an outlandish probank attitude. Mr. Randall constantly flew around the Nation, acting not so much as a Federal regulator as a lobbyist for the banks. He reserved some of his most bitter comments to denounce efforts to bring one-bank holding companies under regulation.

At one time, his opposition became so frenzied that he announced that he would personally go to the White House and ask President Nixon to veto the one-bank holding company bill.

Like Mr. Greenspan, Mr. Randall seems to prefer no regulation.

Mr. Nixon has probably done the Nation a favor by loading up this Commission with people from the financial community. It makes the bias of the Commission very easy to spot and I do not think that the press, the public, or the Congress will be fooled by any of the recommendations from this Commission. Mr. Nixon was not subtle in the appointments to the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the appointment of the Commission on Financial Structure and Regulation is just one more chapter in the sad history of Presidential commissions. Few Presidential commissions have served any real purpose. Most of them—with some exceptions—have been a great waste of time, not to mention a waste of taxpayers' money. They invariably come up with giant tomes which gather dust on bookshelves and contribute little.

What they do contribute is often on the negative side of the fence. Lobbying groups—just as they have on the financial commission—invariably move in, place their members on the commissions, and carefully control whatever study takes place. Sometimes the lobbying groups are able to seize on a commission report as an "objective study" to browbeat the Congress into some outlandish special interest position.

In a democracy, Presidential commissions are a questionable institution. And they often operate in a highly undemocratic manner. Few of these commissions hold public hearings. Most of them go behind closed doors, gather information from whatever industry they are claiming to study, and then issue a report.

In many cases, they bypass the democratic processes and the elected Representatives of the people. Basic changes in regulatory structure are better undertaken in the open atmosphere of congressional hearings, where witnesses representing the public and all the interested parties can appear. In this atmosphere, the public at least has a voice. If a committee of Congress reports out an outlandish piece of special interest legislation, its Members can be punished at the polls.

But these Presidential commissions—many of which try to make a quasi-legislative function—are not really accountable to anyone. The members of the commissions have no constituency save the industry which they represent. They simply fade out of existence and go back to their industry jobs, well-protected and insulated from public opinion.

Sometimes a President will use the findings of a Presidential commission in an attempt to get around the legislative processes and to quietly enact basic governmental changes through administrative edicts. It is not unknown for an administration to seize on a commission report as an excuse to issue administrative regulations through the Federal Register which bear the color of law. Many times, commission recommendations and the resulting administration regulations could not survive the legislative process of open hearings and full public disclosure.

Commissions are usually ineffective.

But when they are ineffective, they are often highly dangerous to the public interest.

In Sunday's Washington Evening Star, columnist Carl Rowan analyzes the problems created by Presidential commissions. He notes that there are at least 2,500 governmental advisory groups and interagency committees wandering around in the Federal governmental machinery. Mr. Rowan notes that:

There are not going to be any meaningful reforms until the public wakes up to the fact that it is being hoodwinked and flim-flammed with this profusion of commissions. The next time a politician avoids action on a tough problem, but promises a commission, the public ought to send in a mountain of protesting telegrams.

That just might get us back to a reasonably sane and honest use of the governmental study group.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of the full text of Mr. Rowan's column:

COMMISSIONS BECOME POLITICAL COPOUTS

(By Carl T. Rowan)

A couple of weeks ago I needed the administration for dragging its feet in naming members of a commission to deal with the vital questioning of population growth and what it means to the nation's future.

Well, the commissioners have now been named and we can all pray for the unlikely formulation of a report to which the country will pay heed.

It is not cynicism, but a look at the facts, that prompts doubt. This business of naming commissions has become the No. 1 Washington way of ducking action or avoiding political responsibility.

These political copouts not only cost taxpayers money for commissions that often are outrageously useless and unused; they also add to the pool of social bitterness and despair when they arouse hopes of action that those in power really have no intention of taking.

The National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control still has no members although it was created more than two years ago.

The Economic Opportunity Council, whose main duty is to coordinate all anti-poverty programs, hasn't met since 1967.

The National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity operated for a year with the terms of 14 of its 24 members expired. Now all 21 terms have expired.

Last Jan. 30, in his annual Economic Report to the Congress President Nixon promised to create a commission to conduct "a thorough examination of needed changes in our financial institutions and our regulatory structure."

Five months later (on June 3) Rep. Wright Patman took the floor to note that this commission finally has a chairman, "but no members, no staff, no work plan, no address, no telephone, and not even a letterhead."

Patman observed: "It appears that the President has come around to the thinking of a lot of members of the Congress that these presidential commissions are a big waste of time. If this is the case, I want to be among the first to commend the President."

If Mr. Nixon has come to that conclusion, it is a bit late. Already there are some 190 commissions, committees and councils that supposedly are advising the President. Most are not worth the paper required for typing their names.

A House subcommittee headed by Rep. John S. Monagan, D-Conn., has turned up some 2,500 governmental advisory groups and interagency committees, most of which

wouldn't be missed if they were wiped out tomorrow.

Monagan calls them "self-serving, non-representative, a device of manipulation." What happens is that if the public is up in arms about crime, or dope, or urban riots, or hunger and malnutrition, and the politicians cannot deliver on their big campaign promises, then they create commissions. On really hot issues they even call White House conferences.

Even when the result is a laudable, highly publicized report such as the Kerner Commission produced on civil disorders, the recommendations have a way of being ignored. The wise actions recommended often require more political courage than the White House occupants possess, which is why the matter got shunted to a commission in the first place.

Or, as in the last years of the Johnson administration, so much money and high-level brainpower can get diverted to a matter like the Vietnam war that no commission report gets adequate attention.

Monagan's subcommittee wants some reforms, including:

A mechanism for eliminating obsolete bodies. Some experts propose a "four year flush" in which all standing advisory commissions other than statutory ones would automatically go out of business at the end of a President's term. Any commission that had not met for a year would automatically come up for review and cancellation.

A central White House office to coordinate the work of advisory bodies, to evaluate and assimilate the reports and to disperse to departments and agencies requirements for follow-up action. This presumably would prevent works such as the Kerner Commission report from falling into oblivion even though the problems to which the report addressed itself remain critical.

But there are not going to be any meaningful reforms until the public wakes up to the fact that it is being hoodwinked and flim-flammed with this profusion of commissions. The next time a politician avoids action on a tough problem, but promises a commission, the public ought to send in a mountain of protesting telegrams.

That just might get us back to a reasonably sane and honest use of the governmental study group.

LABOR DEPARTMENT WINS AGAIN

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a recent newspaper article on the appointment of George Shultz as head of the new Office of Management and Budget said that if anyone could carry out the mandate of the new office, George Shultz was certainly that man. Similarly, I would say, if there is one man who can carry on the excellence of performance which George Shultz has brought to the Office of the Secretary of Labor, that man is Jim Hodgson.

Outgoing Secretary Shultz handled a myriad of problems in his tenure at Labor, and to quote a Wall Street Journal article, "his quiet competence led to an increasing number of assignments from the White House." He has won tributes from labor, business, Congress, and civil service career employees within his Department.

His successor as Secretary is a man

of similar strengths and ability. I have been privileged to work closely with Jim Hodgson during the past year. The talent and competence which served him so well as Under Secretary of Labor will, I know, contribute greatly to his work as Secretary.

Christopher Lydon, writing in last Friday's New York Times, has paid Jim Hodgson fine tribute and at this point in my remarks, I include Mr. Lydon's article in its entirety:

NEW LABOR SECRETARY—JAMES DAY HODGSON
(By Christopher Lydon)

WASHINGTON.—James Day Hodgson, President Nixon's choice to become the new secretary of Labor, would seem to personify the new Cabinet style: less "extra dimension" than Mr. Nixon saw in his first-round appointees, but an unusual breadth of experience and administrative talent to serve the White House's increasingly centralized policy leadership. As Under Secretary to George P. Shultz for the last year and a half, Mr. Hodgson (who pronounces his name as if it had no G) was considered the ideal No. 2 man. He was so intimately identified with his boss that sometimes he nearly disappeared.

"It's interesting," said a union official at the headquarters of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations today, "that we have no sense of Jim Hodgson the way we do of some of the Assistant Secretaries"—like W. J. Usery, the strike specialist; Arnold R. Weber, the manpower director, and Arthur A. Fletcher, who is running the "Philadelphia plan" and others like it to increase minority employment in public construction jobs.

"So we gather," the union man continued, "that Hodgson must have been the guy who was doing the inside, administrative stuff—very quietly."

"HAND IN EVERYTHING"

"He's been the general manager of the department," says one of Mr. Hodgson's colleagues. "He's had a hand in everything—the occupational safety legislation, manpower, labor negotiations, the works. He's always been ready to stand in for the Secretary on anything."

A small, trim 54-year-old who laughs easily and obviously enjoys his work, Mr. Hodgson also seems to embody the affluent good fellowship that has banished the sense of class warfare from American industrial relations.

When he left a job as vice president at the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation to join the Government last year, he brought with him Mr. Usery, the machinists' union official with whom he had fought over innumerable contracts.

Today the labor movement returned the favor. Though the Labor Department has usually been headed by union men, just as the Secretary's office in the Commerce Department has been a businessman's preserve, the A.F.L.-C.I.O. extended its congratulations to Mr. Hodgson and the machinists "breathed a sigh of relief."

As industrial relations director of Lockheed, Mr. Hodgson had made an enviable record in collective bargaining as a straight-shooting management man," the machinist said. "We have no reason to believe that as President Nixon's new Secretary of Labor he will do anything to change that image."

Mr. Hodgson was born on December 3, 1915, in Dawson, Minn., ("and that's nowhere, believe me"), where his father ran a chain of lumber yards and where Mr. Hodgson still owns 160 acres of diversified farm land.

He attended the University of Minnesota at the time when former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey and Eric Sevareid, the television commentator, were leading campus

rebels. After graduation in 1938, he answered Gov. Harold E. Stassen's call to work on employment problems in state government.

In 1941 he joined Lockheed in Los Angeles as a personnel clerk. With the exception of three World War II years as a Navy intelligence officer in the Pacific, he was with Lockheed even after—for the last six years as the man directly responsible for relations with the aerospace company's 100,000 employees.

Lockheed was one of the first big corporations to make a concerted effort at hiring and training the hard-core unemployed in the early 1960's. Mr. Hodgson also identifies himself proudly with Lockheed's every man a capitalist program, in which the company puts up 50 cents for every dollar that workers salt away in savings or stocks.

LEADING JOB AT LOCKHEED

The plan is popular and the workers' fund at Lockheed, which Mr. Hodgson calls "a versatile cushion for retirement or any kind of adversity," now totals more than \$100 million.

Like Mr. Shultz, Mr. Hodgson believes in minimal government interference in union activities and bargaining. He is not expected to be easily excited to action by strikes and strike threats, and he does not believe in "jawboning" wages and prices.

Mr. Hodgson, the father of a married daughter and college-age son, is married to the former Maria Denand.

He gets less time than he wishes for golf, though he played one close round with George Meany, the AFL-CIO president, last summer and will renew the competition this summer. His principal diversion these days is reading: Huxley, Waugh and C. P. Snow for novels; Lionel Trilling and Edmund Fuller for criticism; and, at the moment, A. A. Berle on "power."

PETITIONS SIGNED BY MANATEE COUNTY CITIZENS IN OPPOSITION TO FORCED BUSING BROUGHT TO ATTENTION OF HOUSE

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, few issues in recent years have elicited the mass public outcry that has accompanied the issue of forced busing of schoolchildren. In Manatee County, Fla., citizens have manifested their opposition to compulsory busing by exercising their constitutionally guaranteed right of petitioning their government for a redress of grievances. Thousands of Manatee County citizens have affixed their signatures to resolutions calling for relief from unjust, unwise, and in my judgment unlawful court ordered busing for the sake of balancing.

Because these citizens have a right to have their views made known to their elected representatives, I have today filed these petitions with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The first of these petitions is in the form of a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Bradenton, Fla., Manatee County. This resolution bore the signatures of 25,600 citizens and is placed in the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION No. 70-15

Whereas, the City Council of the City of Bradenton, Florida, considers itself to be ob-

ligated to take a position on the matter of the busing of Manatee County schoolchildren as required by order of the United States District Court, Middle District of Florida, dated January 29, 1970, and

Whereas, the City Council believes that although the said Court stated that the order dated January 29, 1970, was intended to eliminate the dual system of schools in Manatee County and provide a "unitary system" of schools still it is evident that said order, in practical application, is compulsory busing to achieve racial balance. It is clear that the Court with the avowed purpose of providing an equal education for all students has, instead, attempted to engineer the legal requirement of a unitary school system into the accomplishment of certain social goals, and

Whereas, it is abundantly clear, from recent events, that the Court's attempt to cure certain social ills through the implementation of a planned busing of students has had a boomerang effect and rather than curing these ills has, in fact, made them worse, and

Whereas, the implementation of the above referred to court order will increase the transportation budget of the Manatee County school system by an estimated 35% at a time when our school system budget because of a shortage of classroom space, increased teacher workload and student rapid growth rate, can simply not afford it, and

Whereas, the City Council believes the busing of students is of absolutely no educational benefit.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the city council of the city of Bradenton, Florida

That the City Council of Bradenton, Florida, is opposed to the busing of students as ordered by the United States District Court, Middle District of Florida on January 29, 1970 and requests that the United States Congress and the President of the United States of America make every effort to relieve the citizens of Manatee County, Florida, of the unjust and unwise burden of compulsory busing of students as required by said Court order.

Resolved in regular session this 22nd day of April, A.D., 1970.

Attest:

Mayor.

City Clerk.

The second petition, bearing the signatures of 21,000 citizens, is placed in the RECORD at this point:

We, members of the PTA (Parent-Teachers Association) and citizens of Manatee County, Florida,

Because we feel that forced busing solely for the purpose of racial balance is not the method by which we should attempt to solve the desegregation problem, and

Because it is not a constructive approach to today's social and educational dilemma, and

Because it creates a tremendous unnecessary financial burden to be borne by taxpayers, and

Because we feel it is necessary and desirable to retain neighborhood elementary schools for all children, and

Although greatly opposed, we are in compliance with court order and making every effort to assure the best educational program in spite of the great disturbance caused by this order, we, therefore,

Urge you to find a better method for bringing about a unitary school system which respects the rights of all Americans, retains neighborhood elementary schools, and prevents cross-busing solely to achieve racial balance.

Mr. Speaker, I share the concern in this matter expressed by these citizens of

Florida. As author of the antibusing amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, I have long been concerned over confusing, often contradictory interpretations of that provision by some of our courts that have been contrary to the intent of the amendment. As a result, I have intervened in a number of school desegregation cases originating in my home State of Florida as well as in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg case. It will continue to be my intention to go all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court in hopes of getting this issue resolved consistent with the intent of Congress in passing the antibusing amendment.

UNDERSTANDING THE WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the May 9 issue of the Armed Forces Journal carried an excellent treatment of the war in Southeast Asia, which systematically dispels much of the confusion associated with this subject. As pointed out by its author, Lt. Col. Vincent R. Tocci, deputy special assistant for Southeast Asia in the Defense Department's Public Affairs Office, there is hardly any way to compare the Vietnam war with any other war in U.S. history. Unlike the two world wars and the Korean war, there is no front to simplify military operations. In Vietnam, the front happens to be in the direction one is facing at a given moment. Also, fighting is but one aspect of this unique conflict. Unlike other wars, the cultural and social aspects of Vietnamese life and the geographical area come into play, not to mention economics and politics. Add to this the enemy's use of terrorism, propaganda, indirect tactics, and supply techniques. And if that were not enough, consider an amorphous second front here in the United States with U.S. politics, radical groups, and American social ills complicating still further the issue.

If the issue of Vietnam were less serious and costly, one might not blame some citizens for resorting to generalities and clichés when discussing this subject. The complexities involved are overwhelming and few have the time, effort, and inclination to really master the Vietnam paradox. Not so with Colonel Tocci, however. Having served in Vietnam and presently supplying information to the public on Southeast Asia, he is familiar with the questions and can give the answers to the many aspects of the war which trouble the public.

To further disseminate this very useful account of the Southeast Asian war, I am inserting at this point "Understanding the War in SEA," by Lt. Col. Vincent R. Tocci, with a short biography of its author:

VINCE TOCCI: DoD'S NIGHT OPERATOR

At 1:30 A.M. the morning after President Nixon's 30 April speech on Cambodia, we

called the Pentagon Public Affairs office to check out Vietnam casualty figures for the editorial in our 1 May "Extra." We shouldn't have been surprised when Vince Tocci answered the phone. He refuses to talk about the hours he puts in as Deputy Special Assistant for Southeast Asia in DoD's Public Affairs office, but veterans of the Pentagon press who've covered the Vietnam War will testify that they're long ones—even when operations are "normal."

Lt. Col. Vince Tocci served in Vietnam from May 1966 to May 1967, first as Air Briefer for MACV and, toward the end of his Southeast Asia tour, as Chief of Combat News for 7th Air Force. Since November 1968 he's held down one of the Pentagon's most important (and thankless) jobs: trying to satisfy the press' insatiable demand for statistical reports on U.S. achievements in Vietnam, when all the statistics really tell is how much EFFORT is involved.

His job gives Vince Tocci a unique feel for the questions that really bother Americans about this war. We happen to think he's got some good answers. And he lays them out here in a commentary we're proud to print in *The JOURNAL*. This is NOT a DoD "propaganda plant"; when we heard that Vince Tocci had spelled out his perspective on our progress in Vietnam, his understanding of the war, WE asked HIM to let *The JOURNAL* print it.

Vince Tocci—an Air Force lieutenant colonel—spent most of WWII in an Army uniform, as an enlisted (T-5) medical technician aboard the hospital ship USAHS DOGWOOD in the Pacific. He got his Air Force commission in 1948 from Duquesne University, where in 1949 he earned the first of his two Bachelor's degrees—one in pre-med biology and one in education. Tocci earned his Master's at Duquesne in 1954, and has finished all requirements for his PhD from the University of Arizona except for his dissertation.

He's seen a lot of Asia, having been recalled for the Korean War in 1951. He's one of the founders of the Air Force's Equestrian Team, set up at Randolph Field in 1952, and of its aquatic survival program (Randolph, 1951-1954). He's also one of the few guys we've met who understands what's really happening in Southeast Asia—which is why we asked him to let us print his Vietnam commentary on these pages.

UNDERSTANDING THE WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA (By Lt. Col. Vincent R. Tocci)

A GI returning from Vietnam is struck by how often he is asked two simple questions about the war. First, "Are we winning?" And second, "When will the war be over?" The more he hears these questions the more he realizes the questioners probably do not understand the war.

There are good answers to these questions, but unfortunately they do not relate to the simple "win-lose" frame of reference held by so many Americans which was developed during World War II and the Korean War. There is hardly any way to compare the Vietnam War with any other war in U.S. history.

Thus, results expected by a person using the outmoded World War II frame of reference often fail to materialize. Somehow all the nice easy solutions get mixed up and confused.

"Whose fault is it?" "Why can't we win?" "Why don't the Vietnamese fight for their own freedom?" These and many similar questions cry for simple answers.

Unfortunately, there are none. Only complex, involved relationships can be presented in reply. But then, who really wants to listen? It's easier to sprinkle a vocabulary with clichés which seem to tell all—and which explain nothing.

It would be good for all Americans to

stand back and look in an honest perspective at what is being presented about the Vietnam War. But to do so the viewer must first develop a new frame of reference.

A VIETNAM PRIMER WOULD HELP

If there were a primer it would help. None exists. The only alternative is to try to develop one.

Where to begin? Start at the front.

In this war, however, there is no "front." The "front" in Vietnam happens to be in the direction you are facing at the moment. This unusual concept is not fully understood.

One young officer on his arrival in Vietnam couldn't seem to understand this fact. His simple, impatient suggestion was, "Let's get all our troops to line up across the southern tip of Vietnam and march north to the DMZ." He soon learned that guerrilla warfare defies such a tactic.

He also had to learn that fighting is only one part of the conflict. Deeply rooted in every phase of the action are the cultural and social aspects of Vietnamese life. Further complicating the situation is that in each geographical area these aspects can differ greatly.

If this were not confusing enough, the young officer had to bring economics, politics, terrain, and many other factors into his perspective. Then he had to add the enemy's use of terrorism, propaganda, indirect tactics, and supply techniques to the picture. Perhaps in his years' tour of Vietnam—if he applies himself—he will begin to grasp some of the complexities. But long after he returns to the United States he will continue to learn about the added effects of Paris Peace Talks, U.S. politics, moratoria, and American social ills. Is it any wonder he sought a simple solution? Who wants to fight a war without clear and simple objectives?

In World War II everyone was well aware that when the Allies took Berlin and Tokyo the war would be over. The enemy's command structure—a formal and centralized organization—would be rendered inoperable. These were clear, simple objectives. Americans could follow the war's progress on a map. They willingly provided the resources required to destroy the forces of totalitarianism and bring peace to the world.

But in Vietnam the Viet Cong have no capital and no sovereign territory. The United States has even stated that it does not wish to destroy North Vietnam or force any change on the Hanoi government, which has fomented and supported Viet Cong's fluid, guerrilla activity in the south from the very start.

CONFUSION ON OBJECTIVES, TACTICS, COSTS, AND PRIORITIES

These are enormous differences. The World War II framework and the Vietnam War's "non-framework" have caused corresponding confusion about U.S. objectives, tactics, costs, and priorities. The untangling process seems to be too time-consuming for the busy American.

As a result most Americans find it easier to revert to clichés about the war rather than trying to understand its complexities. They speak in generalities and often draw distorted conclusions. Like the young officer, some Americans oversimplify the problems. Commonly, the solution shouted is, "Get out of Vietnam now." Such oversimplifications are faulty and potentially disastrous. They only add to the confusion.

Particularly confusing is the use of statistics to describe the war. The Vietnam war has been so over-quantified that it has become a war of numbers instead of a war of people.

HOW MANY HOW MANYS?

There are statistics on nearly every conceivable activity in the war. How many indirect attacks? How many fish? How much

rice? How many weapons? How many deserters? How many bars? It's a wonder someone doesn't ask, "How many how many's are kept?" The real question is, "What does it all mean?"

Ah, but never mind what it means, it really must be important for the layman to know body count, in-country troop strength, total B-52 missions, pounds of jet fuel transferred, battalion days of operation, piaster exchange, tons of rice captured, and infiltration rates.

It is important if it fits into a proper context. In the *wrong* framework these statistics are practically worthless. Unfortunately, statistics have become ends in themselves rather than substantive items which help to explain or clarify the situation. The wrong framework—oversimplified and overquantified—will not clarify this problem. For its part, the U.S. government, while keeping the American public apprised of all these numbers, has probably added to the confusion.

A WAR OF PEOPLE, NOT TERRITORY

What is needed is a new device for measuring progress in a guerrilla war. The measuring devices currently in use do not really measure progress in a war of insurgency. This is a war of people, not of territory.

To cite some examples, in World War II an offensive operation resulted in miles of enemy-held territory coming under Allied control. In Vietnam an offensive sweep may result in a hill being taken or a fortified jungle patch being overrun. It does not necessarily mean that the enemy has been removed from the area. In fact, more likely, the troops conducting the sweep must abandon the territory in search of other enemy build-ups. Later the enemy forces re-infiltrate the area and another sweep must be initiated to inhibit the enemy build-up.

Another example lies in the number of air sorties flown per day—B-52s for instance. In World War II great numbers of sorties over Hamburg, Berlin, or Ploesti meant strategic deterioration of the enemy's capacity and will to wage war. Today B-52 missions are limited in part by the type of target they are assigned to hit. It is difficult to assess the value of a bombing mission on a storage area or troop concentration in a triple canopy jungle in terms of accomplishment.

This is not to say that combat operations and air sorties are ineffective. They certainly are effective—but not in the same historical context as we have known them.

MEASURING EFFORT, NOT ACHIEVEMENT

The statistics reported to date have been measuring U.S. effort and not U.S. achievement. As the U.S. effort increased, the public expected a corresponding advancement toward victory and pace. Since there is no measurement of achievement the public cannot see the progress. As a result, the war appears to some people to be a hopeless quagmire.

Conversely, the enemy gets all the credit. In spite of the enormous military effort against them they continue to exist. Ergo: The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese are victorious. Some people actually believe this fantasy. Some go so far as to claim that the U.S. forces are immoral, illegal, and have lost the war.

WHAT MORE CAN A NATION ASK?

This is an amazing situation. The enemy—which has never had a substantial military victory—uses its propaganda voice, limited-value indirect shelling attacks, and deliberate terrorism to become heroes and victors to many Americans. In the minds of those who accept frustration without illumination, the only answer is to abandon Vietnam—now. In their hopelessness they do not seek or recognize the hard-earned achievements of the unsung team of civilians and military which has limited a war, maintained free-

dom, helped to build a nation in the midst of a war, and defeated an insidious enemy in every major military action. What more can a nation ask of its fighting men? A better question: what can these men ask of the nation?

They might ask the American people to measure the enemy's achievements. Is one of the Communist achievements the more than 600,000 dead they have sustained in South Vietnam or the innumerable wounded who are never heard of? Perhaps it's the more than 140,000 "returnees" who have defected from the Communist ranks to join the side of the South Vietnamese government. Maybe it's the size of the population which the Viet Cong control—now less than 3% of the nation's total population.

The Viet Cong and North Vietnamese killing of more than 26,000 South Vietnamese civilians in deliberate acts of terror to coerce people into supporting (or at least not opposing) them is an achievement of sorts. Some might say that indiscriminate lobbing of shells at a population center some six miles away and then fleeing is an achievement. Don't the headlines read, "Enemy Launches 35 Attacks"? That proves they achieve—and if they hit anything it becomes a major victory.

WHAT ABOUT TET?

"Well," one might ask, "What about Tet of 1968? Wasn't that a Viet Cong victory?" Yes, what about the Communist Tet offensive of 1968?

The Viet Cong and North Vietnamese won no military victories. They achieved none of their stated objectives. They failed to hold any major population center, any province, any district capital. (In fact, since the Americans arrived in Vietnam in strength the enemy has never held one of these.)

In the three-week period of the Tet offensive, more than 43,000 Communist troops were killed—a staggering total.

The Army of the Republic of Vietnam did not surrender, defect, or flee as the Communists had anticipated. Instead, they stood and fought, and have been credited with about half the enemy killed.

The South Vietnamese people *did not* welcome their so-called Communist liberators. They fought back, organized their efforts, rallied to protect their homes, and began a period of sustained action against the aggressors. Americans should ask again, "What are the enemy's achievements?"

CAMBODIA AND LAOS

Recent overt North Vietnamese military activity in Cambodia and Laos clearly spotlights the scope of North Vietnamese aggression in Southeast Asia and belied the claim that the war in Vietnam is a "civil war." The 67,000 North Vietnamese ground combat troops in Laos prove their intent to expand their control in spite of their international agreements or pledge to respect the neutrality of their neighbors. The North Vietnamese and their supporters would have the world believe the Plain of Jars is a picnic area and their trucks on the Ho Chi Minh Trail are out for a Sunday drive.

The presence of thousands of Communist military forces in Cambodia, so often denied by the North Vietnamese, recently led to the ouster of Prince Sihanouk and the demand that the troops leave Cambodian soil.

In a speech in June 1969 Prince Sihanouk—then Cambodia's Chief of State—said Viet Cong forces were "now present everywhere" in Svay Rieng Province, which borders on South Vietnam. He said he had asked the NLF to sign a "promise" that the Viet Cong would withdraw from Cambodian territory "as soon as possible." Sihanouk said: "The Viet Cong have signed, pledging strict respect for Khmer territory, saying that their presence here has been due to the fact that they had lost their way and promising that once peace has been restored over there, they

will no longer dare to stay on Khmer territory but will leave immediately. That is what their Ambassador has put down in writing." He added, however, that he did not fully trust the written pledge.

The Communist forces have now been exposed as both Viet Cong and North Vietnamese. They use base camps and sanctuaries in Cambodia to support their aggression in South Vietnam and to build a Communist insurgency in Cambodia itself. To restore peace to this troubled area would require only the withdrawal of Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops. But then, there would have been no carnage in that area in the first place if the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese had not been there. Perhaps their violation of Cambodian neutrality is rated as another of their notorious achievements.

THE POW ISSUE

Probably the crowning achievement of all is the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong treatment of prisoners of war. The North Vietnamese signed the Geneva Agreements on the Treatment of Prisoners, which gave them the aura of being a civilized nation. But their barbaric violation of this humane protocol identifies the levels they will probe for "victory." The North Vietnamese tactic of surreptitiously releasing the names of prisoners to members of U.S. peace groups is in keeping with their willingness to exploit these helpless prisoners and their families for propaganda purposes. Such is the high-point of their "humanitarian" achievements.

THE ALLIED TRACK RECORD

Allied forces in Vietnam, on the other hand, can claim many achievements. First, the Communists have not crushed the Republic of Vietnam and taken over, as they have been attempting to do since 1954. This has always been their stated objective. (Communist incursions into the rest of Southeast Asia have also been thwarted or inhibited. Because of the American presence in Vietnam, the Domino Theory has not had a chance to operate—but the other free nations of Southeast Asia have.)

The Republic of Vietnam has developed a democratic, constitutional government—far more democratic than anything the Viet Cong would permit, and possibly the most democratic in Southeast Asia.

The Republic of Vietnam has held both national and local elections in full view of the world press and U.S. legislators. In the 1969 local elections more than 92% of the villages and hamlets elected their own officials. More than 80% of the eligible voters voted, despite threats of reprisals by the Viet Cong. Conversely, the Viet Cong have never conducted free elections for their so-called Provisional Revolutionary Government.

The Government of South Vietnam has called for free elections, to include the members of the Viet Cong and to be held under international control, to determine the destiny of the people of South Vietnam.

The Communists refuse even to discuss an election—yet somehow manage to claim that the people support them.

In 1955 nearly a million North Vietnamese fled to South Vietnam to escape the "benevolence" of Ho Chi Minh. If these North Vietnamese in the South were to call for an internationally controlled, free election in North Vietnam, would the Communists permit it?

Yet, when the Communist leaders even hint at a willingness to accept a "coalition" government in South Vietnam, they quickly find supporters in the United States.

Indeed, there are many more achievements by Allied forces in Vietnam. Education has been advanced throughout the country. In 1954 there were only 401,000 elementary school students in both North and South Vietnam. By the end of 1969 there were more than 2.3-million elementary school students

in South Vietnam *alone*. This is better than 80% of the school age population. Corresponding advances have been made at the secondary, technical, and collegiate levels.

In agriculture the progress has been considerable. Unlike other wars, there is no mass starvation in Vietnam. Production of rice, vegetables, hogs, chickens, and fish has increased. With this year's IR-8 (Miracle Rice) crops harvested, the government of Vietnam expects to wipe out a million-ton rice deficit caused by the disruptions of war.

Roads, railroads, airfields, waterways, ports, communications facilities, and markets are continuously improving—all in the midst of war. After WWII leveled much of Europe, the United States returned with the Marshall Plan to put it on its feet again. After the surrender of Japan the United States helped to rebuild a bombed-out industrial empire. In Vietnam the United States again is developing a war-torn country—and in the very midst of the war.

The Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam are developing and improving. More than one out of every nine Vietnamese is bearing arms. The People's Self-Defense Force now has more than 3-million "home guard" members to add to the 1.2-million regular, territorial, and irregular forces. Would an unpopular government dare to arm so many of its people?

The Vietnamese have been fighting for their freedom for more than 20 years. Since 1960 they have lost more than 100,000 men killed in action. Their wounded far exceed that number. Hardly a family exists in the Republic of Vietnam which hasn't lost someone in combat. This represents a solemn commitment. There is no doubt that the people value peace—but they are paying with their lives for the greater values of freedom.

The present Vietnamese Constitution is about two years old. The nation has known democracy and freedom for only a few years. They have paid heavily for it. Can anyone logically expect more of them in so short a time and under such conditions?

Most men and women who have served in Vietnam understand the difficulty of the task. They see it up close, not as casual observers comfortably isolated from the problems. They know it is a far cry from a glibly spoken theory of solution to actually putting it into practice.

WHAT THE COMMUNISTS HOPE FOR

The Communists recognized long ago that they could not achieve their goals militarily in Vietnam. Their *only* hope is to convince enough Americans that there is a hopeless quagmire in Vietnam, a stalemate which will create continued dissension in the U.S. Hanoi hopes Americans will so concern themselves with internal problems that—seeing no personal threat to their homes—Americans would press for immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces.

The withdrawal syndrome has great precedent in the eyes of Ho Chi Minh's cohorts. After Dien Bien Phu didn't the French give up in Paris and call their troops home? Why not the Americans, too?

Although the same psychology that affected the French has influenced a large number of Americans, there are subtle differences in the conditions.

First, the French never intended to give up their colonial hold in Vietnam. *The Americans never intended to remain.* The Viet Minh were fighting the French and a small element of Indo-Chinese who supported them. Their Communist cause was easily disguised by the nationalistic fervor of the people.

Today, although they claim the Americans are in Vietnam to replace the imperialist French, the Viet Cong are more easily recognized for what they are—Vietnamese Communists. The Communists must dominate the Vietnamese people in South Vietnam to win.

Recognizing this key fact—and realizing that freedom is ultimately the responsibility of those who seek it—the United States embarked on the program of Vietnamization. In this program the United States would not make the unconscionable and potentially disastrous error of abandoning its solemn commitment to Vietnam and its other Asian allies. Instead, the U.S. is preparing the Vietnamese to defend themselves from Communist aggression.

In this program emphasis is placed on training and equipping the Vietnamese. As they increase their capability and assume a stronger defensive posture, the United States redeploys its troops. More than 115,500 Americans have departed Vietnam in less than a year; more will follow as the Vietnamese problem becomes fact.

VIETNAMIZATION

But first it will take time. Training, equipping, and building an experienced fighting team is not an overnight project. And second, since this is a war for people, progress must include many non-military aspects. Economic, social, and internal security development must advance along with the military. And third, the Communists must disrupt the Vietnamization of the war or find themselves without popular support and facing a strong all-Vietnamese armed force capable of protecting its own people's freedom. The attempts at disruption may cause temporary slowdowns in the Vietnamization process.

Vietnamization combines the best elements of U.S. involvement with Vietnamese aspirations. The end result, given time for implementation, is in keeping with the American commitment and position as a responsible leader in the Free World.

American troops in Vietnam have had to adapt to a completely different concept of fighting. Even the most strident opponent of the war admits that these are the best troops in U.S. military history, young men who see the war as it really is, sharing the dangers and fatigue of combat while fighting the enemy in all areas. They know what it's like to split up into five- or 10-man groups and live in a Vietnamese hamlet. They know what it's like to help people defend their hamlet, build sanitation facilities, learn to communicate, improve health conditions, bury their dead, and struggle toward freedom.

A lot of publicity is given to the four to five thousand draft dodgers who have fled to Canada. Television programs follow the 300-odd deserters who have defected to Sweden. But somehow the story of the 13-man Marine Combined Action Platoon rarely gets told.

These young volunteers live in Vietnamese hamlets, isolated from other Marine units, and actively help the Vietnamese in the countryside. The language and cultural gaps are wide, but they are spanned by the platoon's achievements.

About 2.5-million American military personnel have served in the Vietnam war. Their good deeds seldom rate a line of publicity. Atrocity stories may be "hot" news—but in no way are they indicative of the actions of today's G.I.

There are many indices of the Vietnam War which never get examined publicly. These are the day-to-day tasks, difficult and dangerous—but rarely glamorous. The men who perform them get neither headlines nor much thanks. They work and fight and build. Some die. How can their achievements be measured?

It takes three months to build a school. The Vietcong can destroy it in three minutes. But still the Vietnamese, with our assistance, build. There must be some way to include such hard-earned progress in measuring achievement. How much is a year of freedom worth?

By almost any yardstick, Allied forces are making progress. They are attaining their objectives. It's a slow and difficult process full of pitfalls, some errors, and many lessons learned.

The war will be over when the Communists recognize that they cannot dominate the people of South Vietnam, or it will be over when the Communists succeed in subjugating the people of South Vietnam as they did those in North Vietnam. In either case the Communists, unfortunately, retain these options.

Regardless of the outcome, the United States has played a vital role in the lives of some 17-million people in Vietnam. Millions more in Asia and throughout the world are watching to see the result.

GET OUT OF VIETNAM NOW

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, another powerful moderate voice now has been joined with those of us who call for immediate termination of this Nation's tragic adventurism in Southeast Asia.

In a strong and direct editorial on June 7, the Los Angeles Times bluntly said:

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

Of course, I agree, and I applaud the Times for taking this important step. And, rather than just echoing the many points brought out in the editorial, I would now like to insert it in the RECORD, and I highly recommend that it be given very serious attention:

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 7, 1970]

GET OUT OF VIETNAM NOW

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

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

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

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

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

NOT THE CENTER RING

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

All questions of American foreign policy are subordinate to the central one, which is to prevent nuclear war between the two super-powers. We shall be engaged against

the Communist world one way or another all our lives; but in Southeast Asia we are engaged on the periphery of that world in a battle obscured by the elements of civil war and Vietnamese nationalism.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

JOB CAN BE BETTER DONE

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

He has promised a withdrawal of American combat troops—another 150,000 by next May 1—but the withdrawal in these summer months has been reduced and after the 150,000 leave there will still be 248,000 troops left in Vietnam. If Mr. Nixon has a private schedule for their withdrawal he has not revealed it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

can reasonably be expected to do for Vietnam.

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

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

THE TIME IS NOW

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

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

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

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

IMMEDIATE DEPARTURE

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

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

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

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

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

EULOGY TO HENRY ZIPPER, FRIEND AND OUTSTANDING CITIZEN OF NEW YORK

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the sudden death of a very close friend and an outstanding citizen of my city and congressional

district in the Bronx. Mr. Henry Zipper of 140 Donizetti Place, passed away on Monday, June 15, 1970, only a few short hours after I had the pleasure of his company.

Henry leaves a deep void in the lives of those who knew him. He was the epitome of dedication to community and country, and he did much more for his fellow man in his own way than should be expected from a devoted husband, father and public servant.

For most of his adult life, he was an efficient and highly respected supervisory employee in a large municipal agency in New York City. After retirement, his devotion to community affairs caused him to continue to strive for a better world through the exercise of the democratic political process. His time and effects were unselfishly given to a broad spectrum of good causes. His sincere concern for the well-being of his neighbors and friends was an inspiration to those of us who labor in the public interest.

Henry Zipper was a gentleman and a friend to many of us who will sorely miss him but long remember his affect on our daily lives. All of us who were privileged to share his abundant charm and affection are saddened by his sudden death.

To his wife and daughter, I offer my own personal expression of sympathy as well as the fervent prayers of a grateful community.

MUST THE "QUEEN" RETIRE?

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star which urges that the *Delta Queen* riverboat, which still plies the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers be exempted from Federal Safety and Sea regulations.

As a sponsor of legislation which would exempt this picturesque stern-wheel vessel from safety at sea regulations, I am pleased that the Indianapolis Star has joined in this effort.

The editorial reads as follows:

MUST THE "QUEEN" RETIRE?

The *Delta Queen*, paddle steamer which carries pleasure-seekers on nostalgic cruises up and down the Ohio River, is doomed unless Congress comes to her rescue.

The problem is the Safety at Sea Law, which includes stringent regulations for cruise ships flying the American flag or taking on passengers at American ports. Because she has overnight accommodations the *Queen* somehow comes under these rules for safety at sea, although she never sees the sea. In fact, her defenders say, she never ventures more than 30 seconds from shore.

In 1968 Congress found justification for exempting the *Delta Queen* from the regulations for two years. If she has been safe enough to ply the waters of the Ohio these last two years, why isn't she safe enough to go on doing so? There are bills before Congress to exempt her permanently, but so far there is no action on them.

The *Delta Queen* is a charming vestige of an era in which travel was at a leisurely and

tranquil pace that now seems almost beyond understanding. A voyage aboard her is an opportunity to recapture a bit of the relaxation of that bygone day. That this is something people want is attested by the fact that she is booked up long in advance.

We hope Congress can see the sense of holding the *Queen* only to the requirements of the river and not to those of the open sea.

DISASTERS BEFALLING WILDLIFE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by Mr. Gene A. Hill, a distinguished conservationist and writer. It is a sad allegorical chronicle of disasters befalling wildlife on this continent because of man's depredations.

PARTING SHOT

(By Gene A. Hill)

It was the kind of day you'd expect for a funeral. The northeast wind was grizzled with rain and heavy grey clouds lumbered about the sky so dismally that the mere memory of sunshine seemed absurd. But, all the animals that could get there, were there. They clustered into small groups more or less according to age, like humans do, while waiting for the hearse. Some wandered reflectively around the graveyard staring at the various headstones and the stone vaults. They stood before the marker of the passenger pigeon a minute or two and then passed by the crypt of the woods bison, where some of the larger ones, like the timber wolf and the grizzly, lingered. A few of the birds who had come a long way—the whooping crane from Texas and the condor and brown pelican from California chatted softly near a tilted headstone that marked the remains of the heath hen.

Some of the bolder ones stole glances at the pelican and the condor, both of whom bore the telltale look. Their feathers were dull and wispy and they hung their heads a bit more than you'd expect from just the fatigue of such a long journey. The pelican still had traces of crude oil along the bottom of his pouched beak; now and then he absent-mindedly wiped at it with his wing but merely succeeded in smearing it around. One of the alligators who had come from the Everglades stared at them so intently it verged on rudeness, but curiously no one seemed to care.

Some of the smaller birds, like the woodcock and the kingfisher, started the old rumor again about a cure for DDT, but few paid any attention except for the loons and the mergansers, who were largely just looking for someone to talk to anyway.

As usual much of the conversation centered about those who couldn't come. The clams, the Atlantic salmon, the shad who, up until recently, had attended all the funerals.

The bald eagle began to complain about the upper air, coughing every so often, to punctuate his remarks. And, inevitably the conversation turned to the Great Lakes, the Hudson River, the Delaware, California beaches, several of the great southern swamps and the Canadian prairies. The ducks, who travelled a great deal and usually tried to dominate the talk, did no more than nod in agreement until the end when a hen redhead told about the experience her neighbors were having with lead poisoning, and her own problems about not being able

to find a place to raise her family last summer.

But few were really paying close attention. They had heard it all before and stood around staring into the distance and now and then cocking an ear or turning toward the road where they expected any minute, to see the hearse.

As they waited the wind began to freshen and the familiar acrid odor of sulphur drifted over them from a distant pulp mill. In the same tones that they had used in dredging their memories about the days of fresh water and succulent grasses the talk wove around the old homes they had known. Redwoods, the towering fork of the American elm and the soft cool shade of the sheltering chestnut in summers too long past. Some even remembered the singular mast-filled forests of the huge white pines. Others, the black cypress and the waterbirds murmured about the ebb and flow of the tidal eelgrass. Near the grave of the masked quail a pair of prairie chickens reminisced about the old farm hedgerows and the harvests before the time of the machines.

The grizzly, impatient with all this doleful chatter, began to aimlessly rake through some heavy tufts of grass in hopes of finding a mouse for a tidbit, but stopped when he heard an owl clattering his beak at him for being so silly as to have forgotten what happened to mice—and if some had escaped so far—it was a foolhardy thing to eat one.

His indigestion had come back and the grizzly was about to ask around about any new berries that someone might have found when the sound of a motor was heard.

They lined up along both edges of the road so that the hearse passed between them and then turned and followed it to the place where a mound of bare earth lay beside a small grave.

The same words that had been used so many times before were spoken once again. "Progress . . . in the name of civilization . . . scientific triumph for the larger good . . . etc. etc. etc."

The box was lowered. The clods of dirt slapped hollowly against each other until only a scar of water remained in the sere grass, mudily reflecting the one word OSPREY and the date.

Some of the birds flew off together. The wolf and the grizzly separated and left alone. The alligator stayed, blinking his eyes, until almost everyone had left, then he, too, with one last look at the resting place of an old friend, stumped off. The eagle, the pelican and the condor however didn't move. Nor did they speak. It was as if their homeward journey was too far . . . and too futile for such an effort. They would stay here. It would be just a matter of time.

**BALTIMORE ARMY SERGEANT
KILLED IN VIETNAM**

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Michael F. Brown, a courageous young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

**BALTIMORE ARMY SERGEANT KILLED IN
VIETNAM**

Sgt. Michael F. Brown, son of Mrs. Mildred H. Smith, 2512 West Lafayette avenue, was killed recently in Vietnam.

Sergeant Brown, 23, was killed May 6 when his fire support artillery base was overrun.

He was in charge of a .155 mm. howitzer in the northern part of South Vietnam.

A native of Baltimore, Sergeant Brown graduated from City College in 1964 and majored in mathematics at Morgan State College for 3½ years before joining the Army in February 1969.

He attended artillery leadership school at Fort Sill, Okla., and was sent to Vietnam in March of this year, where he was assigned to B Battery, 2d Battalion, 101st Airborne Division.

Sergeant Brown wrote of "my little family," the men with whom he worked, and said they considered him to be "the fastest gunner on the hill," Mrs. Smith recalled.

Sergeant Brown is survived by his mother and father, Percy L. Brown, and a brother, Gregory Smith, all of Baltimore.

**THE ONE RELIABLE COURSE BETWEEN
TODAY AND TOMORROW**

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege to attend an apprenticeship award dinner in Santa Rosa, Calif., at which time I heard one of the most outstanding appraisals of the value of the apprenticeship training program I have heard.

In order that my colleagues may have the benefit of this analysis by Mr. Robert Chapman, I am inserting a copy of his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I sincerely urge my colleagues to avail themselves of the opportunity to read this probing and thoughtful analysis of apprenticeship programs.

The remarks follow:

**THE ONE RELIABLE COURSE BETWEEN TODAY
AND TOMORROW**

Ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure for me to join in celebration of the occupational achievement of the adult students here tonight. May I also express my profound admiration of the apprenticeship program because I know how dedicated this program is to education at every level.

The occupational achievement that we celebrate is shared by a great many in this room. The principal stockholders are, of course, the students themselves, but their achievement is also shared by their teachers, by their principals, and by all who have helped these mature students develop important new skills. Furthermore, the achievement is shared by the business community that is represented here, and in particular by the Management Council which has led in the all-important task of gearing the training program to the real needs of industry.

The enlightened interest of so many good employers in the apprenticeship program has quite naturally provided a strong stimulus to all the participants. All of you are to be congratulated, and you are to be commended by setting a splendid example for other areas to follow in making the most of their human resources. Most assuredly throughout the nation there is an urgent requirement for educational programs of the kind you have carried out so successfully.

In this era and in this nation every citizen must possess a high degree of proficiency in his chosen field of work. The need for skill in work is particularly apparent here in California where technological growth and population growth are so remarkable. California

ranks with the nation's leading states in manufacture, construction, and the service industries. Since the defense build-up began in World War II, we have witnessed a continuous and dramatic flow of new population into California. Today this state grows at a rate of over 2½ times the national average.

The proper assimilation into our communities of the thousands who enter this state every month, and the attainment of the social progress through peaceful means, are major concerns, but perhaps most important of all is the problem of making sure each citizen has the opportunity to partake fully in the development and benefits of this technological era. Perhaps most important of all, therefore, is the problem of preparing the citizenry for employment and keeping it prepared. Indeed, each and every citizen must have access to the means of developing the necessary skills for continuing employment. Each of us must perform his task in life with a proficiency that can only come from training and retraining, from learning and continuing to learn.

It is because society changes so rapidly that lifelong learning is essential for all citizens of this nation. We can expect rapid change in our society to continue powered by an exploding technology as it has been since the conquest of the atom. What advances can we not expect when we consider just a few of the innumerable advances that have been made since World War II. For example, some of the major wonder drugs such as streptomycin, aureomycin, and cortisone, are less than 25 years old. Our programs in rockets, missiles, and lunar travel have produced a variety of electronic and systems advances, many of which find their way to commercial industrial application. Nothing in the foreseeable future is likely to stop this kind of technological progress or to slacken its pace.

As a consequence of racing technology, business organizations everywhere have been expanding at a tremendous rate and while vast number of additional jobs are given birth by this chain reaction, most of these jobs require special training.

It used to be that the most important qualification for the great majority of jobs was the number of years of experience that an applicant possessed, but now more important is the kind of training one has had. Furthermore, succeeding in a position depends more and more on the amount and quality of one's training. Every student knows that education and training have a tremendous bearing upon income. Therefore, adult training of the kind you students have received is a very practical means of adjusting to the demands of a changing society.

The practical value of continuing education, getting and holding a better job is certainly clear. There are also long range values in continuing education which are perhaps of even greater importance in the lives of many.

There is only one reliable course from the present to the future: the course of life-long learning. Anyone who chooses not to continue to develop his innate ability destroys the bridge of his own tomorrow. Anyone who is not afforded the opportunity to develop his innate abilities has been deprived of his fundamental American right. It is no wonder, therefore, that in our own country we place so much emphasis on education for all.

Unfortunately, there are those in our society who persist in believing that education is a process you go through as a car goes through an assembly line. The notion is that you go in one end when you are six years old, you come out at the other end when you are 22 and you're a fully educated man ready for the road. Such thinking has nothing to do whatsoever with the facts of life in the 70s.

Today we know that the process of learning must go on, not only in the classroom or in the training program, but ever afterward as

we read, as we watch television, as we observe the procedures in our places of employment and even during our lunch hour conversation.

Whether one's learning is to master a trade, such as carpentry or plumbing, or to master a foreign language, the truth is that the pursuit of knowledge is the proper special function of human beings.

This desire to know and to improve upon nature and upon the random circumstances of one's birth, is one of the things that distinguishes man from the other creatures of this planet, who are restricted to engaging forever in mindless, repetitive behavior. Man was not given superior intellectual capacity only that he might carry out minimal life functions and think the same thoughts day after day for 70 years or so.

Each of us has special aptitudes, creative urges, and a vast hidden reservoir of capabilities which we can never drain dry but which some of us are never encouraged to tap. We have the capacity for self-pride and the need of it, too. We need to feel pride in accomplishments and awareness of participation in life. When we accomplish, when we participate, and when we exercise our special capabilities, we are fulfilling ourselves as members of the family of man. For these reasons, this evening is especially important to all of us. Indeed by continuing their education, the adults we salute here tonight have embarked upon the right course to a good future.

You students have completed a particular program of training and one that will be highly valuable to you and to your employers, and you still have a life-time of learning to pursue.

All of us here have recognized that today one thing is certain; the citizen who gets the most from society and who gives fully to society is the citizen who has learned to continue learning; and having recognized this fact, we are entrusted with a solemn obligation to make widespread our knowledge that the opportunity to learn and to grow must belong to all, to every age, to every race, and to every class.

In summary, our nation will be immeasurably strengthened and in the long run human civilization will grow more meaningful and worthwhile.

Thank you.

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY: A VALUED ASSET TO MILWAUKEE, WIS., AND THE NATION

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, all too often, the role that a university plays within a community is underrated, perhaps through oversight but more likely because its contribution has become expected, even taken for granted.

To remedy this regrettable omission, Mr. Speaker, it might be beneficial to recognize just one example of how valuable a university is to the well-being and development of the community in which it exists.

As an alumnus, I am especially proud that Marquette University has proven to be such an asset to Wisconsin and especially to the Milwaukee area. In every aspect of community life, Marquette's influence has been felt through the work of its graduates, professors, and students.

The extent to which the university serves the community was pointed out in an article appearing in the June issue of Milwaukee magazine, "Marquette, Graduates and Community Growth."

To illustrate in concrete terms how Marquette University truly serves its community, it should be noted, for example, that nearly one-third of all doctors and 85 percent of all dentists practicing in Milwaukee were Marquette graduates. One of every three teachers in Milwaukee has attended Marquette. Almost half of Milwaukee's 2,200 attorneys owe their degrees to Marquette; 19 are Milwaukee county judges and two are State supreme court justices. The Wisconsin Supreme Court chief justice is a Marquette liberal arts graduate after teaching there over 28 years.

In the fields of communications, engineering and water pollution control the university has been active in initiating projects which benefit the city and the Nation. Graduates hold significant positions in these areas not only in Milwaukee and Wisconsin but throughout the country.

Perhaps the most publicized event in recent months that can be credited to Marquette is the contribution of one of its medical school graduates, Dr. Derward Lepley, Jr., who headed Wisconsin's first heart transplant team.

What is so important, Mr. Speaker, is that as our society becomes more technologically advanced, as metropolitan populations spiral and urban problems become more complicated, communities surrounding a university will look to these institutions of higher learning to an even greater extent for better answers, different solutions and brighter ideas.

As Marquette continues to give to Milwaukee, Wis., and the Nation so also do universities throughout the country enrich their communities and ultimately the Nation.

The full article is reprinted below:

MARQUETTE, GRADUATES AND COMMUNITY GROWTH

Milwaukeeans were caught by surprise some weeks back when Dr. Christiaan Barnard arrived on the scene, announcing his intention to observe new heart surgery techniques developed here.

Heart surgery techniques?

Milwaukeeans knew their town was pretty good at brewing beer and printing annual reports, building hydroelectric generators and constructing cranes. And even moon rocket guidance systems.

But heart surgery sophisticated enough to bring the South African superstar of surgery? That indeed was a revelation.

And something else they didn't know. The heart surgery program that attracted Barnard traced its roots to Marquette University.

It is but one of numerous contributions that the university has made to community well being over the years, contributions frequently overlooked.

Health care, government, law, business, industry, communications—all these fields, as they exist in Milwaukee, have been influenced significantly by Marquette.

In some fields, like medicine and engineering, the school's local activities have resulted in or promise worldwide benefit.

Barnard came specifically to observe a surgical method to supply new sources of blood to the heart. Dr. W. Dudley Johnson,

assistant professor of surgery at the Marquette School of Medicine, Inc., developed the method in a program sponsored by the school and St. Luke's Hospital.

The world famed heart surgeon also investigated the total heart surgery program of the school and hospital. It is chiefly the child of Drs. Johnson, Derward Lepley, Jr., and Robert J. Flemma. 377 open heart operations were performed at St. Luke's last year in this program, restoring health to hundreds of persons.

Lepley, who headed Wisconsin's first heart transplant team that operated on Mrs. John Anick, is a graduate of Marquette University School of Medicine, forerunner of the present school. The school of medicine was legally separated from the university in 1967. He is a professor of surgery and chairman of chest and heart surgery of the new institution.

These developments are dramatic and promising. Nevertheless other aspects of Marquette University's long service in the health care field certainly must rank with them on the basis of their importance to the people of Milwaukee and Wisconsin.

The depth of the university's contribution to medicine came into vivid focus during the recent successful effort to save the medical school from financial collapse. The university, which had been assuming increased operating deficits for the medical school, found it could no longer support the school—a condition that led to the legal separation.

During that time Wisconsinites learned that the medical school was the largest single source of new physicians for the state. A 1967 survey showed that almost one-third of all doctors practicing in Wisconsin were Marquette graduates.

In 1966 of the 1,299 Marquette medical graduates practicing in the state, 731 were in Milwaukee county and almost 1,000 in southeastern Wisconsin.

Once these figures became widely known, Milwaukee's leading citizens, the governor and state legislators banded together in a vigorous program to provide short and long term financial aid to the school.

So important was the institution that the legislature raised the beer tax to provide a base of support—an extraordinary development in the nation's leading beer brewing state.

The school is expected to be one of the cornerstones in the development of a regional health center.

In another area of health care the influence of the university's dental school is proportionately greater in the state than the medical school. Dr. Leonard C. Alexander, the dean, said that more than 85% of the dentists now practicing in Wisconsin graduated from his school. A similar breakdown is not readily available for the Milwaukee metropolitan area, but Dr. Alexander believes the percentage is even higher here.

The dental school also provides care to more than 50,000 patients a year in its clinic, the world's largest. All the patients pay is the cost of material and overhead, resulting in substantial savings for Milwaukee area families.

Obviously, the clinic is a great benefit to the poor. But service is not limited to them. Many middle class families and even a few of the affluent come to the clinic because of the high quality of care available from students working under the close supervision of dentists who rank among the best in their profession.

About the turn of the century John Edwin Copus, then city editor of the Detroit Free Press, joined the Catholic church and ultimately became a Jesuit priest.

Assigned as an instructor at Marquette, he dedicated his mature years to communications education so the professions of gathering and publishing news and advertising would be put to best use in society's behalf.

In 1910 Fr. Copus founded the Marquette University School of Journalism, one of the first of its kind on a university campus.

In the ensuing 60 years the MU Journalism School has been an influential member of the journalism community.

Today its graduates hold such positions as European editor, Scandinavian correspondent, director of Southeast Asian Services and chief of broadcast service for the Associated Press; photo editor of the National Geographic magazine; business manager of Mc-Calls magazine, west coast bureau chief of Time magazine, editor of the Air Force Digest and many more.

In the Milwaukee metropolitan area, MU journalism graduates can be found on the staffs of the daily newspapers and many of the weeklies as well as television and radio news staffs. They hold high advertising and public relations positions in communications agencies, financial institutions, manufacturing companies, retail firms, publishing houses, government agencies and utilities.

Numerous staff members of the Milwaukee Journal, one of the country's most influential newspapers, trace their beginning in the profession to Marquette.

How many Milwaukeeans realize that of the estimated 2,200 attorneys practicing in the Milwaukee metropolitan area, about half are Marquette graduates? Or that of all the lawyers in Wisconsin, a third are graduates of the Marquette Law School? Eleven of Milwaukee county's circuit judges graduated from the school, as did eight of the 13 county judges. Two of the graduates sit on the supreme court, Leo Hanley and Robert Hansen.

Supreme Court Chief Justice E. Harold Hallows is a graduate of the MU College of Liberal Arts. He taught at the university for more than 28 years.

Four members of the university's Board of Trustees, Atty. Steven E. Keane, Harvey W. Peters, Victor McCormick and Clifford A. Randall are law school alumni. Another alum is one of the few county executives in the United States, John L. Doyne.

A glance at a list of some of the graduates of the Marquette School of Engineering suggests the impact that it has had on the community:

Frank P. Agenten, president, Peerless Gear; Roland Bayerlein, vice president, Nordberg Manufacturing; Oscar J. Druml, president, Druml Company; Benard Friedl, vice president, Vilter Manufacturing; James B. Kurtzwell, president, Milprint; Raymond D. Leary, chief engineer and general manager, City and Metropolitan Sewerage Commissions; Robert E. Miller, president and general manager, Curtis Development and Manufacturing; Wilbur G. Prasse, president, Oilgear; Clayton J. Trudeau, retired vice president of Wisconsin Electric Power; Edward Wellauer, director, research and development, Falk Corporation; Kurt W. Bauer, executive director, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (and part-time MU instructor); Robert McGinn, vice-president, research and development, A. O. Smith Corp.

For years Milwaukee and Wisconsin industry have looked to Marquette engineering faculty members for help on a consulting basis. Men busy in the classroom and on research projects for the Atomic Energy Commission or the Air Force in materials science, for example, also have helped solve complex problems for local manufacturing firms.

Marquette's chemical, electrical, mechanical and biomedical engineers have been called on to do similar work, as have instructors in chemistry, physics, psychology and education. Similarly, nursing, business administration and graduate school alumni have made important contributions to the community and even to the nation.

Some of the most significant work in the country in the field of water pollution abatement is now being done by the school of en-

gineering's sanitary and environmental department, headed by Dr. Raymond J. Kipp, chairman of civil engineering.

A major project that could lead to solution of one of the country's worst water pollution problems is under way in Milwaukee, with Marquette University in a critical role. Like many cities, Milwaukee is afflicted with combined storm and sanitary sewers in older sections of town. During heavy rain storms or periods of rapid snow melting, the system, including the sewage mains and treatment plant, cannot handle all the liquid that pours into it.

In order to keep the sewers from backing up into homes and other buildings during such periods, designers built overflow mains that lead directly, in Milwaukee's case, to the Milwaukee River and its tributaries.

This means that large quantities of raw sewage at times runs into the river and is eventually discharged into Lake Michigan. Sometimes the resulting pollution is so great that the park commission must close the beaches.

The estimated cost of separating storm and sanitary sewers throughout the country is a whopping \$48 billion. Obviously it will not be done at that price.

Several years ago the federal government invited imaginative ideas to overcome this problem. The city of Milwaukee proposed construction of a giant tank on the west side of the Milwaukee River, just below the North Avenue dam. The combined sewer overflow will be channeled to it and held until the city's sewerage plants are able to handle the waste. It will then be pumped to the plants, treated and discharged to Lake Michigan.

Dr. Kipp's group has a vital role in the project. It will monitor the overflow, the tank itself and the river and ultimately evaluate the effort and report to the government.

Success could result in a significant advance against one of the largest sources of water pollution in the country.

The Kipp group is engaged in another project connected with Milwaukee's sewage disposal system. Its long term significance in the fight against water pollution may be even more important than solving the combined sewer problem.

A few years ago science discovered that lakes even as large as the Great Lakes could be polluted beyond recovery and "killed"—allowed to go over to weeds and other growth, ultimately to become swamps in a process called eutrophication. Formerly it was universally believed that bodies of water as large as the Great Lakes could not be polluted. Scientists then discovered that phosphates, which are dumped into the lakes in tremendous quantities by disposal of household detergents in sewage systems, were fertilizing the aquatic growths.

For some reason, Milwaukee's sewage treatment process removes a high percentage of phosphorous, Dr. Kipp said. The aim of the MU project is to learn why and spread the information so that the same results can be achieved elsewhere. It is believed that the individual wastes treated here are somehow instrumental in reducing phosphorous discharges. (It should be noted that nowhere in the country are present treatment systems able to remove all phosphorous. Total removal is a vital goal in the water pollution struggle.)

The engineering school's biomedical engineering program, one of the first of its kind when established in 1953, has increased substantially the level of health care available to Milwaukeeans.

An example is the computer-aided coronary care unit at Milwaukee County General Hospital, in which heart patients receive extraordinary intensive care utilizing the most advanced techniques. Also found at the county hospital, as a result of the biomedical en-

gineering program, is a biophysical laboratory for biomedical and neurological research. It is of enormous benefit to patients with neurological disorders.

In the field of education, Marquette's influence is enormous. Every third teacher in public and private schools in the Milwaukee area has attended Marquette. The university provides a facility for continuing education of about 1,500 adults—many at night—in addition to the 11,000 full time students, about 40% of whom are from Milwaukee or elsewhere in the state.

Milwaukeeans for years have found help at Marquette for speech and reading problems. The school has enriched the cultural life of the community with its theater, music and art programs. Business and industry have found themselves welcome to use its extraordinarily good technical libraries.

Men and women of the Marquette staff serve on many civic committees. An outstanding recent example was T. Robert Martin, dean of the School of Business Administration, who was co-chairman of the so-called Martin Weber committee, which studied the structure of city government and proposed substantial changes.

The Marquette Warriors basketball team, winner of the 1970 National Invitational Tournament in New York city, is one of the great unifying factors in the community and an immense source of pride.

With an operating budget of more than \$24 million annually, Marquette is one of the biggest businesses in the city and state.

In response to nationwide concern about the crisis in American cities, Marquette faculty and students have become active in more than 20 projects to improve the urban environment.

The school even has its own Community Action Program, with more than 300 student volunteers tutoring off campus, supervising recreational programs, providing home nursing services and contributing to less affluent sections of the city in other ways.

Marquette University is deeply involved in the physical renewal of the old, deteriorated area of the city immediately west of the central business district.

The university, in cooperation with the city, has eliminated 24 of 33 blighted buildings scheduled to come down in its area. By the time construction under its master plan is completed in 1974, 13 new buildings will have been erected and five others expanded or remodeled. Several parking structures also will have been built.

Another 118 blight buildings in the university area, but not connected with university development, have been removed or are scheduled to be removed by the city to further enhance the area.

Today, the university consists of 46 buildings on 47 acres with a book value of more than \$45 million.

Marquette has undergone dramatic changes recently. Last year control of the 88 year old institution shifted from a board of three Jesuit priests to a board which provides for 21 laymen and eight Jesuits. Only two Jesuits who are on the board remain in high administrative positions in the University, the Very Rev. John P. Raynor, president, and Rev. Edward J. O'Donnell, chancellor. Of the 500 full time faculty members, only about 60 are Jesuits.

Indeed one of the university administration's chief concerns today is to enlist capable Jesuits in the face of strong demands for their services in numerous places.

As our technological society becomes more complex, as population in metropolitan areas grows and the problems of urban areas are compounded, communities fortunate enough to be served by a university are certain to look increasingly to them for solutions.

There is little doubt that this is the future of the relationship that exists between Milwaukee and Marquette University.

A PERSUASIVE ARGUMENT FOR U.S. COMPLIANCE TO ISRAEL'S MILITARY AID REQUESTS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished faculty member at Harvard University's Center for Middle East Studies, Prof. Nadav Safran, recently made a persuasive case for the United States complying with Israel's request for additional military assistance. The professor presented his thesis in an address to the American Jewish Committee's annual meeting, May 14, in New York City.

Perhaps Professor Safran's most interesting premise is that the Soviet Union has lost as much, if not more, than it has gained in the Middle East crisis.

The text of the professor's speech follows:

TIME FOR DECISION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The commitment of Soviet pilots and air defense personnel to the ongoing limited war between Egypt and Israel has given a new, possibly fateful, twist to the Middle East crisis, and has once more imposed on the United States the necessity to make new, critical decisions.

I do not know what these decisions will be. But I know of one current of advice being offered to the Administration which, if adopted, would have disastrous consequences for the cause of peace in the Middle East, for American interests in the area, and for Israel and American-Israeli relations. This advice does not spring from any malevolent intention. Worse than that, it springs from a very poor and simplistic understanding of the situation.

I would like to use this erroneous view as a take-off point for my own alternative analysis and conclusions. Now the erroneous view I am speaking of starts with four simple premises:

1. That the Soviet Union has gained and is gaining greatly from the persisting Middle East crisis, and is therefore not interested in a settlement;

2. That Egypt, the key Arab country, will never agree to make peace with Israel, and that pressure on it to do so would only cause it to turn in upon itself and produce chaos which would bring great danger to the entire area;

3. That Israel has been getting more and more extremist in its aspirations and inflexible in its posture as a result of its military strength and its immunity to outside pressure, made possible in a decisive measure by the diplomatic and material support of the United States;

4. And that the United States has been losing greatly and steadily from the persistence of the conflict and from its support of Israel.

From these premises, the upholders of the view under discussion draw the general conclusion that the United States should do its utmost to terminate the conflict, which they allege, so benefits the Russians and so harms the United States, by applying every possible pressure on Israel to accept a settlement that does not include the formal peace which Israel insists upon, and which the Arab countries will not grant. With regard to the particular issue raised by the commitment of Soviet pilots and personnel, these people caution the United States against providing arms to Israel in response for a variety of reasons derived from their premises: Giving arms to Israel, they say, would

further antagonize the Arabs and drive them further into the arms of the Soviet Union; it would encourage Israel to continue in its intransigence; and it would prolong the conflict uselessly. What the United States should do, they add, is to take advantage of the present situation in which Israel is in a relatively weak and therefore presumably more amenable position in order to press it to accept a settlement that does not include peace.

When faced with such an analysis, one is very tempted to respond immediately with *ad hominem* attacks, with criticisms of particular points, or with bold counter-assertions. This temptation must be resisted because it sidetracks attention from the fundamental weakness of the argument, which is in its basic approach. This approach is linear and simplistic; whereas the facts to which it addresses itself are dialectical and complex. In simple words, there is an "on the other hand" to each one of its basic premises, which if properly weighted, in the end produces a totally different picture. Let us go back over these premises and note those "other hands."

1. That the Soviet Union has been making gains in the Middle East as a result of the crisis—This is true. It has entrenched itself more deeply in Egypt, Syria and Iraq since 1967, and it has gained an entry into the Sudan as a result of a coup d'état that took place there a year ago.

On the other hand, the Soviet position has also suffered a great deal as a result of the crisis:

First of all, the Suez Canal has been closed since 1967, just when the Soviet Union was getting ready to assert itself as a global power with the help of a very substantial merchant marine and navy developed for that specific purpose in recent years. The closure of the Canal has frustrated Soviet plans by barring to them the main access route from their bases in the Black Sea to the Third World through the Indian Ocean, the Red Sea and the Suez Canal.

Secondly and by the same token, the footholds which the Soviets had gained in Yemen, South Yemen and in Somalia at the southern gateway of the Red Sea became useless and had to be abandoned because the northern gateway was closed.

Thirdly, Nasser's militant pan-Arab drive which had served as a vehicle for the extension of Soviet influence in the area, was checked, and in the case of Yemen reversed, as a result of Nasser's defeat in the 1967 war and his inability to recover his lost territories.

Fourthly, Soviet credibility and reliability as an ally suffered considerable damage in Arab eyes as a result of the failure to save the Arabs from defeat and failure to save them from some of the consequences of defeat. This is particularly true of Algeria, whose relations with the Soviet Union have cooled a great deal since 1967.

Fifthly, the assumption of the burden of rearming the Arab countries and supporting their economies has cost the Soviet Union several billion rubles since the end of the war, in addition to forfeiting much of the pre-war investment. This cost constitutes a substantial drain of resources even for the Soviet Union, especially since it has not been doing so well economically in recent years. At the very least, the absorption of these resources in the Middle East pre-empted their use to extend Soviet influence elsewhere.

Last but far from least, the 1967 defeat shook the foundations of the Arab regimes on which the Soviet position in the Middle East rests, and left them more vulnerable than ever to sudden collapse as a result of the kind of pressures that are inherent in a continuing confrontation with Israel. To anticipate a little, it was precisely the fear that Nasser might collapse as a result of the Israeli response to his war of attrition that impelled

the Russians to come in with their missiles and pilots.

If all this is true—if it is true that the position in which the Soviets have found themselves since the war involves important advantages but even more important disadvantages, it would be wrong to conclude that in principle the Soviets have absolutely no interest in a settlement. The contrary conclusion is more appropriate and finds confirmation in the fact that the Soviets had actually engaged for over a year before their recent move in negotiations with the United States aimed at reaching a settlement. The problem has been that the Soviets have not dared to move ahead of the Egyptian position, or to persuade Nasser himself to move forward and accept the principle of peace, which is the key to an agreement with the United States.

This leads us to the second assumption, that no Egyptian leader could afford to make peace with Israel. I cannot help but observe here that attempts to explain the Arab attitude in terms of "the Arab mentality" is the refuge of people who will not or cannot examine the facts. It is true that Nasser has been obdurate in his rejection of the principle of formal peace; but it is no less true, on the other hand, that he has come a long way in his position vis-a-vis Israel—from insisting on its destruction as the only goal and on belligerency as the only interim relationship, to renouncing that goal publicly, being willing to accept Israel's existence *de facto*, to terminate belligerence, recognize its frontiers, agree to free navigation through the Suez Canal as well as the Gulf of Aqaba and so on.

I mention all this not in order to suggest that it is enough and not to make the points that Nasser is reasonable, but in order to point out that Nasser is rational and has acted rationally in the sense of matching ends and means and responding to the realities of the situation. If he has not so far taken the extra step of being ready to contemplate firm and binding peace, it is evidently, in view of this record, not because of emotional obsession but because the pressures working on him have not been sufficient to compel him to take that additional step. This does not, however, preclude that they might do so in the future. Much will depend on the position of the United States.

The third assumption concerning Israel's getting tougher is in part correct. However, like the other assumptions it tells only half the story and tells it too simply. The toughness of Israel and its relative inflexibility are products of the national consensus that has peace as its lowest common denominator. But on top of this denominator, there is a wide variety of views and forces which have been prevented from asserting themselves by the fact that the denominator itself has never been met.

Let a concrete prospect of peace be presented to Israel, and the national consensus would certainly break up, bringing down, in my judgment, the national coalition government based on it, and opening up the entire political system. The so-called "Goldmann Affair" and the agitation it caused in Israel when nothing more than the shadow of a shadow of a prospect for peace was involved is very significant in this respect. Now, whether a break-up of the national coalition and the reformation of the political parties would produce a simple majority that would favor peace without significant territorial changes from the pre-war lines is difficult to be certain about. My own judgment is that such a majority would emerge.

The fourth and final assumption to the effect that the United States has been losing a great deal as a result of the present situation is true also to some extent. But there is also an impressive ledger on the credit side and this produces quite a different net balance. On the debit side, there is undoubtedly

a general loss of American popularity throughout the Arab world; but popularity is an extremely soft and unstable currency in international relations and should not be confused, as is often done, with influence. Moreover, influence and popularity are not necessarily always directly correlated: In fact, a power may be unpopular because it can exercise a great deal of influence. In the strict sense of the term, influence can be defined as a heightened probability that others should act as we wish them to. I submit that this indeed has been the case with Egypt since 1967. There has been a loss of popularity but a gain in influence. With Syria and Iraq, the United States has had no influence to begin with and therefore has lost nothing since 1967.

Continuing on the debit side, there is undoubtedly a loss to the United States in the weakening of the stability of Jordan and Lebanon as a result of the present situation, which, if it continues, may well bring about the collapse of the regime in either or both of these countries.

People who hold the view I am debating would add the Sudan and Libya to the debit list. I would not dispute that the United States position was somewhat weakened by the coups that took place in these countries, but I would doubt that the damage should be attributed to the Arab-Israeli confrontation.

In any case, let us note that the American interest in the Sudan had been very slight to begin with and that the loss for the United States in Libya was restricted and did not amount to any automatic gain for the Soviets. There was no attack on the position of the American oil companies in Libya and the United States was eased out of Wheelus air base rather than being thrown out by fit, a mere few months before the lease on the base was to have expired anyway. At the same time, the new Libyan government did not turn to the Soviets for arms and advisers, according to the pattern of radical coups, but turned instead to France for help. This was done at the behest of Nasser himself for a very interesting reason:

By refraining from using the club against the United States that fell into his hands when the young Libyan officers solicited his advice, Nasser hoped to dissuade this country from responding favorably to Israel's then outstanding request for arms. Here is a dramatic illustration of the point I made a moment ago about the difference between popularity and influence. Here the Egyptian fear that the United States might respond by giving arms to Israel compelled Nasser to act in a way desired by the United States, even though giving arms to Israel has been a thing which had made the United States unpopular. You see loss of popularity, on the one hand, accompanied by increase in influence on a crucial issue on the other, Nasser realizing that it was dangerous for him to interfere with vital American interests.

On the credit side, there is a list of gains which is none the less impressive for being mostly the obverse of the Soviet and Egyptian losses. There is the frustration of the Soviet global strategy based on the Suez-Indian Ocean route; there is the pinning down of large Soviet resources in the effort to support shaky allies; there is the removal of the Nasserite anti-American pressure on regimes friendly to the United States. People forget, for example, that for five years before 1967 Egyptian troops had been fighting in Yemen with the explicitly proclaimed aim of overthrowing the so-called "reactionary" regimes of the Arabian peninsula and the Persian Gulf, including the oil-rich Saudi Arabia and Kuwait; and that for five years the United States had used largesse and pressure to persuade Nasser to desist, without success. Today, as a result of the post-1967 situation, the proud revolutionary of

yore, who would overthrow all the reactionary regimes, is now eating from the hands of these regimes.

Altogether, then, our examination of the four premises about the position and attitudes of the four principal actors in the present situation gives us a picture of a multiple tug of war in which the United States is relatively better placed to accomplish its aims than its opponents are to accomplish theirs. Our analysis, therefore, leads us to reject the panicky view that peace cannot be achieved, without, however, carrying us to the equally fallacious suggestion that peace is easily attainable or is around the corner.

There is a situation in which there is a set of opposing forces at work. The task of the United States is to try to manipulate these forces in such a way as to enhance those that tend to favor peace and to check those that tend to oppose it. The guiding strategy should be to maintain a situation in which the Soviet Union and Egypt can find no relief from the pressures under which they are and no outlet from the crisis except by taking the extra step of agreeing to peace. Once they do that, the United States can use this agreement to prod the Israel leaders to break up the national coalition government in Israel and bring about a political reshuffle that would hopefully produce a simple majority in favor of a peace of reconciliation.

The specific application of this approach to the particular issue of the commitment of Soviet pilots to the Arab-Israeli confrontation requires a few preliminary remarks: In the latter part of 1969, Nasser had declared the cease-fire dead and launched a war of attrition against Israel with a view to forcing it to accept a settlement of the crisis on Egyptian terms—that is to say on terms that rejected peace, negotiations, and recognition. Nasser's strategy in that war consisted of taking advantage of the immense Egyptian numerical superiority in manpower and artillery on the Canal front to launch continuous massive artillery bombardments and frequent commando raids. The idea was to inflict heavy losses of personnel on Israel which would sap its will to fight, and force it to mobilize larger and larger segments of its reserves, which would undermine its economy and its capacity to continue the war.

After suffering considerable damage, Israel devised an effective response by using its superiority in air power to foil Nasser's superiority in manpower and artillery. It started by systematically destroying Egypt's air defense system with air attacks and radar-jamming devices; proceeded with surprise airborne and seaborne commando attacks everywhere behind the Egyptian front, thus forcing Nasser to disperse his forces all over Egypt to meet possible Israeli attacks; finally it went on to attack his exposed and dispersed forces to inflict maximum damage and force Nasser to agree to the restoration of the cease-fire. The operation succeeded so well that it turned the tables over on Nasser completely; it was Egypt, which was subjected to a war of attrition—saw treasures of equipment go up in smoke, suffered a hemorrhage of casualties, and had the morale of its forces shaken.

Unable to react himself, Nasser turned to the Russians and asked them to repair the situation or else face the risk of a collapse of his regime on which their position in Egypt and in the whole region rests. The Russians responded by rushing, by air, men and equipment to meet the situation. They quickly emplaced at strategic points in mainland Egypt SAM-3 missiles and committed Russian pilots to provide a first line of defense for the missiles from the air and Russian troops to protect them against Israeli airborne commando attack. So far, the Rus-

sian pilots have not intervened against Israeli planes operating in the immediate vicinity of the Canal front; but the Israelis had to give up almost entirely their penetrations into the mainland.

As soon as Nasser felt his mainland to be secure under Russian protection, he concentrated once again all his own air power and most of his ground forces on the Canal front and resumed the war of attrition, with already visible effect. This fact makes nonsense of the simple argument that the Russian move is defensive and therefore should not call for an American response. It may be defensive in intent but it has offensive consequences—and both of these aspects should be kept in mind in thinking of the proper response.

Taking these facts against the background of the position of the Soviets and their relations with Egypt, we get the following overall picture, which we may present in the form of a scenario: After nearly a year of vain effort to reach an agreement with the United States on a settlement that avoided peace, the Soviets, mindful of their interest beyond the Middle East as well as of the difficulties of their positions in the area, suggest to Nasser that perhaps the time has come for him to take the next step and agree to peace, although without territorial changes. Nasser, concerned only with his own more limited aims in the region and mindful that the Russians have no alternative to him, balks at the suggestion and wants to keep on trying to change the situation by continued military pressure and diplomatic maneuvers.

The Soviets, unable to apply pressures on Nasser for fear of breaking the branch on which they are sitting, let him go on. Nasser launches the war of attrition, gets himself into trouble and turns to the Soviets for help. The Soviets, fearing his collapse, are compelled to take a critical step of committing their personnel to the defense of Egypt's mainland. Nasser, having succeeded in using his weakness to suck the Soviets in, now takes advantage of the accrued strength in order to resume his war of attrition. The Soviets, having accomplished the essential purpose of saving Nasser from collapse, now stand at the crossroads and watch: If Nasser's pressure appears to be successful, they might throw their whole weight behind a continuation of his campaign of military pressure and diplomatic maneuver. If Nasser's pressures appear to fail, they might be in a better position to convince him that after having tried everything to no avail, there is no escape from taking the next step and agreeing to genuine peace.

Whether Nasser's pressure appears to be successful or not will depend in a decisive measure on how the United States responds.

If the United States responds to the present situation by providing arms to Israel and reiterating its commitment to preserve the balance of power in the area—which in effect means its opposition to any attempt to alter the situation by force and to insist that the only way to alter the situation is through peace—then 1) Nasser's offensive would be effectively checked, 2) his pressure will be seen to have failed, 3) the Russian intervention will be kept within the present limits, 4) and the Soviets will be able to reassert their argument to Nasser that peace is the only outlet for him. If, on the other hand, the United States equivocates on the supply of arms or, much worse, if it should choose this time to urge upon Israel a settlement that does not meet the minimal demand of peace, then even if the Israelis should respond successfully with the arms they already have, this will be a sign that Nasser's strategy is succeeding, that it is detaching the United States from Israel, and that the Soviets could therefore contemplate further steps to intensify the pressures to overcome Israel's predictable resistance.

One alternative would frankly envisage the continuation of a struggle in which the odds are favorable to the United States and which keeps the prospects of an eventual peace open. The other would immediately foreclose such prospects indefinitely and would set things on a turbulent course whose outcome God only knows.

CONSUMER WRITER SIDNEY MARGOLIUS DESCRIBES NEW FEDERAL GARNISHMENT LAW TAKING EFFECT JULY 1

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most far-reaching consumer laws ever enacted by the Congress, the Federal Restriction of Garnishment Act, takes effect 2 weeks from today, on July 1, establishing for the first time Federal limitations on excessive levies on workers' paychecks for the satisfaction of debts. The garnishment law was included as title III of Public Law 90-321, the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968, which also contains as title I the Truth in Lending Act, as title II the Extortionate Extension of Credit Act, and as title IV the creation of the National Commission on Consumer Finance.

As the principal author of this landmark consumer legislation, which was cosponsored in the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency in the 90th Congress by Congressmen HENRY B. GONZALEZ, JOSEPH G. MINISH, FRANK ANNUNZIO, JONATHAN B. BINGHAM and SEYMOUR HALPERN, I think I speak for all six of us in expressing our tremendous satisfaction as legislators that this most controversial aspect of our original bill, the garnishment title, was written into law and is now about to become effective. When we introduced on July 20, 1967, the bill H.R. 11601 which became Public Law 90-321, we were given no chance whatsoever of being able to enact most of its provisions and certainly not anything dealing with garnishment.

MODIFICATION IN ORIGINAL TITLE

As originally introduced, the bill would have prohibited the garnishment of wages for any purpose. The testimony in our hearings indicated that we would have to modify that if we were to have any chance of passing this portion of the bill, and so as sponsors we compromised by recommending as a substitute a modification of the New York statute. The amended version would have permitted garnishment of no more than 10 percent of a worker's pay over \$30 a week, prohibiting the firing of an employee for a single garnishment.

This is the form in which this title first passed the House, after withstanding a challenge on the House floor which came within three votes of knocking it out of the bill. After 6 weeks of debate with the Senate conferees over this and many other controversial aspects of the House bill which had never been considered in the Senate in its passage of a

truth-in-lending bill, the garnishment title was finally agreed to in conference, but in further modified form.

One compromise involved delaying the effective date for a full year following the effective date of title I, Truth in Lending. Another compromise raised from 10 to 25 percent the portion of a worker's wage which could be garnished, but at the same time we also succeeded in raising the nongarnishable portion of the wage from \$30 a week to 30 times the minimum wage, which means that, at the present minimum of \$1.60 per hour, the first \$48 of a worker's pay after taxes and social security is immune from garnishment—except for taxes or court support orders.

I strongly believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Restriction of Garnishment law will do far more than any other provision of Public Law 90-321 to increase the quality of credit transactions for low-income families. Predatory sellers of debt will now be far less likely to extend excessive credit to those who obviously cannot afford to repay it in the normal manner. These are the people who have been victimized over and over by sharpsters who signed them up for expensive credit merely on the showing that the person had a job and thus was garnishable.

ARTICLE BY SIDNEY MARGOLIUS IN "THE MACHINIST"

Mr. Speaker, this week's issue of the Machinist newspaper contains an excellent article on the new garnishment law by its consumer columnist, Mr. Sidney Margolius, who is syndicated in many other newspapers also, and is a member of the National Commission on Product Safety. Mr. Margolius, the first writer to have made a successful career writing exclusively on consumer issues, deserves a significant share of the credit for the inclusion of the garnishment title in the Consumer Credit Protection Act, because he was an outstanding witness before my subcommittee during our hearings in 1967 on the legislation which became Public Law 90-321. His testimony on the cruelties of many of the State garnishment laws, and the significance of these laws in promoting credit abuses, was truly impressive.

Probably the most telling testimony we received on this issue came from a group of Federal bankruptcy referees, who showed the manner in which countless Americans were driven into bankruptcy in order to escape from garnishments which had made them literally unemployable. The president of the Steelworkers Union, Mr. I. W. Abel, also contributed greatly to our understanding of the problem of garnishments, as did some of our other witnesses also.

The garnishment title, as I indicated, is not as strong as we originally hoped to make it. But it is the strongest law we now have on this subject, other than in a few States. Where any State law provides greater protection to the worker than the Federal law, in any particular, the stronger feature of either law applies. Thus, in New York, where only 10 percent of a worker's pay can be garnished, compared to 25 percent under the Federal law, the Federal law never-

theless protects the first \$48 from any levy whatsoever, whereas the State law has no blanket exemption except for those earning less than \$30 a week. So depending upon one's income in New York, the State law would be better protection for those earning over \$55 or so before taxes, while the Federal law would be more helpful for those earning less than that amount. I cite this example because Mr. Margolius' article notes some of these differences, and I am not sure that his article makes completely clear that the two laws operate side by side, with the better feature of either one being applied to any specific situation.

The article referred to, by Mr. Sidney Margolius, is as follows:

HOW TO BUY—NEW GARNISHEE RULES
(By Sidney Margolius)

If you ever get swamped by too many debts or trapped by an unscrupulous installment dealer, you'll have more protection from now on against that cruelest of debt-collection weapons—the wage garnishments.

New federal rules, effective July 1, 1970, place a few restrictions on garnishments as part of the truth-in-lending law, the rest of which became effective last year.

It would be wise to know about the new rules, and also your own state's restrictions if even more humane and fairer. Moderate-income families can never be sure that they may not be lured into excessive debt by high-pressure salesmanship or fall behind because of illness or a job cutback. In fact, with a recession on our hands, the timing of the new garnishment restrictions couldn't be better.

The new federal law (1) limits the amount of your wages that can be garnished, and (2) prohibits firing an employee because of a garnishment.

25 PERCENT OF EARNINGS

The most that now can be garnished under the federal law is no more than 25 percent of "disposable" earnings or the amount of disposable earnings over \$48 a week, whichever is less. Robert D. Moran, Federal Wage and Hour Administrator, who administers the new law, cites these examples. Say you have disposable weekly earnings of \$112. Since 25 per cent of \$112 is \$28, that would be the most that could be garnished. But take a worker who has only \$62 a week in disposable earnings. While 25 per cent of \$62 is \$15.50, the most that could be seized would be \$14, since they have to leave him at least \$48.

Actually the law does not specify the \$48 figure but specifies 30 times the federal minimum hourly wage. Currently this is an obsolete \$1.60. If Congress finally realizes that there is an inflation and raises the minimum wage to at least \$2, the garnishment exemption would go to \$60.

This provision does provide a better exemption than in those states which permitted garnishment of as much as 50 per cent of pay and minimum exemptions as low as \$25-\$40 a week. But the 25 per cent or \$48 is not as good as the laws in some states. They permit only as little as 10 per cent to be garnished, as in New York, or have minimum exemptions of 40 times the minimum wage as in the new Washington State law, or even more as in Illinois and Connecticut.

Incidentally, under the new federal law "disposable earnings" is not the same as "take-home pay." Moran warns, "Disposable earnings" excludes only items legally required to be withheld from pay such as taxes and Social Security.

Of somewhat more help is the prohibition against firing for one garnishment. The specter of being fired often has been used by collectors and finance companies to scare

a debtor into paying what even may have been an unfair or deceptively-incurred debt.

But the new law is a little vague in that it prohibits firing for garnishment "for any one indebtedness." Whether the Wage and Hours Division interprets this language rigidly or more realistically will determine the real usefulness of this law.

If the interpretation is that the worker is permitted only one garnishment during his entire period of employment, it's not much help. Hawaii and Connecticut already bar firings for garnishment; Washington, for no more than two garnishments on separate debts within 12 months, and New York for no more than one in 12 months. Several other states are considering or already have enacted similar restrictions. Pennsylvania, Texas and Florida do not even permit garnishments at all.

Moreover, many employers do not fire for just one garnishment anyway.

The Wage and Hours Division is studying whether the new law should be interpreted to protect against more than one garnishment if they arise from the same debt situation. What often happens is that one creditor slaps on a garnishment, and then others garnishee to protect their stake in the debtor's wages. Or, because his income has been reduced by one garnishment, a debtor may fall behind in other payments and suffer another garnishment. Under a narrow interpretation, the employer then could fire since there is more than one garnishment.

To its credit, the Wage and Hours Division is considering establishing a period of time, such as a year after the first garnishment, before another could be considered grounds for firing. Another method I have proposed to the division, would be to bar garnishee firings unless the additional garnishments were for debts contracted after the first garnishment. Thus, garnishments for debts existing at the time of the first garnishment could not legally result in firing.

LEGAL HELP

If you ever do get garnished, even just after one garnishment, try to get legal help to make sure all the potential defenses against the garnishment are used. If you have more than one garnishment, legal help is even more urgent to make sure the employer and courts interpret the law adequately and not narrowly. If you have little or no funds for an attorney, you may be able to get help from the local Legal Aid Society or a neighborhood legal center operated by a Community Action Council. Your union's business agent or community services representative may be able to advise on getting legal help.

Your lawyer also even may advise bankruptcy or a wage-earner plan (Chapter 13 of the Bankruptcy Law) to protect you from further garnishments.

If you do get fired for a second garnishment consult your union. You may be able to file a grievance or have it arbitrated, as the Washington State Labor Council recently advised union members.

UNITE

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the other day while I was going through my daily volume of mail, I came upon this news bulletin mailed to me by the Kiwanis Club of Bristol, Virginia-Tennessee, concerning the club's activities.

CXVI—1281—Part 15

In reading over the bulletin, one particular article caught my eye. It was titled "Unite" and it truly offers an inspiring message for all of us.

I believe it would be of interest to many persons and, therefore, I submit it for the RECORD:

UNITE

Americans built this country with their hands. They stood at the edges of a raw wilderness, with nothing except the promise of freedom . . . the wit and the will to achieve it. They planted their farms, raised their roofbeams, laid their rails, built their churches, dreamed their dreams. They drenched the earth with their blood defending what they'd built.

WHAT KIND OF COUNTRY DO YOU MAKE THAT WAY?

The kind of country that can put a man on the moon . . . Or feed the hungry world . . . Or heal the sick . . . Or teach the children who long to learn. The kind of country that will stand up and be counted in some forsaken corner of the map when other people's right to do the same is threatened.

That's why, when you look for Americans, you often find them in tough places, the unpopular places. With blisters on their hands, doing the work that no one else has the strength, know how, or fortitude to do.

Room for improvement at home? Of course. Americans continually strive to improve their heritage, to make the best better. The results are readily apparent to an envious world.

So let's count our blessings as we start a new decade, take inventory of our standard of living, of the freedoms we defend and cherish. Compare America with any other country. Then stand up and be counted . . . proudly and confidently.—United Telephone System.

**WILBUR AND ORVILLE WRIGHT
TO CONGRESSMAN ROBERT M.
NEVIN, JANUARY 18, 1905**

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine has called to my attention some very interesting correspondence between Wilbur and Orville Wright, Congressmen, the Secretary of War, and other Government officials in 1905.

My constituent pointed out the similarities between this correspondence and the handling of current new ideas.

I would like to place this material in the RECORD and call it to the attention of my colleagues:

**WILBUR AND ORVILLE WRIGHT TO CONGRESSMAN
ROBERT M. NEVIN, JANUARY 18, 1905**

The series of aeronautical experiments upon which we have been engaged for the past five years has ended in the production of a flying-machine of a type fitted for practical use. It not only flies through the air at high speed, but it also lands without being wrecked. During the year 1904 one hundred and five flights were made at our experimenting station, on the Huffman prairie, east of the city; and though our experience in handling the machine has been too short to give any high degree of skill, we nevertheless succeeded, toward the end of the season, in making two flights of five minutes each, in which we sailed round and round the field until a distance of about three miles had been covered, at a speed of thirty-five

miles an hour. The first of these record flights was made on November 9th, in celebration of the phenomenal political victory of the preceding day, and the second, on December 1st, in honor of the one hundredth flight of the season.

The numerous flights in straight lines, in circles, and over "S"-shaped courses, in calms and in winds, have made it quite certain that flying has been brought to a point where it can be made of great practical use in various ways, one of which is that of scouting and carrying messages in time of war. If the latter features are of interest to our government, we shall be pleased to take up the matter either on a basis of providing machines of agreed specifications, at a contract price, or of furnishing all scientific and practical information we have accumulated in these years of experimenting, together with a license to use our patents; thus putting the government in a position to operate on its own account.

If you can find it convenient to ascertain whether this is a subject of interest to our government, it would oblige us greatly, as early information on this point will aid us in making our plans for the future.

**REPLY TO CONGRESSMAN NEVIN FROM THE
BOARD OF ORDINANCE AND FORTIFICATION,
SIGNED BY MAJ. GEN. G. L. GILLESPIE**

I have the honor to inform you that, as many requests have been made for financial assistance in the development of designs for flying-machines, the Board has found it necessary to decline to make allotments for the experimental development of devices for mechanical flight, and has determined that, before suggestions with that object in view will be considered, the device must have been brought to the stage of practical operation without expense to the United States.

It appears from the letter of Messrs. Wright that their machine has not been brought to the stage of practical operation, but as soon as it shall have been perfected, this Board would be pleased to receive further representations from them in regard to it.

**WILBUR WRIGHT TO OCTATE CHANUTE,
JUNE 1, 1905**

We would be ashamed of ourselves if we had offered our machine to a foreign government, without giving our own country a chance at it, but our consciences are clear. At the Christmas holidays we talked with Mr. Nevin, congressman from this district, and he proposed that we write him a letter containing a general statement of our business, and that he take it to Mr. Taft (Secretary of War) and secure an appointment for us to meet with the War Department officials, thus saving us delay when we should visit Washington. But owing to sickness he was compelled to turn over our letter without personally seeing Mr. Taft and shortly afterward received the letter from the Ordinance Department which I enclose. As we had made no request for appropriation, but on the contrary had offered to furnish a machine of "Agreed specifications at a contracted price", (which offer was entirely ignored,) we were driven to the conclusion that the letter of the War Department was intended as a flat turn down. We still think so.

A note to Col. Capper informing him that we were ready to talk business with British government soon brought a response from the English war office requesting us to make a definite proposition, and now have an answer stating that an officer will be sent to see us.

It is no pleasant thought to us that any foreign country should take from America any share of the glory of having conquered the flying problem, but we feel that we have done our full share toward making this an American invention, and if it is sent abroad for further development the responsibility does not rest upon us. We have taken pains

to see that "Opportunity" gave a good clear knock on the War Department door. It has for years been our business practice to sell to those who wished to buy, instead of trying to force goods upon people who did not want them. If the American government has decided to spend no money on flying machines till their practical use has been demonstrated in actual service abroad, we are sorry, but we can not reasonably object. They are the judges.

WILBUR AND ORVILLE WRIGHT TO SECRETARY OF WAR W. H. TAFT, DAYTON, OCTOBER 9, 1905

Some months ago we made an informal offer to furnish to the War Department practical flying-machines suitable for scouting purposes. The matter was referred to the Board of Ordinance and Fortifications, which seems to have given it scant consideration. We do not wish to take this invention abroad, unless we find it necessary to do so, and therefore write again, renewing the offer.

We are prepared to furnish a machine on contract, to be accepted only after trial trips in which the conditions of the contract have been fulfilled; the machine to carry an operator and supplies of fuel, etc., sufficient for a flight of one hundred miles; the price of the machine to be regulated according to a sliding scale based upon the performance of the machine in the trial trips, the minimum performance to be a flight of at least twenty-five miles at a speed of not less than thirty miles an hour.

We are also willing to take contracts to build machines carrying more than one man.

REPLY FROM MAJOR GENERAL J. C. BATES, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF ORDINANCE AND FORTIFICATION, AND MEMBER OF THE GENERAL STAFF

I have the honor to inform you that, as many requests have been made for financial assistance in the development of designs for flying-machines, the Board has found it necessary to decline to make allotments for the experimental development of devices for mechanical flight, and has determined that, before suggestions with that object in view will be considered, the device must have been brought to the stage of practical operation without expense to the United States.

Before the question of making a contract with you for the furnishing of a flying-machine is considered it will be necessary for you to furnish this Board with the approximate cost of the completed machine, the date upon which it would be delivered, and with such drawings and descriptions thereof as are necessary to enable its construction to be understood and a definite conclusion as to its practicability to be arrived at. Upon receipt of this information, the matter will receive the careful consideration of the Board.

WILBUR AND ORVILLE WRIGHT TO THE ORDINANCE BOARD, OCTOBER 19, 1905

We have no thought of asking financial assistance from the government. We propose to sell the results of experiments finished at our own expense.

In order that we may submit a proposition conforming as nearly as possible to the ideas of your Board, it is desired that we be informed what conditions you would wish to lay down as to the performance of the machine in the official trials, prior to the acceptance of the machine. We cannot well fix a price, nor a time for delivery, till we have your idea of the qualifications necessary to such a machine. We ought also to know whether you would wish to reserve a monopoly or use of the invention, or whether you would permit us to accept orders for similar machines from other governments, and give public demonstrations (exhibits), etc.

Proof of our ability to execute an understanding of the nature proposed will be furnished whenever desired.

REPLY FROM CAPT. T. C. DICKSON, RECORDER OF THE BOARD

The Board of Ordinance and Fortification at its meeting October 24, 1905, recorded its action as follows:

The Board then considered a letter, dated October 19, 1905, from Wilbur and Orville Wright requesting the requirements prescribed by the Board that a flying-machine would have to fulfill before it would be accepted.

It is recommended that Messrs. Wright be informed that the Board does not care to formulate any requirements for the performance of a flying-machine or take any further action on the subject until a machine is produced which by actual operation is shown to be able to produce horizontal flight and to carry an operator.

WRIGHT BROTHERS TO THE U.S. WAR DEPARTMENT, MAY 17, 1907

We have some flyers in course of construction and would be pleased to sell one or more of them to the War Department, if an agreement as to terms can be reached.

These machines will carry two men, an operator and an observer, and sufficient supply of fuel for a flight of two-hundred kilometers. We are willing to make it a condition of a contract that the machine must make a trial trip before Government representatives of not less than fifty kilometers at a speed of not less than fifty kilometers an hour, before its acceptance by the Department, and before any part of the purchase price is paid to us.

If the War Department is in a position to purchase at this time, we will be pleased to have a conference for the purpose of discussing the matter in detail, or we are willing to submit a formal proposition, if that is preferred.

ORVILLE WRIGHT TO WILBUR WRIGHT, DAYTON, OHIO, MAY 27, 1907

A few days ago the following came from the Ordinance Board:

"In reply to your letter of the 17th instant, I am directed to request that, as suggested by you, you will submit a formal proposition for furnishing a dirigible flying machine in such detail that the Board may take action thereon.

"The subject aerial navigation being still in the experimental stage, no requirements have been formulated by the Board, and it is therefore suggested that you state what specifications you can fulfill, incorporating the conditions already named by you for a machine capable of carrying fuel supply for a flight of two hundred kilometers and two men in free flight at a rate of 50 kilometers an hour, for a sustained flight of 50 kilometers, and with reasonable dirigibility and safety in flight and landing.

"Your proposition should also include a time of delivery and a stated price for the complete apparatus, payment to be made contingent upon agreed performance.

"If you have a machine constructed with which you can make flights, the Board would be interested in witnessing tests and could visit your establishment for the purpose.

"The next meeting of the Board will be held in this city on June 6th and a reply to this letter is requested prior to that date."

I intend to answer that we will furnish one machine, etc. for \$100,000; that additional machines will be furnished at a reasonable advance over the cost of manufacture. That the time of delivery will be dependent upon what other engagements we have at the time of signing a contract, but that a contract entered into now could be filled within three to six months. I will probably answer their suggestion to come here and witness a flight something like this: Since many of the important features of our flyer have been kept secret—and are now properly protected by patents—it would not

be prudent to show the machine in advance of a contract. But in order to protect the purchaser we are willing that the specifications be entered in the contract as may be necessary to guarantee the dirigibility of the machine and its structural strength; and that as an additional safeguard to the purchaser, we are willing that no part of the purchase price be paid to us until the trial flight has been made in accordance with the requirements of the contract. I think I will propose to make the minimum speed forty miles an hour, provided \$5,000 is allowed us for each mile above the speed performance in the trial flight; we offer to forfeit \$5,000 of the purchase price for each mile below forty miles.

POLLUTION AND THE PUBLIC

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Center magazine, published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, carried a perceptive article on the pollution problem by Mr. Frank M. Potter, Jr., executive director of the Environmental Clearing House.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read this article, I include the text at this point in the RECORD:

POLLUTION AND THE PUBLIC
(By Frank M. Potter, Jr.)

Pollution is limited by neither internal nor external political boundaries. Dirty air and water pass easily from country to country, and people downwind and downstream can only suffer, possibly comforted to know that their hands are no cleaner than those of their neighbors. We are challenged to develop new ways of attacking pollution. In so doing, we must take account of the deficiencies built into the system and, wherever possible, should adapt corrective techniques to the situation as we find it, not as we would have it.

The first and basic need is for a more authoritative information-gathering network, and methods of getting that information at minimum cost to those who need it. This need affects all institutions at all levels. It is being met only superficially at the present time. How it should be carried out and who should do it are important questions not yet resolved: bureaucracy makes strong arguments for keeping the apparatus out of governmental hands, and the profit motive provides strong reasons for keeping it out of the marketplace.

In developing any such information network, emphasis must be placed upon the excellence of the service—differences of opinion are no vice when responsible and adequately documented, and unanimity of opinion ought to be cause for concern.

Unfortunately, the time scale within which we must respond to environmental challenges is so compressed that whatever information and control systems we can develop may still be unable to operate effectively. The rate of technological change will probably remain rapid, although, as suggested by John Platt in his article "What We Must Do" (*Science*, November 28, 1969), a leveling off is likely in some areas. The objective thus becomes to develop sufficiently responsive systems to permit society to react to new crises before they have acquired unstoppable momentum.

These difficulties are compounded by our inaccurate and inadequate trouble-sensing procedures. We do not seem able to react

even when problems are foreseen; we respond only when they have become massive and less easily managed. Inaction in turn requires far greater corrective force than would have been necessary had we reacted sooner and more adequately.

This also points up the failings of the more or less simplistic solutions that we tend to adopt as a means of correcting environmental problems, which are rarely if ever simple in origin, and are not usually curable by the simple solutions presented to and accepted by those who make the crucial decisions.

Finally, we have never seriously set out to define what we mean when we talk about an "optimum" or "livable" environment. True, we all tend to make these judgments on a subjective, non-analytical basis, and we focus on issues with which we may personally and emotionally be involved. The tennis-shoed little old lady may grieve for the Redwoods or a threatened brook without realizing that bigger and more serious problems may threaten much more basic values—perhaps life itself.

Subjective judgments on these questions are unavoidable, and may not be undesirable. But at the same time it would seem important to devote a portion of our energies to an informed effort to *define* the public interest and clarify some of the conflicts that are inevitably involved. If, for example, we continue to favor the internal combustion engine as an integral element of our transportation system, what will this mean in terms of projected levels of air pollution, climate, and human health? Should we not, in other words, develop a base line, from which we may then judge the consequences and costs of proposed new courses of action?

The traditional approach to the development of social control systems has involved the creation of regulatory agencies acting as expert arbiters to protect the public interest. This approach has been spectacularly unsuccessful: the regulators have inevitably become captives of the very industries they were established to regulate. Consciously or not, the regulators have adopted roles as promoters and protectors of the theoretically regulated, and leave little hope that improved environmental protection would result from the establishment of a new super-regulatory agency.

A newer method suggested for controlling rampant environmental degradation involves establishing technical and technological monitoring systems; that is, putting scientists in the position of active maintenance, control, and dissemination of environmental information and protective measures. But this effort is hardly more likely to succeed, since it requires a degree of political sensitivity and aggressiveness foreign and perhaps even antithetical to the scientific method, and certainly inconsistent with history and current practice.

The most adequate solution appears to lie in putting necessary information into the hands of the concerned public, which has the most direct interest, and by giving it better tools and ways of calling environmental miscreants to account. Of course we cannot prevent the bureaucrat or the entrepreneur from making decisions which have short-term advantages for him but long-term disadvantages for us, but we can require him to make his decisions and reasons public, and to provide a forum to review those decisions with broad social interests in mind.

In effect, this would involve building into the decision-making structure of government the ability and desire to consider long-term and ecological consequences of activities, a process that might be accomplished through a number of specific steps:

Long-term effects of programs and policies must be examined and detailed as a matter of public record.

Procedures must be established following government programs and projects to determine whether the environmental effects were those anticipated, and if not, why not. (Here again the public should be given easy access to the full record, and procedures should be established permitting citizens to put the appropriate agencies on the spot.)

Executive agencies should be required as a matter of procedure to obtain the views of other interested federal, state, or local groups, public and private, on questions related to their programs. Responsible criticisms should be answered on the record, and if no answer is forthcoming, or if the answer is unsatisfactory, procedures should be established to permit judicial review.

Public agencies, in adopting specific programs, should also be required to show how these programs are best adapted to the total needs of the situation. Where reasonable alternatives exist, these should be described, and an explanation given as to why they were not adopted.

Each agency taking action should be legally required to justify why any action at all was desirable. This is not so simple-minded as it sounds: the Corps of Engineers is hard put to defend itself when asked to develop cost/benefit calculations for *not* building a dam. Assembling a group of technologists and/or engineers presupposes great pressure to do *something*, and the option of not going forward at all is often obscured or ignored.

This last requirement suggests itself for nongovernmental areas of endeavors as well. Highway builders, land developers, and others have a far easier job in making their cases than do their opponents. A heavy burden of proof is placed upon the people who presume to speak for the public interest. To get into court they must show that active harm will result, not balanced by the putative good provided by the proposed activity. The burden is misplaced—those who wish to use environmental assets should be required to show that the balance *favours* their proposals.

We also need mechanisms for more rapid, extensive, and convenient public review of major public and private agency decisions. Perhaps a Public Defender for the Environment, with authority to review general governmental policies and pass upon specific problems considered to have significant environmental consequences might be a solution. In extraordinary cases, this Defender could be given the authority to issue temporary cease-and-desist orders to prevent the otherwise inevitable destruction of important resources. Control procedures must be set up to prevent such a Defender from acting irresponsibly, or to force him to act in proper cases.

We must encourage the public to participate more effectively in the making of decisions with environmental implications, on which it has no presently measurable impact. This means citizen action programs, keyed to the issues of the day. Call them lobbies, pressure groups, or anything else; color them important. Their actions should be coordinated to have meaningful impact upon the legislative bodies whose decisions affect us all.

We also need to develop new ways of funding citizen organizations with environmental objectives. Where they act to protect common assets, they should be supported by the public treasury or by the organizations whose actions created the problem.

Greater citizen participation might be accomplished by the enactment of a federal statute to the effect that any person or group winning or perhaps even instituting a court case based upon the violation of a federal pollution law should be entitled, in the discretion of the court, to recover reasonable

fees and costs. It would be necessary to spell out in detail the type of cases in which such relief would be appropriate, but the basic idea merits discussion.

In many ways it would appear more desirable to force the would-be polluter himself to underwrite the costs of protecting the resources that he has threatened. This could be done by requiring a public bond to be filed by agencies which propose to take actions with potentially undesirable environmental consequences. That bond would be subject to forfeiture if an anti-pollution law were violated or if unforeseen environmental consequences should occur, and the funds might be applied to legal fees or to cleaning up the resultant damages.

We should also step up our efforts to find more adequate technological solutions to the problems which technology has created. The most effective and least harmful method developed to clean up the Santa Barbara oil spill was the massive use of straw, men, and hand rakes—hardly a creative response. Transferring oil from Alaska's North Slope to world markets may create serious environmental threats: the use of gigantic ice-breaking tankers endangers the Arctic Ocean, and the use of overland pipelines threatens a tundra that has remained substantially unchanged for many, many years. Both techniques menace a fragile ecology that might take centuries to recover if something unforeseen should happen.

It is almost inconceivable that more effective and less expensive techniques could not be found to meet these and other environmental hazards of the time. The civilization that put men on the moon ought to be able to do better.

In 1968, several congressmen formed an unofficial Ad-Hoc Committee on the Environment as a channel for communication on environmental issues between the Congress and interested scientists and informed citizens. The committee now numbers a hundred and twenty, and is in regular contact with a hundred and thirty-two expert advisers. Membership on the committee is open to any interested legislator, senator, or representative, Republican or Democrat. This step does not entirely satisfy the need for better information, but it seems to be a long step in the right direction. The information network available to members of that committee may soon be expanded to meet state and local demands for better environmental information, and ought also to be useful to other groups with similar concerns.

Legislation has been considered in the Congress which could go far toward arming citizens' organizations with better information on what federal agencies are doing and why they are doing it. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, sponsored by Senator Henry Jackson and Representative John Dingell, contains language to this effect, as does the airport construction bill recently passed by the House. It remains to be seen, of course, to what extent the executive agencies will be successful in their inevitable efforts to weaken the impact of these measures, though their jobs will be made more difficult by the certain knowledge that interested legislators will be watching.

These steps and the ones that remain to be taken are hopeful signs in an area in which hope is uncommon. If anything, these efforts should be accelerated; we may not be able to afford more delay, and we should begin to exercise what talents we have for imaginative and bold departures from the patterns of behavior no longer adequate to our needs.

The international community is also rapidly becoming aware of the dangers of environmental degradation. Sweden has taken an important step by proposing a worldwide Conference on the Environment for

1972, under the auspices of the United Nations. The hazard is one which many nations recognize, but this recognition must be tempered by the realization that agreement is easy in principle but not in fact. Everyone is against pollution, but the ranks of enthusiasts thin quickly as specific problems arise and specific remedies are proposed.

We have been less than successful in dealing with environmental problems on the local and national level. International, our record is even worse. The history of the international fishing and whaling commissions does not encourage a sanguine view of the future. The United Nations, in turn, has neither the constituency nor the commitment to resolve foreseeable international environmental conflicts. It was not created for this purpose, and would require extensive internal change if it were to take them up seriously.

The need for better information channels is as great internationally as it is on a smaller scale. If anything, political solutions are more easily blocked than at state and national levels, and no one has yet devised a workable system of sanctions to minimize those problems, which all concede do exist.

If it is true that the interests of small groups are often at odds with those of the larger societies in which they exist, how much more true is this of nations, whose antagonisms are more easily created and sustained, and whose common concerns may be deliberately obscured? Downwind and downstream nations from those applying persistent pesticides may see their own problems clearly, but their apprehensions are likely to be viewed as quite unimportant by the nation creating the problem. That nation may well consider its first interest to be protection of the health and food supply of its own citizens, and look upon undesirable side effects as someone else's problem. Unfortunately, they may be everyone else's problem.

The strongest peaceful sanction we have available to influence international decisions appears to be public opinion. More attention might profitably be devoted to the use of public disclosure as a stimulus for more adequate decisions about the international environmental issues. A weak reed it may be, but it must serve until we can find a stronger substitute.

One simple illustration of how such pressures might work can be seen in proposed treaties for the use of the seas. This crucial area has been perceived clearly by national interests as a vast potential source of food and mineral resources, and consequently as critical to their survival.

We must pass over without further analysis the critical issue of sanctions as beyond the scope of this article and as beyond the ability of the concerned parties to resolve at this time. We shall also assume, for the purpose of argument, that it will eventually become possible to develop working treaty relationships with the affected nations and that such a treaty will provide an operating structure as well as a policy-making body.

What suggestions may be made to provide some assurance that the vast assets of the ocean will be used for the common good, and not misused on behalf of narrow segments of humanity? Proposals have been made to provide a focus for scientific impact at the policy-making level; these disciplines will of necessity be represented at the operating levels as well. The proposals do not appear to be entirely adequate to current needs—they will be as inadequate to solve international issues as they are to solve problems on the national scale.

We need an Ombudsman for the Seas.

The functions of such an organization would be simple: to review and to comment upon proposed actions by the operating arm of the treaty organization and others, to consult with the policy-making arm on matters which are or which ought to be under

consideration, and to make recommendations to these and to all nations on ways to use, without misusing, the oceans.

This latter point is particularly important, since the seas could be affected by the activities of nations which may not be treaty signatories—even by nations which are entirely landlocked. Inland rivers and estuaries play an important role in the life cycles of fish and other species important to man, and are in turn highly vulnerable to actions affecting airsheds or watersheds with oceanic outlets. Few nations in the world remain entirely oblivious to the opinions of others, and the ability of the Ombudsman to focus worldwide attention upon previously ignored problems could develop into a highly valuable tool.

As sanctions are developed for the international treaty, consideration should also be given to making sanctions available to the Ombudsman, under adequate control procedures. The Ombudsman should not be a policeman: there will be enough problems without adding new ones. However, there should be a close working relationship with whatever organization handles the operations of the treaty organization.

The Ombudsman should have direct access to current oceanographic and ecological information about the seas. Again it would be desirable to keep informational and experimental activities separated from their primary functions; it would also be important to keep them separated from the conventional channels of authority within the operating arm of the treaty organization.

History indicates that, in the seas as elsewhere, strong pressures will be brought to bear by those seeking to exploit these resources. It will be critically important to build into the treaty organization some form of countervailing pressures to ensure that the long-term productivity of the oceans is not endangered by man's effort to turn these assets to limited advantage. If we have learned nothing else from the ecologists, we know now that we exist within a closed system and that we must develop processes and procedures that will permit us to recycle those resources that we must use. To this end, the Ombudsman can serve us well.

For a number of reasons it would seem desirable to create a three- or five-member organization of Ombudsmen with staggered, rotating memberships, and a semi-permanent professional staff. Continuity is important, but a constant access to fresh blood provides a responsiveness to challenge that will be invaluable.

A highly structured decision-making apparatus within the organization itself may not be desirable. No member should be given a power of veto; indeed, if any member sees a particular problem as important, and his colleagues do not share his views, he should still be given latitude to study the problem and to report on it to the appropriate bodies, supporting his report with whatever evidence is available.

The Ombudsmen should be required to submit an annual report on their operations to the treaty organization, and copies of this report should be given wide distribution to member nations as well as to the United Nations. Dissenting views should be made available in the same form. The incentive to review specific problems might come from within the organization itself, or it might come from any member nations. If review is declined, the reasons for disapproval ought to be spelled out in detail.

Funding is critical. As one of the important functions of the treaty, the Ombudsmen should be assured of a regular budget, subject to no diminution for political reasons. Unless the organization can be free of budgetary apprehensions, its work must inevitably suffer.

Clearly the problems of protection of the global environment are not confined to its

oceans. Treaties for the oceans are only a beginning—but there is no good reason why these treaties should not be viewed as the first real steps toward more comprehensive and adequate environmental protection. Men require a world that men can live in.

The oceans are important for a number of reasons. It has been shown that they are not as productive as they were once thought to be, in terms of long-term food sources for humanity. We cannot carelessly develop the oceans as a habitat or dumping grounds, but must concern ourselves with protecting this vital element of Spaceship Earth. At the same time, we may perhaps take a halting step toward developing techniques that may prove effective in other areas as well.

The environmental outlook is not encouraging. We are coming to recognize that, however distant the prospect, we have degraded the environment in which we live and on which we depend, and that the quality of our lives—very likely our existence itself—is in danger.

Paradoxically, there is really no villain at whom one can point the finger of blame—unless we are all villains. However, a strong case can be made that the real problem is that our social institutions have proved inadequate to carry the burdens suddenly thrust upon them. Our ability to manipulate the physical world has far outstripped the social institutions and protective devices that might otherwise have shielded us.

Therefore, our new struggle must be to achieve more direct and intimate participation in the decision-making process by citizens and broadly based interest groups. This, coupled with fuller disclosure of the process itself, promises significant benefits.

Representatives of the bureaucratic/industrial complex may say that such changes in the making of decisions will slow those decisions down and will make the process itself more cumbersome. They would be quite correct: new projects and proposals will be hampered and new enterprise will be slowed down.

There may be extraordinary occasions in which such delay cannot be tolerated, but I believe that more careful and balanced consideration of the consequences of future enterprise will benefit society. Once upon a time, social policy was designed to encourage new forms of commercial, industrial, and governmental activity: the elaborate fiction of the corporation was devised to permit men to act collectively without risk to their personal fortunes. America encouraged the growth of the maritime industry, then the railroads, and we are still encouraging an aircraft industry which scarcely needs encouragement and which may be serving interests opposed to those of society (who really needs the SST, anyway?).

Perhaps it is time to cut back this encouragement—to build up the other side of the case: the protection and nurture of the citizen—the human being. New procedures to protect the earth's endangered life-support system may indeed produce a less vigorous exploitation of her resources—but consider the alternatives.

DETENTION WITHOUT TRIAL IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in South Africa today we are reminded of the strength of legal traditions, the persistence of human courage and the capacity

of university students to strike a responsive chord in society. Preventive detention in its most extreme form—indefinite detention on police suspicion—which has resulted in reported torture and death of detainees, was added in 1967 by the South African Terrorism Act to an already shocking panoply of arbitrary police and administrative powers. That act passed with only one dissenting vote. The organized bar was mute. Yet today, there are ferment, responsible public criticism and the resurgence of a chance that the Government may back away from such practices.

The goads to conscience have been sharp. Starting in the fall of 1967 came debates and resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council, both incensed at the application of such a law as the Terrorism Act to the international territory of Namibia—South West Africa. The press of member states carried the story to their people; some Governments registered protest at Pretoria. The legal profession in the United States, Great Britain, and elsewhere evidenced deep concern. Reports of abuse of detainees and other forms of police brutality surfaced in South Africa in spite of official silence. New trials under the act at Pietermaritzburg and Windhoek dramatized the plight of detainee, defendant, and witness under its provisions.

Then came "the trial of the 22" in the fall and winter of 1969-70. Twenty-two Africans were detained under the Terrorism Act for over 6 months and subjected to inhuman treatment in interrogation of kinds described in their own statements as submitted to the supreme court by their counsel and in cross-examination of state witnesses. They were brought to trial under another act—not authorizing indefinite detention—the charges were withdrawn and they were acquitted. Before they could leave the courtroom, the Special Branch redetained them under the Terrorism Act. Efforts of their counsel to secure judicial protection from police abuses have met frustration and delay. As the significance of the proceedings gained wider understanding in South Africa, protest spread from editorials of a few free-speaking papers and the ladies of the Black Sash, long known for their peaceful vigils against injustice, to the university students and faculty, the churches and the organized bar and side bar. The forceful and authoritative indictment of preventive detention and other forms of arbitrary denial of rights delivered by Joel Carlson, attorney for the 22 and observer for the International Commission of Jurists in earlier matters has already been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. (May 13, 1970, p. 15425; May 20, 1970, p. 16404).

I submit herewith for inclusion in the RECORD the condemnation of the preventive detention provision of the Terrorism Act issued on May 27, 1970, by the distinguished and highly respected bar council of Johannesburg, a newspaper report that the Government intends soon to charge or release the 22 and other

reports evidencing that the hope for justice under law can still rally significant support in South Africa:

JOHANNESBURG ADVOCATES ATTACK TERROR ACT

The Johannesburg Bar, in a statement issued yesterday, strongly criticized the provisions of the Terrorism Act.

It said: "The detention of persons under the provisions of Section Six of the Terrorism Act, No. 83 of 1967 is an example of the application of the power which has been given to the executive to detain persons for an indefinite period without trial.

"The Johannesburg Bar * * * repeatedly in the past expressed its concern at this type of legislation and its attitude ought by now to be well-known, to both legislators and members of the public.

"The Johannesburg Bar wishes to reiterate its strong opposition to any legislation which conflicts with the fundamental precepts of our Roman Dutch Law as applied for many years by the courts of our country, and in particular, to provisions such as Section Six of the Terrorism Act which enables persons to be detained in solitary confinement for an indefinite period, without the right to receive legal advice or to apply to court to determine the legality of their detention.

"BURDEN

"There are other objectionable features of the Terrorism Act, such as the wide definition of 'terrorism' whereby ordinary law-abiding citizens going about their lawful pursuits can also become 'terrorists,' and the placing on an accused person the heavy burden of proving certain facts beyond reasonable doubt in order to escape conviction and heavy penalties.

"This is not even an exhaustive list of the objectionable features of the Act.

"The Johannesburg Bar has always recognized the duty of the Government to ensure the safety of the State. It does not seek in any way to trespass upon any person's political convictions which, in this respect, are quite irrelevant.

"Nor does the Johannesburg Bar seek to prescribe to Parliament how it should combat terrorism or any other activity prejudicial to the safety of the State.

"PILLARS

"What it is, and always has been, concerned about is that legislation dealing with any subject ought to be so designed that it does not contain provisions which run counter to our fundamental precepts of law.

"It is the Bar's traditional duty to warn against the erosion of these fundamental principles which are the very pillars upon which our civilisation has been built.

"The Terrorism Act, and other legislation containing similar features, and the application of such legislation in practice, constitutes a very serious inroad upon the rule of law, and in the view of the Johannesburg Bar this type of legislation is subversive to the proper administration of justice in South Africa.

"The Johannesburg Bar further urges the Government at the earliest opportunity to introduce legislation to restore the courts to their traditional role as guardians of the liberty of the subject."

LAWYERS ARE WORRIED ABOUT DETAINEES: ACTION AT "HIGH LEVEL" URGED

The Johannesburg Attorneys' Association, representing all working attorneys in Johannesburg, has asked the Incorporated Law Society of the Transvaal to approach the Government about the 22 men and women being detained indefinitely under the Terrorism Act.

At a meeting in Johannesburg last week, the association's committee expressed their concern about indefinite detention. They were particularly perturbed because the accused had already been acquitted in a court of law.

On Friday Mr. K. D. Moodie, Attorney-General of the Transvaal, told me that no charges had yet been preferred against the detainees. He said that, as far as he knew, no charges were being considered at present.

Mr. Moodie reiterated that the Security Police had powers, under Section 6 of the Terrorism Act, to hold people indefinitely.

Concern and opposition are mounting among legal men, including advocates, attorneys and academic lawyers, over arbitrary indefinite detention without trial. I understand that other law societies, representing attorneys, and bar councils, representing advocates either have or are planning to take up the matter at "the highest levels".

Representatives of these law bodies in the different centers this week declined to say what action was being taken, however.

Mr. Harry Frank, president of the Incorporated Law Society of the Transvaal, would not confirm the approach by the Attorneys' Association to investigate the position of the 22 detainees.

In the Sunday Times last week Dr. Barend van Nickerk, senior lecturer in law at the University of the Witwatersrand, accused law societies and bar councils of being "deafeningly silent" on the law governing solitary confinement, which he said they knew to be utterly wrong.

Investigations this week showed that many leading advocates and attorneys are deeply perturbed and are looking to their legal bodies to make their feelings known to the highest authorities.

BOSS LAW

One told me: "On a point of law, as in this case, we feel that we cannot remain silent. Our legal bodies spoke out strongly against the boss law, which allows for certain evidence to be withheld from the courts if it is considered to be prejudicial to the interests of the State.

"We believe that indefinite detention also abrogates the rule of law because it supercedes the powers of the courts."

Dr. Van Nickerk told me this week that he had been pleased to learn that the Johannesburg Attorneys' Association had already taken steps, when he criticised the law bodies, to express their concern. He also welcomed the fact that other legal bodies were discussing the question of indefinite detention.

"It is to be hoped that any action they take will be unequivocal and expeditious.

"After all, people are in solitary detention now—and have been for a very long time."

U.P. HITS OUT ON DETAINEES

The central head committee of the United Party—consisting of the full Parliamentary caucus of the party, as well as provincial leaders and senior M.P.C.s—last night recorded its "profound concern" at the continued detention without trial of the 22 detainees who have now been held in custody for more than a year.

A statement said: "This committee places on record its profound concern at the continued detention without trial of 22 detainees held in terms of section 6 of the Terrorism Act after they had been acquitted by the Supreme Court of charges laid against them.

"This committee believes that Parliament, when it passed this law, never intended that it should be used in this manner."

The committee reiterated the determination of the United Party to uphold the safety and security of the State, and law and order, and the maintenance of the democratic process.

"If the further detention of the 22 detainees is not arbitrary, they should be charged and the facts which the authorities feel justify their actions should be placed before the court—in camera if necessary—and their rights and liberty or otherwise determined by the court."

DECISION SOON ON TRIAL OF 22 DETAINEES

The Minister of Justice, Mr. Pelsler, announced this week that police investigations about the 22 people detained under the Terrorism Act have reached the stage where the matter could soon be submitted again to the Attorney-General.

The Attorney-General, he said, has undertaken to give it his immediate attention and to announce his decision as soon as possible. Those of the 22 who were not charged would be released unless circumstances arose which he could not now foresee.

In a statement to Sapa the Minister said: "As is known, the Attorney-General of the Transvaal, on February 16, 1970, stopped the prosecution in the case of the State versus S. R. Ndou and 21 others, who were on trial in the Supreme Court in Pretoria on charges under the Suppression of Communism Act, 1950.

"Thereafter the accused were detained in terms of the Terrorism Act, 1967.

"The Terrorism Act authorizes me as Minister of Justice to order the release of any detainee and I can assure the public that I am at all times kept informed of all the circumstances concerning a person's detention under the Act.

"I am now able to announce that the further investigations instituted by the police in regard to these persons, have reached the stage where the case can, within a few days, again be submitted to the Attorney-General.

"The Attorney-General has undertaken to give it his immediate attention and to announce his decision as soon as possible. Those of the 22 persons who may perhaps not be charged, will be released unless circumstances which I cannot now foresee, arise."

In the early hours of Monday, May 12 last year, police raided homes and arrested people all over the country. Nobody knew how many were arrested, but Parliament was told three weeks later of "some 40 people detained."

Relatives did not know where the detainees were. At first they thought the detention was under the 180 days' clause, but this was later denied.

After 5½ months of detention, incommunicado and in solitary confinement, 22 people were charged under the Suppression of Communism Act with being members of a banned organization, the African National Congress, or of furthering its aims.

Among them were Winnie Mandela, wife of Nelson Mandela, and a Johannesburg journalist, Joyce Sikakane. There were 17 men and five women, including a husband and wife, a grandfather, an old man of 73 and a youngster of 19.

On December 1 their trial began before Mr. Justice S. Bekker in the Pretoria Supreme Court. Five State witnesses spoke of threats and assaults during interrogation.

On February 16, 1970, the Attorney-General made his first appearance at the trial and said he was stopping the proceedings and withdrawing the prosecution. No reasons were given.

Since then, for a further 14 weeks, they have been detained under the Terrorism Act, in places unspecified.

PROTESTS AGAINST SECTION 6 WILL BE CONTINUED

Protest against arbitrary indefinite detention will continue "as long as Section 6 of

the Terrorism Act remains on the Statute Book", I learnt from many different quarters this week.

Both the United Party and the Progressive Party will raise the issue in Parliament starting in July. Questions will also be asked concerning the "many other persons apart from the 22 who have been held incommunicado in detention for long periods."

Opposition to the section, which has been voiced from many responsible and even conservative quarters in the past few weeks, was directed at the principle of arbitrary indefinite detention, and will not cease now because some detainees—the "22 on whom the spotlight fell"—are to be charged or released, I was told.

Yesterday Mrs. Helen Suzman, Progressive Party M.P. said from London: "In Parliament this session I intend raising the repeal of Section 6 and any other laws which prevent access to the courts or provide for detention without trial.

"I also intend to press for information about other persons being held under Section 6 or the 180-day law.

"It is high time South Africa returned to the normal rule of law. There can be no emergency situation which our police and the army are not capable of dealing with under normal law."

Stressing that she strongly supported further public protest, Mrs. Suzman said it was only protest that kept the minds of the public alerted and might eventually persuade the Government that these laws were not acceptable to people who had respect for democratic practice.

ABUSE

"It is worth remembering that the Transkei is still under the shadow of Proclamation 400, which gives vast emergency powers to the Government."

Mr. Mike Mitchell, United Party M.P. and leader of the Justice Group in Parliament said yesterday that the U.P. would raise the matter in Parliament because it was plain that the detention law was subject to abuse.

"We will demand that Section 6 be amended to allow the courts to determine whether a person should be detained, and on what conditions," he said.

Elaborating on the criticism that Section 6 was open to abuse, Mr. Mitchell pointed out that the 22 had been detained the first time for 5½ months but it could, under this law, have been 5½ years.

JUDGES

"In addition, they were detained under an Act purporting to deal with terrorists and terrorism, but eventually were charged under the Suppression of Communism Act.

"One thing is clear—that after the coming case against them (if there is going to be one) we will be in a much better position in Parliament to deal with detention without trial," Mr. Mitchell said.

Mr. Justice Blackwell, a former judge, said it was not only the right but also the duty of judges, advocates, attorneys and academic lawyers to speak out in defence of public liberty and the rule of law.

"If our legislators were to provide that no person were to be detained over a certain period without the investigation of the Supreme Court—or a judge—public opinion might be satisfied.

"But to be enabled by law to keep persons locked up indefinitely without even accusation, let alone trial, in a time of peace, is barbarous."

It was this sort of thing that gave South Africa an extra bad name "and, heaven knows, our name is bad enough as it is," Mr. Justice Blackwell said.

Professor S. A. Strauss, professor of law at the University of South Africa in Pretoria,

said it was to be commended that the Minister of Justice had announced that the 22 would now be charged or released.

"This is widely welcomed because concern has been expressed from numerous and responsible quarters."

However, he said, the principle of indefinite detention was a violation of the sacrosanct principles of South Africa's common law—such as the law of habeas corpus.

OTHERS

Professor John Dugard, of the law department at the University of the Witwatersrand, said yesterday:

"Obviously every right-minded South African is delighted with the news that the 22 are to be charged or released. Obviously we are all pleased to know that the 22 will soon emerge from solitary confinement and the absolute power of the police.

"One is also gratified to learn that public opinion appears to influence the authorities in the exercise of their arbitrary powers.

"But at the same time one must remember that the wave of protest which has flowed across South Africa over the 22 is as much concerned with other persons held under the Terrorism Act and Section 6 of the Terrorism Act itself."

The 22 had symbolised injustice and arbitrary rule, Professor Dugard said.

"The fact that they are to be charged or released must not be allowed to dampen the protest on behalf of all other detainees or against Section 6.

"One hopes that this protest will continue until the Government announces its intention to repeal Section 6."

The following are two of the questions which were put to Mr. Pelsler, Minister of Justice, by the Sunday Times this week. He declined to answer them.

It is understood that there are many others besides the 22 who are being held in indefinite detention. What is their position now that you have announced that the 22 are to be charged or released?

People who have protested in recent weeks—particularly the academic lawyers from the Afrikaans universities—have expressed concern over the indefinite detention law in principle. Is there any chance that Section 6 may be repealed in view of the fact that South Africa is not in a declared state of emergency?

END THIS "INHUMAN LAW," SAY 120 TOP SOUTH AFRICANS

(By A. J. Wannenburg)

CAPE TOWN, Saturday—A call for the repeal of the 180-day detention clause and clauses in the Terrorism Act providing for indefinite detention in solitary confinement without trial, has been made by 120 prominent South Africans.

The call is made in a statement circulated by the Civil Rights League.

The statement recalls that as long ago as 1964, a representative section of South African religious leaders condemned the 90-day detention clause as "a violation of the moral law and an offense to religious conscience".

It also points out that 60 eminent medical specialists, psychiatrists and psychologists condemned the effects of the law as "no less abhorrent than physical torture," adding: "We feel that this system of detention in solitary confinement is inhuman and unjustifiable and appeal for its abolition."

A former Chief Justice of South Africa and a number of distinguished former members of the judiciary also condemned "this degradation of the rule of law."

"So far from heeding these appeals, the Government replaced the 90-day clause with legislation authorising detention for 180 days, and later, under the Terrorism Act, indefinite detention in solitary confinement

without access to anyone save jailers," the Civil Rights League statement says.

"There appears to be no need for this abrogation of the rule of law, and many citizens are disturbed by:

"deaths reported in the newspapers of people held, in terms of these laws.

"allegations of torture and 'third degree' methods of interrogation.

"arrests of many political suspects who are held in jail without charge for months, only to be finally discharged or found 'not guilty' if brought to court eventually.

"reliance by the Security Police on evidence procured from paid informers, a method which invites abuse and has been abused."

LEADERS HAIL DETAINEE MOVE: PROOF THAT PROTESTS BRING RESULTS—STEYN

(By Jill Chisholm)

The announcement by the Minister of Justice, Mr. Pelser, that a decision could be expected soon on the fate of the 22 people detained under the Terrorism Act was welcomed yesterday by those who have protested against the continued detention.

It was hailed as "very good news" by church and student leaders, the General Council of the Bar of South Africa—representing all advocates—and other groups.

"This announcement by Mr. Pelser is evidence that the duty to protest against injustice—when carried out with dignity and due regard for the law—is not without results," said the Transvaal leader of the United Party, Mr. Marais Steyn, M.P.

Mr. Pelser said in his statement yesterday that police investigations had reached a stage where the case could—within a few days—again be submitted to the Attorney-General.

The Attorney-General, he said, had undertaken to give it his immediate attention and to announce his decision as soon as possible.

Those of the 22 persons who were not charged would be released—"unless circumstances which I cannot now foresee arise." Among those to welcome Mr. Pelser's statement yesterday were:

The Bishop of Johannesburg, the Rt. Rev. Leslie Stradling: "It is very good news. I am very pleased to know that this is being done."

Chief Rabbi B. M. Casper, Chief Rabbi of Johannesburg: "I am delighted. This will bring widespread relief to those who are concerned with the good name of South Africa."

Mr. G. A. Coetzee, Q.C., chairman of the General Council of the Bar of South Africa: "I am extremely happy to hear of the Minister's statement—and, in a way, not surprised to hear it, in the light of my interviews with him.

"The Bar generally will be very pleased with this result."

Mrs. Jean Sinclair, national president of the Black Sash, which has protested publicly, through vigils, against the continued detention of the 22: "It appears that the protest has been heeded.

"I am very glad that this has happened—albeit none too soon."

Mr. Ken Costa, president of the Students' Representative Council of the University of Witwatersrand: "We are pleased that the 22 are to be charged or released.

"This is a tremendous victory for our students, who started two and a half weeks ago on a campaign to make the public aware of these detentions."

Mr. Herman Koch, a former president of the Chamber of Mines, who was chairman of a public protest meeting organized by the Witwatersrand Council of Churches: "I am relieved and gratified that the authorities have taken seriously the expressions of con-

science that have come from all over South Africa."

Mr. Marais Steyn: "All those who have kept the conscience of the South African people alive—in and outside Parliament—should be congratulated."

But Section 6 of the Terrorism Act remained on the Statute Books, he said, adding: "In Parliament we shall seek its repeal.

BLOTCHES

"Whether or not we succeed in this particular instance we will continue to work so that a new government in South Africa can remove all such blotches from our statute books."

In Cape Town the announcement was welcomed by two prominent churchmen, the Rev. Derrick Timm, president of the Methodist Church Conference, and Rabbi David Sherman, senior rabbi of the Cape Town Jewish Reform Congregation.

In Durban Mr. Joel Carlson, a legal representative of the detainees when they appeared on charges under the Suppression of Communism Act, said it was the nationwide protests about detention without trial that had provoked the statement by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Carlson, South African representative of the International Commission of Jurists, said: "The protests have been based on sound arguments and the Minister has responded sensibly," writes a "Rand Daily Mail" staff reporter.

RICHARD SUGGESTS TERROR ACT CHECK

(By Anthony Holiday)

Mr. Dirk Richard, editor of the Nationalist newspaper "Dagbreek," last night made a public call for a panel of judges to be set up to submit reports on detainees held under the Terrorism Act.

Mr. Richard made the call at a symposium on "law, order and protest," organized by the Progressive Party, where he came under heavy fire from questioners.

Answering a question by Mr. Harry Brighish, Transvaal chairman of the party, he said he agreed that laws like Section Six of the Terrorism Act should be subject to some form of control or review by Parliament.

"I would like to see a panel of judges set up to submit regular reports on the conditions of detainees. Their reports could be made available to the Leader of the Opposition," he said.

Answering another questioner, he said it was "nonsense" to say that the nation was subjected to terror by the Act. South Africa was living in dangerous times and none of his questioners could dispute it.

"My God, you can't catch the terrorists' bullets with the rule of law," he added.

ADMISSION

In his main address, Mr. Richard admitted that the principle of detention without trial was something he did not like and would like to see done away with.

"The Government itself is conscious of what this principle is doing to its image.

"I will further admit that the detention of the 22 people is not above criticism," he added.

But the position at present was that communists had a plan for revolt in three phases. These were: passive resistance, urban sabotage and then the combination of passive protest with urban sabotage. The communists calculated that when they had won over 15 per cent of the population they were in a position to take over.

There were 20,000 guerrillas in camps in Zambia and Tanzania.

"Can the Government relax? Can they really do away with Section Six and open the door to communism?"

Professor John Dugard, Professor of Law at the University of Witwatersrand, said a legislature which enacted laws which were devoid of moral content ran the risk of losing people's respect for law.

This loss of respect had already occurred among Non-Whites and among White students. Protests in South Africa was important because it gave some outlet for political expression to the young.

If students were not allowed to protest there was a danger that their frustrations might tempt them to break the law and "go underground."

Professor S. Strauss, Professor of Law at the University of South Africa, said every political party in South Africa saw democracy as its goal. This meant that it should be accepted that the greatest possible measure of individual criticism should be allowed.

POLICE DUTY

"The right to protest is worthy of protection. Where there is thought to be a danger of violence, it is the duty of police to protect lawful protest.

"I do not stand for uncontrolled protest," he added.

Mr. C. S. Reynecke, a law student and chairman of local committee of the Afrikaans Studentebond at the Rand Afrikaans University, said if there were no law and order in a country there could also be no right to protest.

South Africa was in a "difficult position" where laws like the Terrorism Act were necessary because of prevailing circumstances.

Miss Linsey Collins, an honours student at Wits, said it was very difficult in a country like South Africa to exercise any effective control over the Government except by protest.

A TRIBUTE TO BABE RUTH BASEBALL

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to express my appreciation for a stimulating branch of the American athletic tradition—Babe Ruth Baseball—which has captured the attention of American sports lovers, coast to coast.

It may well be that baseball no longer stands unchallenged as the national sport, and that other forms of athletic competition are bidding for ascendancy. But after watching a contest between a couple of teams clashing for supremacy of the Babe Ruth Baseball circuit, it is hard to believe that any sport can overshadow this one, in the eyes of the average young American.

The spirit of the game and of its youthful participants renders it a major contribution to the American heritage in keeping with a million other grand athletic traditions. The knowledge and experience acquired in such an undertaking cannot be measured except in watching the development of the young men involved. And, from what I have seen, they are truly a tribute to the cause of Babe Ruth Baseball and their adult associates who, through tireless activity, have sponsored its production for the benefit of all concerned.