

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DEDICATION OF THE LYNDON
BAINES JOHNSON NATIONAL HIS-
TORIC SITE

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last Saturday, June 13, to attend a very memorable historic event, the dedication of the Lyndon Baines Johnson National Historic Site. This splendid new addition to our national parks system was the birthplace and boyhood home of President Johnson, and the preservation of the Johnson home is a meaningful tribute to a dedicated and courageous former U.S. Representative, Senator, Vice President, and President.

During the ceremony dedicating the Johnson home, I recalled that President Truman once defined a "statesman" as a "politician who has been dead 200 years." It seems that we as a people are making progress in giving due recognition to the contributions of our outstanding Chief Executives. The American people are far ahead of Mr. Truman's timetable in honoring his own outstanding statesmanship, and last Saturday men of good will joined to dedicate, as a national historic site, the early home of a truly great American statesman, Lyndon Baines Johnson. The fact that we have acted to set aside his early home for future generations to enjoy and visit is evidence that Americans deeply appreciate the great accomplishments of this Texan who served so devotedly and dynamically as the 36th President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Walter J. Hickel, accepted the Johnson home on behalf of the American people, and I place in the RECORD the Secretary's fine statement upon that historic occasion:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
WALTER J. HICKEL AT THE DEDICATION OF
LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON NATIONAL HIS-
TORIC SITE, STONEWALL, TEX., JUNE 13, 1970

It is a great honor and a deep personal pleasure for me to accept on behalf of the people of the United States, the birthplace and boyhood home of President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

We all are indebted to the Johnson City Foundation, which recognized very early the historic significance of these properties and moved vigorously to restore and preserve them.

Thanks to the efforts of the Foundation, it will be possible for all Americans to visit these historic scenes associated with the formative years of President Johnson, and to learn about an important period and place in the history of our nation.

I would like also to express my appreciation to the Congress which last year approved legislation designating these buildings and grounds as a National Historic Site to be preserved and administered by the National Park Service.

This legislation was signed into law by President Nixon on December 2, 1969.

We in the Department of the Interior take very seriously our obligation to protect these historic properties for the millions of

Americans who will visit here in the years to come.

The birthplaces and homes of many of our Presidents are preserved within our National Park System, beginning with the very first—George Washington.

The George Washington Birthplace National Monument, is located at Wakefield, Virginia, on the banks of the Potomac River.

And so here today, as we dedicate the birthplace and boyhood home of our most recent Ex-President, Lyndon B. Johnson, the Peder-nales joins the Potomac as a Presidential river.

Other Presidential birth places that have become a part of the National Park System include those of Presidents Lincoln, Taft, Hoover, the two Roosevelts, and Kennedy.

This ceremony today is unique in one respect, at least. It is the first time that a Presidential birthplace has been established as a part of the National Park System and dedicated in the presence of the person so honored.

This speaks well to the increasing awareness of the American people in preserving sites of historical importance.

It has been said that "the land shapes us, even as we attempt to shape the land."

And so, there is no question in my mind that President Johnson's deep and abiding interest in conservation stems from this west Texas hill country where he was born and grew to manhood.

This land of vast open spaces and gently rolling hills has a rugged beauty and appeal. But it also is a land of fragile soil that requires care to make crops grow and to support livestock.

It is a land that demands industry, self-discipline and courage from the people who would live upon it.

And it molded these traits into the character and personality of the boy who was to become the 36th President of the United States.

It was little wonder then, that as President, Lyndon Johnson returned whenever he could, to his beloved West Texas hills.

And it was no surprise that he chose to come back here when he left the White House.

The National Historic Site we dedicated today will preserve the birthplace and the boyhood home as they were in the days when President Johnson was a young man.

It becomes an important new addition to the cultural heritage of our country.

It stands also as a monument to a public servant who has contributed much to the development of that heritage, during his long and faithful service to his country.

CAPTIVE NATIONS: FREEDOM
DENIED

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 19, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, while we in America are able to enjoy many freedoms every day, there are over 100 million Europeans in nine captive nations who are denied by their respective governments these same freedoms. Ironically, the governments of these nations have adopted the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights which guarantees political freedom, freedom of thought and ex-

pressions, freedom of religion, freedom of movement, the right to equal protection under the law, and other similar rights. In many of these countries all of the above freedoms are directly contradicted by the provisions of their constitutions.

It is a disgrace that millions of men are denied the right to have a choice in how they are governed, how they worship, and where they live. In each of the nine nations—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania—people have been jailed, committed to asylums, or sentenced to hard labor for exercising freedoms we all too often take for granted. Citizens can be denied the right to travel if it is not considered to be in the interests of the state. Trials are secret and no equal protection is guaranteed. In all of these captive nations, religious leaders and followers are harassed by diverse and extreme methods.

Yet despite these and many other horrible events, the spirit and the hope of these people to gain their freedom is still very much alive. No one wants to take action which might start another small- or full-scale war. The most effective nonviolent way to gain new freedoms for these people now is by the insistence of free countries and peoples that the Soviet Union adhere to the provisions of the Declaration of Human Rights. There must also be public exposure of the situation.

Public opinion is an effective force. It made us stop bombing North Vietnam. It can help restore to the people of the European captive nations their human rights.

MILLS IMPORT BILL

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Mills bill is the answer to our textile import problem. It is not a protectionist bill, but one which will promote mutually advantageous trade and provide for our friends a huge American market. We should adopt the Mills bill without further delay.

Last evening the Honorable Kenneth N. Davis, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic and International Business, made an outstanding address in New York. I commend the following account of his speech, which appeared in the Washington Post, to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the American people:

NIXON SEEN GETTING BAD ADVICE ON TRADE
BILLS

(By Philip Greer)

New York, June 18.—White House aides and "a carefully organized opposition" are misinforming President Nixon on a bill that would restrict imports of apparel, textiles and footwear, a government trade official said here today.

Kenneth N. Davis, Jr., assistant secretary of commerce for domestic and international business, said foreign affairs aide Henry A. Kissinger, presidential assistant Peter Flanigan and Council of Economic Advisers chairman Paul McCracken are doing the President a "disservice" in the advice they give him in respect to the so-called Mills bill, which would give the President authority to limit imports of the three commodities.

[It was learned in Washington that Davis had earlier submitted his resignation to Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans. There was no word last night on its acceptance.]

Davis said the organized opposition to the bill is led by the Emergency Committee for American Trade and its chairman, Donald M. Kendall of Pepsi Co., Inc., and the U.S.-Japan Trade Council which, he said, is guided by a Washington law firm, Stitt and Hemmendinger, of 1000 Connecticut Ave., N.W.

DIFFICULT SPEECH

Addressing a management research meeting here, Davis told his audience "this is the most difficult and important speech I have yet given. I am trying to reach you, but I am also trying to reach the President."

He expressed admiration for Mr. Nixon's ability to weigh advice and reach decisions, but, he added, "those in business and government who are playing up the political and foreign relations aspects of his decision are doing a serious disservice to the President."

Mr. Nixon is expected to decide next week whether to support the bill, sponsored by Rep. Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.). A Japanese trade mission is expected in Washington at that time to confer with government officials and Japanese Foreign Minister Kilichi Aichi will also be in the capital for meetings with Secretary of State William P. Rogers and Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans.

SUPPORTS BILL

Davis expressed all-out support of the bill, saying "I am convinced that one of the most important direct steps that must be taken if we are to preserve our economic strength is to stop the deterioration of those of our major domestic industries which are being unduly and unfairly impacted by foreign imports."

Denying that the bill is a protectionist measure, Davis said, "every serious U.S. government proposal including the Mills bill has called for foreigners to share with us fully in growth of our market. This is the key point that the President should emphasize, I believe, in making his decision on the Mills bill."

Davis charged that opponents of the bill have branded it an anti-consumer legislation. "I am here today to do my best to convince you, and through you, help convince the President that this should not be looked at as an anti-consumer bill at all, but rather as legislation that is of crucial importance to the well-being of the American economy."

Explaining that Kissinger advises the President on foreign trade policy and Flanigan on business affairs, Davis said, "from what I have seen of the material prepared for the President and from what I have observed in the actions and attitudes of many officials outside the Commerce Department, I do not believe that the fundamental economic issues which are at stake have been adequately presented to him yet."

[Congressional sources in Washington said there still is no firm date for Stans' testimony on a bill by Mills to impose mandatory quotas on textiles and shoes. Stans this week asked Mills to postpone his testimony until after talks with Japanese trade minister Kilichi Miyazawa.]

NATIONAL BUSINESS LEADERS URGE PROMPT VIETNAM WITHDRAWAL

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the board of America's largest bank personally believes that the war in Vietnam is a tragic national mistake, and that it is time to end this "squandering of American blood."

The chairman of the board of IBM likewise personally wants "a prompt end to the Vietnam undertaking."

The patriotic views of these distinguished national business leaders were expressed in testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations during the committee's hearings on our blunder in Southeast Asia.

These leaders of commerce, like millions of other Americans in all walks of life, realize that our current policy of prolonged involvement will only continue to sap our strength and divide our people.

I join them in believing that the time has long passed for initiating a complete phaseout of our involvement. Because of the perception of their remarks, I include the testimony of Mr. Louis B. Lundborg, chairman of the board of the Bank of America, and Mr. Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the IBM Corp., at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF THOMAS J. WATSON, JR.

You have asked me to discuss the economic impact of the war in Vietnam on the United States, and my views on the state of the nation and the world. This is a large order, and I shall be brief. As a matter of fact, since I received your invitation, a number of very highly qualified persons have made their views known—in the press or before this Committee—and I'm not sure there is much left to be said.

This is a personal statement which in no way reflects the policy or opinion of the IBM Company. You certainly know that I'm a layman in politics and international affairs. The only special inputs I get are from a large number of IBM installations throughout the free world.

Increasingly over the past four years, I have been concerned about our nation's course in Southeast Asia, and its effects on our country—especially young people.

The key fact, as I see it, is this: 50 percent of the population of this country is under age 25; and the longer the war continues, the more it broadens the gap between the elder generation, sometimes called the establishment, and our young men and women, who will soon be responsible for the leadership and destiny of this country. Indeed, the prolongation of the war may well set up a continuing evolution of our youth through which they may become sufficiently demoralized so that the progress of our country will be appreciably slowed.

So I have two main points for wanting a prompt end to the Vietnam undertaking. First I don't think we can afford not to heed the dissatisfaction of our youth. Second, it seems certain to me that continuing the war produces unacceptable costs: in the lives of our fighting men, in weakening of our institutions, and in the undermining of our national morale.

Furthermore, our actions in Vietnam are losing us valuable and traditional friends in the West. We present a picture of a terribly powerful, awe-inspiring nation unable to manage itself in a disciplined fashion.

Our prestige is suffering abroad. Let me illustrate the point concretely by giving you a rundown of actions against IBM properties in various parts of the world during the last six weeks. In West Berlin, nearly all the windows in one of our buildings were broken by young rioters. Then gasoline was poured about and it was set on fire. The windows in one of our Dutch facilities were broken by students. Our branch office in Cologne was attacked by protesters against the Vietnam War and the windows smashed. A powerful bomb was discovered just before it was timed to explode in an IBM Argentina office. Just a few days ago, we received bomb threats at our Amsterdam and Paris Data Centers.

And here at home, we've had many bomb threats and one actual bombing at 425 Park Avenue in New York City—our Eastern Regional Headquarters. It happened in the middle of the night and, fortunately, no one was hurt.

While I don't want to draw strong conclusions from random acts of unhappy young people around the world, I do think that if we don't draw some kind of conclusion from all of these things, we will be casting away facts which, if used correctly, can lead us to do intelligent things in the future to ameliorate the situation.

The President found this country in Vietnam and has pledged us to withdraw. I know, of course, of the deep concern and commitment he has to ending the bloodshed and the suffering. I applauded his decision for paced withdrawal as opposed to the earlier open-ended commitment. It is very important, I think, to recognize that once this policy of the President was announced to the country, the youth became quieter than at any time in the previous four years. It is significant that a plan for withdrawal brought about immediate calming and significant, too, that as soon as this timetable seemed to be interfered with by the Cambodian campaign, the violence flared up more strongly than ever before.

To continue as a great nation, our country must be drawn together again. I doubt that this can be done while we're in Vietnam. Once this is thoroughly understood, we can plan our strategy around this point.

Speaking first on the economic side, I want to make it clear that I see this country as the strongest country economically and in every other way that has ever been known to man. This is fundamentally as true today as it was a year ago or five years ago. We are just a bit out of gear. We have a crisis of confidence in ourselves. We wonder not only why we can't get out of Vietnam with dispatch, but how we ever got into it and stayed in it so long. Our children wonder about our leadership, and we wonder about their ideals.

The war in Vietnam is the major factor which has turned our healthy economy into an unhealthy one. Some years ago, many thought the United States could contain and support anti-Communist movements wherever they arose throughout the world and, at the same time, have an economy back here at home that would be almost unaffected. Obviously, this hasn't worked. The present economic prospects are discouraging. Inflation may be slowing down—though very slowly—but unemployment is up and rising, and businessmen are showing great caution and concern about the future.

Inflation always accompanies war and distorts an economy. Inevitably it must be corrected; and this brings about some difficulties for all and disasters for those of the labor force who lose their jobs and don't quickly find new ones. During the first two

years of escalation in Vietnam (1965-1966), we were in a period of rising prosperity. Sales and profits were strong, and the country was reaching full employment. The war and a very strong consumer market base at home combined to overcommit us economically. This overcommitment fueled inflationary pressures, and distortions began to occur. In short, we simply overtaxed our ability to produce, and since the supply of goods could not be increased sufficiently to avoid inflation, a way of cutting down on demand had to be found. Therefore, the Administration took courageous and very necessary fiscal and monetary steps—parts of the inevitable correction process. Nevertheless, as long as the demands on our economy from the Vietnam involvement remain, it will be difficult to contain inflation fully.

When we are completely out of Vietnam, much of our economic problem will be solved. But, in the meantime, inflation may progress, and wage settlements now being made in anticipation of future inflation or in an effort to catch up with the past loss of progress build an uncertainty which is hampering a turnaround. I would, therefore, suggest on the economic side that the Administration give serious consideration to resorting at once to the guideline approach to wages and prices that worked reasonably well in the early years of the Kennedy Administration. I know this method was not successful over the long-term period, but for two or three years, I think the record will show that the approach was helpful, and it has the advantage of being able to be put into effect at once.

In summary on the economic side, as long as our involvement in Vietnam continues, it will be a major obstacle to both the short and the long-term economic health of the country.

There are other important reasons other than economic for leaving Vietnam. In the past year, I have spent over one hundred hours talking to young people on college campuses and elsewhere. Just recently I spent a full day on the California Institute of Technology campus, talking first in private with the class officers of the graduating class, and then with students in their dormitories and at various campus gatherings. I've done the same thing at Brown, at Oberlin, and elsewhere. There is absolutely no question about the sincerity and intensity of the dissatisfaction of the vast majority of these young Americans with the direction in which we are going in Southeast Asia. World War II, with which I was intimately connected, welded the large majority of our country—young and old, rich and poor—together. This war has only lukewarm support from some and varying degrees of dissent from others. Most of it is fairly hot. The dissension is largely between the young and the old, so that it not only fractionates and polarizes, but it does so at one of the fundamental roots of our society, the family.

Earlier this year at Oberlin in an open forum—a give and take session—I attempted to defend the United States, as so many of us do when we're talking to younger people. I said, "You young people are filled with criticism, but where on earth could you find a better country than the United States?" The answer was surprising and in some ways noble. It was simply this—"Of course the United States is the best place in the world, but do you argue with our desire and right to make it even better?"

A young man came into my office the other day to talk to me about a "Pause for Peace." This was an idea for getting people in the United States to stop whatever they were doing for a full hour to emphasize the great desire of most of America to get out of Vietnam rapidly. He spoke with such conviction

and intelligence that I asked him to come back and address the whole management committee of IBM. In the course of his discussion, he said one thing that impressed all of us profoundly. He asked us: "How would you like to have a son killed during a paced withdrawal from a war which you had decided was a bad war in the first place?" I think this chap summarizes the reason for youth's current great dissatisfaction.

This intensity of feeling is a fact—one as real as body counts and defense budgets and the GNP. And it means simply this: As long as Vietnam continues, the polarization of youth and the elder generation will undoubtedly increase.

There will be more inevitable accidents which will engender still more violence. To quell this and keep the peace, more and more National Guard and military units will have to be called out. The longer we continue, the more chaotic the nation will become. The damage we have already seen will take decades to repair, and if we continue, I believe we will soon reach a point where much of the damage will be irreparable.

For all these reasons I believe we should withdraw all of our military activities, both operational and advisory, from Southeast Asia as soon as possible.

I'm sure this Committee has been given many specific suggested dates for complete withdrawal. I won't give a date—I'll simply say that I believe that time is running out and that the situation here at home deteriorates as each month goes by. Summer vacations may produce a misleading calm. Next fall the term may open on a cooler note because of the decision of a number of colleges to recess prior to elections to permit students to campaign for the candidates of their choice. And if it looks as though we really were getting out this fall, the situation on the campuses would be a good deal more peaceful. But if we're still there actively next spring, we'll see a heightened replay of this past spring's campus disorders. And if we remain in Vietnam through the fall of 1971, the situation will become more serious.

There's a syndrome in the United States which makes it very difficult for us to cope with a situation like Vietnam—Americans are efficient and orderly; and when those with responsibility try to find strategies and moves for the future, they try to find efficient and orderly ones. We do this same thing in business. It's impossible to figure out an efficient, orderly and dignified way of getting out of Vietnam. And therefore we continue year after year to compound the situation by staying there simply because we can't find a good, orderly way of disengaging.

There isn't any comfortable way to withdraw. It's always going to be easy for the Communists to interrupt our plans, to make us look ridiculous, and to profit through our loss.

Therefore, I believe we must exhaust every possibility—however novel, however imaginative—to disengage and save as many lives as possible in the process. It seems to me that there are two places we can start. We should take a hard look once again at the Paris negotiations to make certain that in our offers we have gone to the absolute outer limit of what we can give. If we can make a compromise there and succeed, we have the possibility of some dignity as we move out. I think it's vital that the Government assure itself that the truce efforts in Paris and the concessions being offered to North Vietnam are compatible with our aims. These concessions must in fact be balanced off against what we have to lose by a continued stay in South Vietnam or by a confused and chaotic withdrawal.

Combined with our efforts in Paris, we should make major new efforts to get the United Nations involved in the work of ending the war and preserving the peace in Southeast Asia. I think this kind of third party intervention is absolutely essential if we are to have any kind of orderly departure.

We've done a lot of things outside the United Nations in the past decade and so have our opponents. There may come a time when the strength of the U.N. will be directly connected with the survival of the world. So we must help build its strength. Here is a way to let the world know that we continue to believe in the U.N. I recognize, of course, that the Security Council could reject this proposal, but I think we should initiate it.

Now, if we find a successful approach which results in real progress towards withdrawal, what will the results be? First, would be the resurgence of faith of our young people.

Second, we would have a better relationship between the Administration and Congress. I am concerned about the various legislative proposals now being considered to restrict the President's ability to move with dispatch for the security of the country. I hope that the Administration and Congress can find a common course of action so that such bills would not be necessary, and we would preserve the President's traditional freedom of action.

Third, the United States would be sufficiently united by these actions so that our governmental processes would receive the support of most of the elements in our society.

Fourth, there would be a renewal of our military flexibility—of our capacity to defend areas critical to our national security, and importantly, a regaining of national respect for our military establishment.

Fifth, a renewed respect and understanding from our oldest and staunchest free world friends and allies.

In conclusion, I do not wish to criticize any of the three presidents—Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon—who have struggled with this immensely difficult problem. I have no doubt that President Nixon—like Presidents Kennedy, and Johnson before him—sincerely seeks peace in Southeast Asia. In appearing here today I wish to do just one thing: To voice one man's conviction that we stand at a crossroads of decision, with all comfortable routes closed off; that we must end this tragedy before it overwhelms us; and that we must therefore face up squarely to a tough decision and see it through with courage and dispatch.

TESTIMONY BY LOUIS B. LUNDBORG

(Following his testimony, Mr. Lundborg was asked by the Chairman if he would be willing to depart from his role as Chairman of the Board of Bank of America, and to express any further views on the Vietnam war that he might have as a private citizen. He agreed to do so and then made the following additional remarks:)

First, I would like to make absolutely clear that I am not now speaking for the Bank of America institutionally, nor for any of my colleagues. Rather, as you put it Senator, I am speaking as Louis B. Lundborg, private and concerned citizen.

Because I anticipated I might be called on to testify on a personal and private citizen basis, I have committed my thoughts to writing and am prepared to enter my personal testimony into the record.

In my judgment, the war in Vietnam is a tragic national mistake.

I see no profit to the country in trying to fix the blame for what is past. No matter who initiated the first involvement or subsequent expansions, the rest of us have gone along

pretty supinely. If anyone is to blame, it is people like me for not speaking up and speaking out sooner—for not asking "What goes on here?"

The fact is that collectively, as a nation, we have made a mistake, a colossal one. In any context of life, when a mistake has been made—whether by a person, by a company, or by a nation—there is only one thing to do: face up to it. No amount of cover-up—rationalizing, alibiing, or ducking the facts—will avoid the inevitable day of reckoning: it only compounds the cost.

If a company in private business were guilty of making such a bad judgment as we have made in Vietnam; and then of pursuing that judgment until so large a part of its total resources were committed to the ill-starred project, the management of the company would be under attack by the directors and ultimately by the shareholders of the company.

In my judgment, it is time the shareholders of America—the people—begin to call for an end to the squandering of American blood, morale and resources on what is in essence and Asian war of nationalism.

Because many who have condemned our involvement in Vietnam have also wanted to abolish such things as ROTC—and because, consequently, many people have come to equate anti-Vietnam with military weakness, let me say that it is precisely because I want us to be strong—militarily as well as economically, politically, diplomatically—that I do not want to see us dissipate and squander that strength in such misguided ventures as this Vietnam war.

I want us to have military strength. I just don't want the use of it to be dictated entirely by the military.

The revulsion against our posture in Vietnam has been so strong that it has colored and distorted the attitude of our people, and particularly of our young people, toward military service of any kind. It is easy—too easy—to dismiss that as an indictment of our young people—as an evidence of the "weakening of their moral fibre."

It is sufficiently more complex than that, that I would not want to be equally guilty of over-simplifying in the opposite direction: but certainly the disillusionment of the young over our whole Vietnam experience has weakened their willingness to follow adult leadership in anything.

I shudder to think of our being confronted by a real military threat—a direct and immediate one—to our own national security while our youth are in this mood.

Unlike Korea, this does not represent the banding together of the major nations as a group, under the leadership of the UN, to protect any established principle. It is a unilateral action, in which we as self-appointed militia have seen fit to inject ourselves into an internal fight between two parts of a single country—to take sides in that fight and try to impose our views on the entire country. Even from an ideological viewpoint it was questionable, because we drove Ho Chi Minh into the arms of a Communist China that he hated.

The overriding question is this one—"Does the United States from either a practical or moral viewpoint have either the right or the might to set itself up as the unilateral policeman for the world?" My answer to that question is that such a position is morally indefensible and practically unsustainable.

Because I have had no reason to doubt the good faith of the withdrawal plans announced by the President, I might have continued to remain silent. But when I read 12 days ago that the President is under pressure to expand our military role in Asia, it seemed to me that the time had come to speak up and speak out, and to say "Our meddling has gone far enough."

Vietnam has had a corrosive effect on our country, on our society, on our national

morale. Only in part because it has been the most divisive issue of our time—nothing in this generation has so divided our people.

Division per se would not necessarily be bad for us, if it were a good healthy controversy that people could argue about and try to resolve. But this has been an issue that has left our people confused and bewildered, with no clear sense of direction, no clear sense of national purpose, no confidence in the morality of such national directions as are apparent.

I suspect that a sense of national purpose is not a very active ingredient in the conscious daily life of the average citizen. And yet the lack of such a national purpose—or the existence of a distasteful one—can have a corrosive effect on the spirit of our people.

A parallel to private business may be pertinent: an employee may not spend many minutes of his life consciously saying to himself or to others "I am proud of the company I work for"—but if he isn't proud of it, it will show up in his work. The thing we call morale is variously defined, but by any definition it includes an element of pride in the job.

National morale is in no way different. If people are not proud of their country, their morale as citizens will suffer; and their worsened morale will ultimately damage their country.

So it is time that we took stock of ourselves, nationally, and asked ourselves if we are pursuing directions and purposes of which we can be proud.

Our country arrived so suddenly at the position of being the No. 1 nation that we have had difficulty in adjusting ourselves to our new role. Even more basic than that, we have had a hard time deciding and agreeing among ourselves as to just what our role is, or should be. When we were told, and told ourselves, after World War II that we were now the leader of the free world and that we had the obligations of leadership, I doubt that there was much of a consensus as to what those words really meant.

That is not surprising. It is hard enough for a single individual, or a single company, that arrives at affluence and prominence and respect, to know just how to use those assets—let alone a nation of 200 million persons. I have a view on what our posture should have been and should yet be; and since it is germane to the Vietnam issue, I would like to express it, if I may have your permission.

I can perhaps express it best by first drawing a parallel to my own business. It was about 25 years ago that I became the largest non-governmental bank—roughly the same time span as we are talking about in our nation's history. The question of how we should conduct ourselves, now that we are the biggest, has confronted us constantly since that day. If I told you that we had arrived at a rationale—a philosophy—I wouldn't want you to think that it was arrived at spontaneously or easily—without many hours of debate, many false starts, and a few barked shins along the way. It is far from perfect; but here, for whatever pertinence it may have to the question of our country's foreign policy, is the stance we have evolved:

We are vigorously competitive—we know that our customers, our shareholders and our competitors would expect that. So we do not neglect our corporate self-interest in any of the other things we do. But we know that it is in our self-interest—call it enlightened self-interest if you want—to see that our industry and the communities we serve, are also healthy and vital.

So we try to help to keep our trade associations strong and the communities we serve healthy both nationally and in California. We do not try to dominate those associations or communities in any way—we don't seek high office in the associations or

the communities we serve, although we will accept those places if it is clear that we are needed for a special reason.

Do you see a parallel here, to the posture of our country? Our foreign policy must, of course, first protect and promote our national self-interest. That is the first duty of all governments, and particularly in their foreign relations. Then our enlightened self-interest dictates that we help other countries in their economic development—countries that can be expected to trade with us and to be generally cooperative with us.

But it does not dictate that we try to force upon them any of our political or social beliefs or practices. In fact, it does not dictate that we meddle at all in the internal affairs of another country.

Nor does it dictate that we set ourselves up as the self-appointed and solo policemen of the entire world. Quite apart from the fact that even our vast resources cannot stretch over every trouble spot on earth, our injecting ourselves into every conflict everywhere cannot help being resented, and thus ultimately defeating the very purpose of our intervening.

We must remind ourselves that, big and powerful as we are, we are only one nation among many.

This in essence is our mistake in Vietnam. We have somehow lost the vision to see that economics—not ideologies and not military operations—is the key to favorable world development in the latter third of the 20th Century. There is only one way out of our current dilemma and that is the elimination of the war in Vietnam.

SID MENDLOWITZ

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great, personal pleasure I call my colleagues' attention to a man recently honored by the citizens of Glassport, Pa. He is a man I have known for many years; one I am proud to call a friend in the truest sense of the word.

Sid Mendlowitz was selected by the Glassport Lions Club as its man of the year. He was acclaimed for his dedication in assisting people in time of need without personal consideration, for his numerous contributions to civic programs and projects, for his business leadership in the community, and for his many humanitarian deeds.

Mr. Speaker, no man deserves those accolades more than Sid Mendlowitz, a quiet, humble individual who would prefer his acts of charity and kindness go unheralded.

Born in Glassport, Sid worked as a youth on his father's dump truck, but in 1949 he began his own trucking business. Starting with one truck, he built the business into a large trucking and excavating operation. The success of the firm is visible evidence of Sid's belief in hard work as well as his business acumen.

But, it is the other side of Sid which has endeared him to so many people in and around Glassport. He has given food to the needy and jobs to the unemployed. He has contributed financially to many, many charitable organizations, including the United Jewish Appeal, the Boy

Scouts of America, the United Fund, Au-berle Foundation, the Hillel Academy, and the Society of Mary, just to name a few.

He contributed his time and business equipment to dig the foundation for a new wing to the Samuel Weiss Commu-nity Library and later provided furniture for the new addition. He has donated his firm's trucks, and equipment, to help keep volunteer fire companies operable in times of emergency.

It was because of deeds such as these that more than 250 people attended the Lions testimonial dinner in Sid's honor. His wife, Beverly, and their four children must have been proud of the praise be-stowed on their husband and father by Judge John P. Hester of the court of common pleas; Frank J. Cibrik, presi-dent of the Lions Club; Steve Orlando, the banquet chairman, and Dominic Bo-relli, mayor of the Glassport community.

Mr. Mendlowitz well deserves the rec-ognition paid him for his demonstration of devotion and loyalty to his commu-nity. But the Glassport Lions Club also should be commended for bringing such a man and his accomplishments into the public light.

FIFTY-FIVE PERCENT APPROVE MOVE INTO CAMBODIA

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, out in Iowa, the people of that great State are solidly behind the President as he goes about the tough and, in some instances, thankless job of extricating the United States with honor from Vietnam.

The Iowa poll recently showed that 55 percent of Iowa approves of the Presi-dent's move into Cambodia.

I insert the complete results of the poll into the RECORD:

FIFTY-FIVE PERCENT OF IOWANS APPROVE MOVE INTO CAMBODIA

A 55 per cent majority of Iowans approves President Nixon's movement of troops into Cambodia, with 35 per cent disapproving and 11 per cent expressing no opinion.

These views are shown in the latest state-wide Iowa Poll, taken about two weeks after the Cambodian action was announced.

In spite of the Iowa support for the Cam-bodian action, an even larger majority of Iowans, 59 per cent, think the President is not fully informing the public about Cam-bodia; 29 per cent believe he is and 12 per cent give no opinion.

Fewer Iowans support the President now than last fall for his general handling of the Vietnam war. Fifty-one per cent approve, 37 per cent disapprove and 12 per cent give no opinion. Last November, 62 per cent ap-proved, 25 per cent disapproved and 13 per cent expressed no opinion.

Support for Nixon's Cambodian action tends to be based on reports of success of the mission to destroy enemy sanctuaries and end the war sooner. A 24-year-old Grand Junction housewife comments:

"A week ago I would have disapproved, but now it looks like he was right in his decision, as they really found a lot." A 55-year-old

custodian reacts with: "If what he said was true—saving lives—then it was the thing to do."

Opposition to Nixon's decision is based mostly on the feeling it will escalate the war or that the United States should not be in Indochina at all. This and other reactions are reflected by the following:

A 45-year-old farm housewife from Tipton: "I'm afraid it will spread to other countries." The wife of a Des Moines factory worker: "We have enough trouble with Vietnam. We didn't need to start in Cambodia."

Among Republicans in the poll, 66 per cent approve, 24 per cent disapprove and 10 per cent have no opinion. Among Democrats, 45 per cent approve, 44 per cent disapprove and 11 per cent express no opinion. Independents divide 53 per cent approval, 35 per cent dis-approval and 12 per cent no opinion.

Iowans were asked the following questions:

"Do you approve or disapprove of President Nixon's decision to send U.S. troops into Cambodia?"

[In percent]			
	Total	Men	Women
Approve.....	55	60	49
Disapprove.....	34	32	36
No opinion.....	11	8	15

Those approving gave the following reasons:

	Percent
Destroys sanctuaries, supplies.....	38
Overdue, necessary action.....	23
End war sooner.....	20
Support President.....	13
Protect U.S. troops.....	5
Stop Communism.....	3
Miscellaneous.....	2
No opinion.....	3

Those disapproving gave the following reasons:

	Percent
Shouldn't be in Vietnam.....	28
Escalating war.....	27
Vietnam enough, shouldn't risk more..	13
Causing domestic unrest.....	6
Should consult Congress.....	5
Don't like Nixon.....	5
Mission won't help.....	5
Miscellaneous.....	4
No opinion.....	6

(Above tables add to more than 100 per-cent because some gave more than one reason.)

"Do you think Nixon's decision to send U.S. troops into Cambodia is likely to length-en the Vietnam war, shorten the war, or won't it make any difference?"

[In percent]			
	Total	Men	Women
Lengthen war... ..	20	18	22
Shorten war... ..	41	45	37
No difference... ..	26	27	25
No opinion.....	13	10	16

"Do you feel that the Nixon Administration is fully informing the American public about U.S. involvement in Cambodia?"

[In percent]			
	Total	Men	Women
Yes.....	29	28	30
No.....	59	61	55
No opinion.....	12	8	15

"Do you approve or disapprove of the way the Nixon Administration is handling the war in Vietnam?"

[In percent]			
	Total	Men	Women
Approve.....	51	54	48
Disapprove.....	37	37	37
No opinion.....	12	9	15

MORE RESPONSES FROM GOVERNORS ON CLEAN WATER NEEDS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1970, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the responses I had received as of that date from some 30 Governors to my request for information on the needs of the various States for Federal assist-ance under the provisions of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1970.

Since that time I have received several additional responses. For the information of my colleagues, I include these addi-tional responses at the conclusion of these remarks:

STATE OF FLORIDA,

May 8, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Thank you for the opportunity of allowing me to com-ment upon Florida's crucial needs in the field of water pollution control funding. Florida's major problem in this field rests with the domestic sewage plant. A sizeable part of this problem has been with the lack of federal funding for this construction.

Florida's needs in providing its residents with adequate sewage collection, treatment and disposal are more than \$1.8 billion for secondary treatment. If tertiary treatment is required, and it becomes evident daily that this may be a requirement in the not too distant future, these total costs will be more than \$2.5 billion.

Assuming maximum federal financing, this means a need for \$64.2 million for secondary treatment and \$307.5 million for tertiary treatment for Florida alone—only from Pub-lic Law 660 funds which, as you know, can be spent only on treatment works. An addi-tional \$821.4 million would be required from the Department of Housing and Urban De-velopment, again assuming maximum funding.

These figures are taken from a State of Florida Department of Air and Water Pol-lution Control report, "A cursory View of Florida's Waste Treatment Plants and Fu-ture Needs" which has just been completed. A copy is enclosed in order that you can obtain a better picture of Florida's total esti-mated need. The staff of the Department stresses to me that the figures are "mini-mums" and that they are based on "today's costs."

Please feel free to call upon this office or Mr. Vincent Patton, Director of the Florida Department of Air and Water Pollution Con-trol if you need any further information.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE R. KIRK, Jr.,
Governor.

STATE OF IDAHO,
Boise, Idaho, May 13, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Governor Samuelson has asked me to respond to your

request regarding the municipal waste treatment needs here in Idaho, and how we are attempting to solve our pollution control problems.

The 1970 session of the State Legislature passed enabling and funding legislation to provide for State participation with the Federal Government in a waste treatment construction grant program. This legislation has created a tremendous amount of interest among the municipalities across the State and could be a major factor in a successful water quality improvement program. It would be nearly disastrous at this point if the matching grant program from the Federal level was curtailed or significantly altered so as to lessen the financial assistance to the communities.

The Idaho Legislature set up a water pollution abatement fund which continually receives money starting July 1, 1970, from the State Inheritance Tax receipts. This should amount to an excess of 1.2 million dollars each year for matching purposes. The Legislature also authorized the State Treasurer to sell 1.5 million dollars worth of State bonds. This is a one-time funding to assist in getting the matching grant program off to a good start.

I feel certain that as the waste treatment needs become more apparent, that the Idaho Legislature will fund this program as necessary to do the job. We anticipate during the next five years to stimulate between 6 and 8 million dollars worth of waste treatment construction projects. Assuming that the State of Idaho can come up with approximately 2 million dollars each year, approximately 4 million dollars allocated by the Federal Government would be necessary each year to keep our abatement program moving.

We feel that this Federal support is essential if we are to carry out our mutual water quality objectives.

Sincerely,

MELVIN D. ALSAGER,
Chief, Water Pollution Control Section,
Environmental Improvement
Division.

IOWA STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Des Moines, Iowa, May 8, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Your letter of March 12, 1970, addressed to Governor Ray has been referred to this Department for reply. We wish to apologize for the delay in reply.

During the past years over 530 Iowa municipalities have constructed sewage treatment facilities. Therefore, with virtually 100% municipal treatment the needs of the State of Iowa for construction grants are not as great as many of the eastern states.

The State of Iowa has on hand construction grant applications for total eligible project costs totalling \$18.2 million for the fiscal year 1970. It is anticipated that project costs for future years will not exceed \$12-15 million annually to cover secondary treatment needs and expansion and replacement needs for existing plants.

The Iowa allocation from the \$800 million appropriation for fiscal year 1970 is \$12.2 million allocated to the state and will be returning up to half of the Iowa allocation to the Federal Treasury. Iowa would, therefore, not benefit from your proposed full funding of \$1.25 billion authorized for fiscal year 1971 by the 1966 Act.

We wish to emphasize that municipal and industrial pollution are no longer a serious problem in the State of Iowa but that agricultural pollution, particularly with erosion and siltation, is the primary problem in the state today. Water quality of streams of the state and probably other midwestern states cannot be improved without the reduction of

soil erosion through soil conservation practices. Funding to the Department of Agriculture through the Agricultural Stabilization Service and Soil Conservation Service has been reduced which will delay soil conservation practices dealing with our state's primary pollution problem. We would urge that serious consideration be given to allocation of the federal construction grant funds to the state on a block grant basis rather than a categorical grant basis to permit the individual states to use the appropriated water pollution control funds where there is the greatest need. In the meantime we urge that there be adequate funding of the cost sharing and technical assistance programs in the Department of Agriculture to reduce pollution by greater participation in good soil conservation practices. Probably more important than water pollution is the saving of our soil, our most valuable natural resource.

Very truly yours,

R. J. SCHLIEKELMAN,
Director, Water Pollution Division.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul, May 11, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: This is in response to your recent letter requesting information on the funding needs for the water pollution control and abatement program in Minnesota.

The funding needs of this state continue to be greater than the state's allocation of funds even with the increase from \$3.9 to \$14.9 million. To date approximately \$13 million in grant requests have been certified to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration for funding and the remaining \$1.9 million probably will be certified for funding within the next month. This will result in some \$3-4 million in grant requests which are presently proceeding under the reimbursement provisions of the Federal Act that cannot be certified for funding due to the lack of funds.

It is anticipated that the amount of grant requests for FY71 will be at least equal to and probably exceed the FY70 total grant request of \$20.4 million. Including the grant requests which cannot be funded this fiscal year, it is estimated that Minnesota's funding needs in FY71 would be on the order of \$25 million. We anticipate this level of grant requests for the next 2-3 fiscal years.

Under the present allocation method and a funding level of \$1 billion, Minnesota's allotment would be \$18,684,300. At a \$1.25 billion level, it would be \$23.4 million. The latter level more closely approximates our needs. If Minnesota enacted a state grant program, the Federal level of funding would have to be approximately \$2.5 billion in order to fund the anticipated grant requests. A table summarizing Minnesota's construction needs is attached for your use.

However, I believe it is very important to recognize that in addition to the construction grants the supporting grants made to the states for administering the construction grants program also should be enlarged very considerably. Increased construction activity will require increased effort on the state's part in regard to plan review, plant surveillance, and many other aspects. I would recommend that the state program grants for water pollution control also should be correspondingly increased, at least by a factor of three to four times greater than current levels.

Your effort in securing at least full funding of the Clean Water Restoration Act for FY71 will be greatly appreciated. If you have any further questions, or if we can be of further assistance please let us know.

Sincerely,

HAROLD LEVANDER.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT ESTIMATED
FISCAL YEAR 1971 FUNDING NEEDS—APR. 10, 1970

Fiscal year and level of funding	Minnesota's allocation	Grant requests (millions)	Grant requests not funded (millions)
Fiscal year 1970, \$800,000,000	\$14,928,100	\$20.4	\$5.4
No State grant program:			
Fiscal year 1971, \$1,000,000,000	18,684,300	25.0	6.3
Fiscal year 1971, \$1,250,000,000	23,400,000	25.0	1.6
State grant program:			
Fiscal year 1971, \$1,000,000,000	18,684,300	45.0	26.3
Fiscal year 1971, \$1,250,000,000	23,400,000	45.0	21.6

¹ At this time approximately \$3,000,000 in grant requests are now proceeding under the reimbursement provisions of the Federal Act.

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
Lincoln, May 15, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of March 12, 1970 was referred to the Secretary of the Nebraska Water Pollution Control Council, Mr. T. A. Filipi. Mr. Filipi informed me that it took considerable effort to gather materials for a five-year plan, therefore we apologize for this delay.

It is anticipated that approximately \$45,000,000 worth of construction will be needed to maintain and improve our waste water treatment facilities within the next five years. This is broken down as follows:

Fiscal year:	
1971	\$15,000,000
1972	8,000,000
1973	5,000,000
1974	11,000,000
1975	6,000,000
Total	45,000,000

Of this amount, we are of course assuming that at least 33 per cent will be allocated from the Federal Water Pollution Control Program. Should the next legislature provide funds for matching purposes, then the federal portion would be 55 per cent of the amount.

The citizens of Nebraska are cognizant of the need for maintaining their environment and enhancing wherever possible. For this reason, I am sure that monies will be needed continuously and inasmuch as enhancement is a part of all of our programs, I see no way that effort can be released in urging municipalities, industries, and the individual for improving our environment by proper control of land pollution, water pollution, and air pollution.

Sincerely,

NOBERT T. TIEMANN.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT
OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION,
June 5, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Your letter of 12 March 1970 to Governor William T. Cahill has been referred here for response. It asks for information about New Jersey's requirement of Federal funds for sewage treatment plant construction for fiscal year 1971.

The aggregate estimated costs of New Jersey sewerage projects on which it is expected that construction permits will be issued by 30 June 1971 is \$441 million.

These estimates are based on 1970 dollars.

Experience indicates that actual costs run higher than original engineer's cost estimates.

The State of New Jersey has voted a bond issue in November 1969 making 25% State Grants available starting with fiscal year 1968 projects and forward from there.

Under the reimbursability provision of U.S. Public Law 660, as amended, the amount of Federal monies required to bring projects given grants for fiscal years 1968, 1969 and 1970 up to their maximum eligibility of 50 or 55 percent is about 25 million dollars.

Thank you for your interest in having the

full allotment of \$1.25 billion appropriated for 1971.

Very truly yours,
RICHARD J. SULLIVAN,
Commissioner.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
 Providence, May 26, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Please excuse my delay in replying to your letter concerning funding needs for water pollution control

and abatement programs here in Rhode Island.

In accordance with your request, I am enclosing a copy of our municipal listings of eligible projects for Federal construction assistance for both one and five year projections.

If there is any way in which you believe I might be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Warm personal regards.

Sincerely,

FRANK LICHT,
Governor.

MUNICIPAL LISTING (1-YEAR LIST) (PLAN SECTION 4.4.2)—JUNE 1969, RHODE ISLAND

Point ratings	Name of municipality	Location of facility			Population served (thousands)	Type of water poll cont fac required	Estimated total cost (thousands)	State contributions to total cost (thousands)	Conform. w/reg pl.	
		River basin (a)	Receiving stream (b)	Longitude/Latitude or county (c)					Yes	No commission No plan
44	BVSDC Mosh. Int.	Moshassuck	Moshassuck	Providence	12.0	Interceptor	682	170	X	
40	Warren	Narragansett Bay	Warren River	Bristol	7.5	do	550	137	X	
39	Westerly	Pawcatuck	Pawcatuck	Washington	8.0	do	880	220	X	
53	BVSDC Cumb. Int.	Blackstone	Blackstone	Providence	60.0	do	3,700	925	X	
38	Warwick	Pawtuxet	Pawtuxet	Kent	2.0	do	525	131	X	
54	BVSDC Tr. plant.	Narragansett Bay	Seekonk	Providence	178.0	Secondary	8,250	2,063	X	
48	Narragansett-South Kingstown	Atlantic Ocean	Atlantic Ocean	Washington	30.0	do	5,780	1,445		X
48	West Warwick	Pawtuxet	Pawtuxet	Kent	25.0	do	3,600	900		X

MUNICIPAL LISTING (5-YEAR LIST) (PLAN SECTION 4.4.3)—JUNE 1969—RHODE ISLAND

[Period covered from 1970 to 1973]

Name of municipality	River basin	Location of facility		Population served (thousands)	Type of water poll cont fac required	Estimated total cost (thousands)	Estimated Date initiation of construction	Conformity with regional plan	
		Receiving stream	Long/latitude or county					Yes	No Reg Plan
Lincoln	Blackstone	Blackstone	Providence	6.0	Interceptors	3,220	1971	X	
Burrillville	do	Branch	do	8.0	Secondary	2,975	1972	X	
Coventry	Pawtuxet	Pawtuxet	Kent	35.0	do	4,080	1972	X	
Smithfield	Woonasquatucket	Woonasquatucket	Providence	23.0	do	4,800	1972	X	
Barrington	Narr. Bay	Prov. River	Bristol	25.0	Interceptors	1,800	1972	X	
East Providence	do	do	Providence	49.0	Secondary	3,000	1972	X	
Jamestown	do	Narr. Bay	Newport	2.5	Primary	500	1972	X	
Bristol	do	Bristol Harbor	Bristol	13.0	do	400	1972	X	
North Kingstown	do	Narr. Bay	Washington	10.0	do	2,000	1972	X	
Tiverton	do	Sakonnet River	Newport	10.0	Secondary	2,000	1972	X	
East Greenwich	do	Hunts River	Kent	2.5	Interceptors	1,650	1971	X	
Woonsocket	Blackstone River	Blackstone River	Providence	45.0	Secondary	4,800	1971	X	

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
 June 9, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
 House of Representatives,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: I am pleased to respond for the State of Texas on anticipated needs in regard to the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

There are over 126 cities, river authorities, towns, and water districts in Texas that could apply for federal waste treatment construction grants in the next fiscal year. These projects would be to upgrade the wastewater handling facilities to meet State requirements.

Approximately 100 of these political jurisdictions are in the population grouping of less than 10,000 people. The cost of these improvements would probably range from \$125,000 to \$180,000 per installation. Therefore, the minimum-maximum total cost range for this group would be \$12.5 to \$18.0 million.

There are nearly 20 cities with a population grouping of 10,000 to 20,000 people. The estimated cost for facilities in these cities is \$400,000 to \$500,000 per installation. Thus, this grouping would result in a minimum-maximum cost of \$8 to \$10 million.

There are some 8 to 12 cities and river authorities serving populations in excess of 20,000 people. These entities will need installations ranging in cost from \$1 to \$8 million and thus resulting in an estimated minimum-maximum cost of \$15 to \$20 million.

In addition, experience indicates that approximately 18% to 21% of the construction costs is attributed to interceptor line con-

struction for large cities and river authorities expanding their systems to areas within their treatment responsibility. These projects are not usually programmed by construction until coordination between municipalities has been completed.

However, this type of work, not yet scheduled would result in an estimated minimum-maximum cost of \$6 to \$10 million.

The total estimated cost of potential wastewater handling facilities in Texas for fiscal year 1971 thus ranges from a minimum of approximately \$42 to \$60 million. This amount can be anticipated to increase by 20% to 30% due to the State's aggressive enforcement of pollution control measures which my Administration is committed to continue.

In summary, the estimated funding needs of the State of Texas for wastewater treatment and pollution abatement will be \$70 to \$75 million for fiscal year 1971.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Congressional efforts to secure full funding for Public Law 89-753.

Sincerely,

PRESTON SMITH,
Governor.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
 Richmond, May 19, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
 House of Representatives,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: In accordance with your request to Governor Holton, I am happy to provide you with information on the funding needs of the water pollution control and abatement program in Virginia. You will find enclosed a table of grant applications received by the State from the localities and the grants which the State has awarded over the past eight years, based on a grant of 30% or 33% only.

This year the General Assembly has appropriated \$7.8 million in State grant matching money which will reduce the local share from 67% or 70% to 20% or 25%. There are no final figures at present on the grant applications which will be submitted, but it is projected that these grant requests for each of the next two years will approximate some \$30 million for some 100 projects.

I hope that this information is of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

JOHN RITCHIE, Jr.,
Executive Assistant.

GRANT APPLICATIONS PROCESSED OVER THE PAST 8 YEARS IN VIRGINIA

Year	Number of grant requests	Total cost of proposed projects	Grants requested on eligible portions	Number of projects approved	Amount grant money available
1962-63	45	\$33,000,000	\$5,224,390	18	\$1,852,920
1963-64	52	33,000,000	7,584,260	14	1,846,755
1964-65	49	30,000,000	6,302,704	16	2,050,150
1965-66	46	30,000,000	5,937,694	21	3,100,000
1966-67	66	54,000,000	11,965,835	13	4,150,600
1967-68	56	54,000,000	12,315,756	16	4,278,100
1968-69	75	74,000,000	18,946,889	33	4,448,400
1969-70	87	68,000,000	20,195,417	75	17,302,800

MINING AND CONSERVATION

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, when most people think of conservation, they visualize our great national parks and perhaps recall an endangered species of fish or wildlife. Conservation does involve consideration of these, but it also includes recognizing that man is also a proper part of the environment, and by the very act of being alive we are altering the environment to some extent. What is done to make the best of this alteration is of vital importance.

I was encouraged, therefore, to read two articles in the Mining Congress Journal which illustrate that mine operators in increasing numbers are looking at the opportunities for reclaiming mined areas and turning them into useful, profitable and attractive areas. The articles follow:

MINING AND CONSERVATION

(By Charles B. Wurtz)

For somewhat more than 20 years I have been active in the study of the effects of industrial and municipal discharges on the aquatic life of lakes and rivers. From my own work during this time, as well as association with other pollution biologists and a continuing review of the literature, I have become acquainted with the multiplicity of environmental problems. This background resulted in my being asked to serve as one of three national judges for the selection of two National Gold Medal Awards for outstanding achievement by industry in the fight against water pollution.

So often industry is in the position described by Shakespeare: "The evil men do lives after them, the good is oft interred with their bones." One rarely hears about the real achievements of any industry as they relate to conservation.

MINING COMPANY EARNED FIRST GOLD MEDAL AWARD

The National Gold Medal Awards, first given in 1968, are sponsored by the Sports Foundation, Inc. Significantly, the first annual Gold Medal Award for the best program in one plant went to a mining company. Receiving the award was the Urad mine of Climax Molybdenum Co. division of American Metal Climax, Inc. I have yet to see this company's name emblazoned across the headlines of the nation for this singular achievement. Had the company killed a dozen fish, we would have heard it proclaimed from the rooftops.

Total entries in the competition for the Gold Medal Awards in 1968 were in excess of 200. Initial screening reduced these to 31. Of these, three were entries in the field of mining. The obvious conclusion is that the mining industry represents ten percent of our total national industry doing significant work in the field of environmental control.

CONSERVATION MEANS MORE THAN ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

Environmental control is a euphemism for pollution control as it relates to industrial activities. It is a component part of conservation. My experience has been that when most persons think of conservation they visualize our great national parks, occasionally they will recall some endangered species of bird or fish, and perhaps they may think of their nearest state park. This is a limited

view. Of particular annoyance are those advocates of what I call narrow conservation who can think only of fish.

Conservation does include consideration of these items, but, more importantly, it also includes recognition of the fact that man is a proper part of the environment. In effect, man has as much right to live on the surface of the earth as does the whooping crane or pygmy rhinoceros. There are those who would disagree with me. The total environment, and all the material substances of the earth, must be used by all species. Further, by the very act of being alive we are altering the environment to some extent. Individually our personal wastes can be considered pollution.

Substances with biological origins are considered to be renewable natural resources. If a suitable environment is maintained, reproduction will replace the utilized material. This is most evident in field crops, but it is also obviously the case for fish and game. Man also belongs in this category. The Chinese recognize this when they claim they can expend millions of men in war.

Non-biological substances are commonly considered non-renewable. A pocket of ore taken from a deposit is not going to be replaced by self-generation. In time such materials are locally exhausted. However, these materials have not been destroyed. They have been distributed. The concern of conservationists does not usually rest in the exhaustion of the ore body but in the local environmental alteration associated with the removal of ore.

The mining industry does produce local environmental alterations, and mining has had a terrific impact on many geographic areas of the nation. This is particularly true in the case of surface mining. In the United States, three million acres have been affected by surface mining activity. Of these only a little over one-third have been reclaimed by reshaping the surface and replacing the vegetative cover. The 1.2 million acres that have been reclaimed have made a spectacular contribution to environmental improvement. Many of these acres are productive pasture, or yielding forest crops, or providing excellent fishing, etc. Such face-lifting operations on the land is a real contribution to conservation. In effect, a natural resource that had been discovered was exploited. During and after exploitation environmental control was exerted to restore a balanced ecological community. This resulted in benefits for future generations. This is conservation!

FOUR MAJOR AREAS OF INJURY TO ENVIRONMENT

The act of discovering a mineral resource may be simple or complex, but it has little impact on the environment. Impact begins with exploitation. During mining operations, there is the potential of injuring an environment by four major mechanisms. Not all of these are present for all mines, and none are unique to mining.

The first of these is erosion, which can transport overburden into streams and lakes and physically destroy them. Denuded surfaces are particularly vulnerable to erosion, but it can be controlled. The second is the rejection or diversion of unwanted water. This can increase runoff and erosion from an area. One advantage of continuous dewatering in the region of headwater streams is the stabilization of stream flow, but you rarely hear about this. The third item is the toxic effect associated with many materials. Toxicants may occur in water or solids and can be a real problem. This is especially aggravated with certain metals and acid water discharges. The fourth item is the disposal of overburden and tailings. Tailings can be unsightly and we must recognize that esthetic attractiveness is a part of conservation. Obviously, all four of these potential

problems may be intimately interrelated at a given site. The effect of mining on these environmental mechanisms can persist after exploitation is concluded.

ECONOMICS MUST BE INCLUDED IN CONCEPTS OF CONSERVATION

It has been the uncontrolled, long-term, persistent environmental degradation associated with disturbed land surface that has most deeply stirred the nation. For example, people who never even think of potential toxic effects will rise up in arms over the sheer ugliness of a butchered landscape. I do myself; it is logical to expect others to do the same.

Dissatisfaction with the environment leads to the investigation of environmental effects stemming from some recognized source. The properly anticipated result of such investigations should be environmental improvement and control. These actions should lead to the enhancement of the environment to man's advantage. The advantage may be something that is as nebulous as esthetic attractiveness or as real as restored fishing.

Physical environmental control is a facet of conservation that can do much to enhance the world we live in. At the same time, such activities need not injure economic growth.

Unhappily, much of the adverse publicity about our environment is based on puerile emotionalism and fails to recognize that a multiplicity of factors, including economics, are a part of our environment. The reality of economics as a part of the world we inhabit must be included in the broadest concepts of conservation. Economic pressure on man is as great as predator pressure on rabbits I am sure.

PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATION AIMED AT ACID MINE WATER CONTROL

I would like to illustrate some of my preceding comments by reference to coal mining in Pennsylvania. Many years ago the steel industry began developing in the Pittsburgh area. At the time, that industry apparently chose a geographic location based on economic factors. The industry could have located at the ore deposits and transported fuel. Instead, the industry decided to locate at the fuel deposits and transport ore. In those earlier days, no one recognized the debilitating effect of environmental degradation on public health or the limitations of a one-industry economy. And even if someone would have had the temerity to raise the issues, no one could have effectively resisted the men who ran their own railroads.

However, time passed. Today the body politic is well aware of environmental problems. Thus, in 1965, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania held hearings on the effects of acid mine water discharge on the surface waters of the state. This resulted in new legislation designed to control the discharge of such acid mine waters. This was considered *ipso facto*, to be good conservation because it would lead to stream improvement. Nevertheless, I have some reservations about this.

In the overall picture of conservation, this law apparently was designed to consider only the aquatic life in affected surface waters of the state. Little or no attention was given, for example, to the disposal of those solids that inevitably result from neutralization techniques. And, of course, economic considerations were anathema. Anyone who had an interest in the industry and mentioned dollars was simply categorized as greedy.

I had occasion to give testimony at some of the hearings held at the time. In my testimony, I pointed out that Pennsylvania has more streams than any other state in the nation and that 4400 of these are large enough to be specifically named. The state's streams extend for approximately 50,000 miles. Bear in mind that under the best of conditions they are not all equally suitable

for aquatic life. In 1964 the Pennsylvania Fish Commission recognized 2906 miles of streams affected to some extent by acid mine water discharge, i.e., about six percent of the total. At the time Pennsylvania was annually stocking 8700 miles of streams in its fishery program. This was the apparent limit of the commission's resources.

COST OF MINE DRAINAGE CONTROL IS ENORMOUS

Now consider the economics of the situation. At the time of the hearings, and when the law was enacted, the Pennsylvania State Health Department estimated that mine drainage control would cost \$250 million. This would be an average cost of somewhat over \$83,000 per mile of affected stream.

Two years later, in 1967, after the law was effective, the department revised its estimate and the newer costs were calculated to be \$1 billion for an initial four-phase, ten-year program. This is more than \$333,000 per mile of affected stream. In addition, after the initial investment, the new estimate included an annual maintenance cost of \$40 million. This amounts to about \$13,000 per mile of affected stream in perpetuity if costs remain constant. This is a frightening economic burden, and I'm not sure Pennsylvania can afford it.

It is most unlikely that the Pennsylvania program will go smoothly forward. I am not convinced that the technology exists that will permit us to control all acid discharges. I must admit, there may have been a quantum jump in this area within the past two or three years that I failed to notice, but I don't think so. About half the Pennsylvania acid waters are emanating from abandoned mines. Title to these rests with the state, and where it does not I would guess that it will quickly revert. The bothersome thing to me is the fact that the Philadelphia newspapers keep telling us that the state cannot properly feed our institutionalized aged. If this is correct, how can we afford to push corks into holes in the ground?

MARGINAL BENEFITS GAINED BY LARGE EXPENDITURES

But aside from these domestic concerns, let us assume that the Pennsylvania program can and does go smoothly forward at the 1967 cost estimates and that all streams are recovered. What has been gained? There would indeed be biological recovery of the affected streams, but this may mean little or nothing to the vast majority of Pennsylvanians. Many anglers who supported and fought for the legislation would be disappointed. The program simply would not open 2906 miles to fishing. Many of these streams are on private property and not accessible. Others are in scenically unattractive areas and would not be utilized. Some are much too small to support game fish or any sustained fishing pressure. And to top it off, stocking may be well beyond the resources of the Pennsylvania Fish Commission.

Only a half dozen main-stem streams with public access would be recovered for angling. These would be real recreational assets without doubt, but are they worth the price? In a broad conservation view, the money could probably be used to much better advantage in any number of other conservation projects. We are a long way removed from having adequate funds for the development and maintenance of our human resources alone. It is obvious that water quality control should have been undertaken from the time coal mining began in Pennsylvania in 1761. Had this been done, associated costs would have been incorporated into the product. I fear that in this area we may now be crying over spilled milk.

In general, our acid waters are not worse than those naturally occurring where coal outcrops. We simply have more of it. T. M. Morris discussed surface coal in western

Pennsylvania many years ago. In writing about this region in 1803, he said: "But the spring water, issuing through fissures in the hills, which are only masses of coal, is so impregnated with bituminous and sulphurous particles as to be frequently nauseous to the taste and prejudicial to the health."

I suspect the narrow conservationists believe all western Pennsylvania waters should support fish. I would point out that this is unnatural. I doubt that the fight against acid mine discharge water in Pennsylvania can ever be completely successful, but it has been a good, albeit expensive, lesson.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL SHOULD START WITH MINE DEVELOPMENT

The lesson we have learned after two centuries of coal mining is to provide for environmental control in the development of mining properties. The first scoop of overburden removed for the opening of any mine is the first step toward environmental alteration. This need not be, and should not be, a step toward environmental degradation. Modern mine development reflects this. Climax Molybdenum mentioned earlier exemplifies this. This company kept the U.S. Forest Service and the Colorado Game, Fish and Parks Department advised of their actions. All developmental and mining activities were carefully designed to avoid pollution of existing water courses. Not only was stream pollution avoided, but a new recreation area was developed. No better public relations program could be designed.

This type of forward thinking appears to characterize all responsible mining companies. Thus, at the new Rowland mine of Consolidation Coal Co. at Beckley, W. Va. (which will employ stripping, auguring, and continuous miners) all water used in washing is expected to be recirculated through settling impoundments. No water discharge into adjacent streams is expected.

Another example of forward thinking is the Missouri Lead Operating Co. at Boss, Mo. This company began ecological studies of the environment in 1965, long before actual mining operations began. This company practices regular ecological monitoring to assure itself and the state that adverse conditions in neighboring streams are not developing. To date, they have not. Further, because of the design of the operation, deleterious effects are not expected to occur at any time.

Although an extensive list could be made of areas where mine-caused environmental damage has occurred, it is encouraging to note that the list of controlled operations is continuing to grow. Always there will be questions raised that are not easily resolved. For example, in Minnesota, there has been considerable press furor and citizen discontent over the discharge of taconite tailings into Lake Superior from a location on the north shore. From very limited observation, I am of the opinion that the so-called damage is negligible. At the same time, others are convinced that the lake is afflicted with some monstrous creeping horror that will lead to extinction in another few years. I honestly believe there is more emotionalism involved here than potential damage. It will prove interesting to see what ultimate decisions are made in this case.

No business can afford to put environmental programs ahead of profit, but there is no reason why such programs should not accompany profit. As a matter of fact, it makes sense for all industry to indulge pollution control. It is far better for a mining company to control its environmental influence directly. Failure to do so simply forces governmental agencies to do it from tax dollars, and dollars suffer considerable abrasion in passing through the public till. The incorporation of pollution control in mine operation is far cheaper than spending money on reclamation. The Pennsylvania coal mining sit-

uation clearly demonstrates this. Last but not least, there is no sounder way to develop good public relations.

CONSERVATION IS ABSOLUTE NEED

Today we do not look on conservation as an amenity; it is an absolute need for the survival of man. We have long since passed the tooth and nail level of survival, and we must do more than drag our feet when we recognize more subtle, but no less real, threats. Happily, the leaders in the mining industry appear to be well aware of this. Let us hope they will not be discouraged by the absurdities mouthed by narrow conservationists who cannot see anything beyond a six-lb trout in a stream. The total environment is the real meat of conservation, and it is the total environment that will cause our extinction or permit our survival.

AFTER THE MINING—USEFUL LAND

(By Darnell M. Whitt)

The science of strip-mine reclamation is comparatively new and still developing.

Yet proof of achievement in this field lies in the hundreds of thousands of acres which are witness to the skills of the soil scientist, the agronomist, the wildlife specialist, the land use planner, and their associates. For over 30 years they have been guiding the changing of torn earth into useful and attractive pockets of countryside.

An equally encouraging word reflects the interest of the mining industry in responding to the growing national concern over the quality of the rural environment.

Two million acres could benefit from reclamation.

The National Surface Mine Study, under Public Law 89-4, turned up the information that 3.2 million acres in this country had been disturbed by surface mining. Of this, more than two million acres would benefit from conservation treatment to restore the disturbed areas to productive, stabilized, and attractive condition.

The remaining acreage—a little over a million—needs no treatment. Over half of this was reclaimed or stabilized through the efforts of the mining industry, individual owners, or some unit of government. Nature herself, with processes slow and methodical, took care of the rest, using her own adapted grasses, shrubs, and trees.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE OFFERS ASSISTANCE

The Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which since the 1930's has been dealing with strip-mine reclamation along with its regular problems of soil erosion and land use, offers its assistance to owners of strip-mined land through the nation's 3000 soil and water conservation districts.

The districts, subdivisions of state government, have been carrying on their own effective campaign to restore surface-mined lands to usefulness and beauty. In the five-year period from 1960 to 1965, more than 5000 land owners and operators in 500 districts used SCS technical help, through the districts, to apply conservation to nearly 128,000 acres of surface-mined lands in 31 states.

The districts consider the restoration of strip-mined lands a part of the total soil and water conservation job, not a separate activity. Many mining firms, in cooperation with the conservation districts, have used the help available to solve strip-mine reclamation problems. Individual companies and their associations have reclaimed many thousands of surface-mined acres.

In the Appalachia region, reclamation associations have done reforestation and seeding on more than 74,000 acres. From 1961 to 1966, phosphate mine operators in Florida voluntarily restored 75 percent of the acre-

age mined. The National Sand and Gravel Association's members reclaimed more than half the land disturbed in 1965.

The National Coal Association, whose members account for over a third of the strip mining now being done, encourages its members to develop plans for reclamation before the mining machinery moves in. An Ohio coal mining company takes aerial photos of land to be mined. The negatives are projected on a plotter which traces contour lines on a map. A computer then reveals the amount of overburden that must be moved and indicates where it should be placed for both mining and reclamation work.

The Department of Agriculture, pushing ahead in its effort to raise the living standards of many of the nation's rural communities, looks at reclamation of strip-mined areas ties, one of its clear opportunities.

RECLAMATION FOR RECREATION IS ONE LAND USE OPTION

The SCS believes that more than a fourth of the disturbed land can be reclaimed for recreational uses. More than a third would support woodland plantings, and another third would serve well in range and pasture. Some of the remainder would be productive cropland and some would be desirable for residential, industrial, and institutional development.

Ponds and reservoirs, often a possibility in strip-mine reclamation, can be developed for a variety of uses.

Near Lakeland, Fla., a 740-acre tract turned over to Polk County by phosphate mining firms has been developed as Saddle Creek Park—an expanse of nature trails, camp sites, playgrounds, a marina and other facilities for water-based recreation. Another tract, leveled and filled according to a mining plan, is being developed for homesites. The companies cooperating with the Polk Soil and Water Conservation District have had technical help from the Soil Conservation Service.

Near Port Washington, N.Y., grading and planting have brought usefulness and beauty to many mined areas. In Missouri, a landowner built an attractive recreation area on 42 acres of strip-mined land he bought in 1953. The SCS, the U.S. Forest Service, and the Missouri Department of Conservation gave him a hand through the Callaway Soil and Water Conservation District. The Agricultural Conservation Program, another USDA activity, furnished trees and shrubs.

West Virginia soil conservation districts have been helping landowners restore surface-mined lands for many years. The districts employ crews experienced in planting grasses, shrubs and trees.

DISTURBED LAND EXISTS IN ALL STATES

All states have areas of land disturbed by strip mining and needing conservation work; although Hawaii, with 300 acres, barely qualifies for the list.

There are at least 13 states that have 50,000 or more acres needing reclamation. These are Pennsylvania with 229,500; Ohio-171,600; Florida-143,500; Texas-136,400; West Virginia-111,400; California-107,900; Illinois-88,700; Alabama-83,000; Kentucky-79,200; Minnesota-71,500; Tennessee-62,500; New York-50,200; and Kansas-50,000.

Information gathered by SCS shows that over nine-tenths of the mined acreage needing conservation treatment is in private ownership, most of it in small scattered parcels. The small tracts can usually best be treated along with the rest of the farmed area in a conservation farm plan.

Most of the mined areas are shown to be within five miles of communities of 200 or more residents. About 40 percent are more than five miles from towns of this size.

CONTROL OF POLLUTION OF MOUNTING IMPORTANCE

In the more than 50 Resource Conservation and Development Projects around the country, with the Soil Conservation Service giving technical help, unreclaimed strip-mine areas are inevitably examined by local planning groups for their potential uses.

It is the same in the national Small Watershed Program assisted by USDA. Land treatment gets priority rating as the conservationists seek out erosion and other sediment-producing sources.

With water pollution an increasing concern among conservationists, the control of pollution from mining sites is mounting in importance. Of sites surveyed by the national study, over half showed no pollution; 23 percent showed intermittent pollution and 21 percent showed substantial pollution.

The SCS reported that about a third of the mined areas needing conservation treatment should have some action to reduce offsite water pollution. This amounts to about 665,000 acres.

Of streams receiving direct runoff from surface-mined areas, nearly a third of those studied contained noticeable quantities of mineral precipitates. Another third or more showed water discoloration indicating chemical or physical pollution.

Of 14,000 miles of stream channels affected by surface mining, about half had water-carrying capacity reduced by sediment. An additional 4,500 miles of channels had capacity moderately reduced. Along 2,500 miles, channel capacity was only slightly affected.

INDUSTRY MOVING AHEAD OF REQUIREMENTS

The surface-mining industry is giving increasing attention to the restoration of mined areas and appears to be moving ahead of regulatory requirements. Operators in 22 states have formed the Mined Land Conservation Conference to promote reclamation of mined areas. These efforts appear to be producing impressive results.

Twenty states now have laws requiring mining operators to restore mined lands. Most such laws have been enacted within recent years. Reduction of pollution is high among the objectives of state laws. The trend in regulation is toward requiring that arrangements for restoring the mined area be made before license or permit to mine is granted.

Opportunity to turn mined areas into useful, profitable and attractive tracts, blending with the surrounding countryside, is claiming the attention of an increasing number of mine operators as well as that of conservationists and concerned communities. Experience has shown that most surface-mined areas offer great potential. This, with the development of new skills and materials in restoration work, can be expected to keep progress at least on a level with today's land use demands.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 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?

TONY HART MAKES DREAMS COME TRUE

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, in the often turbulent and crisis-ridden world in which we live, it is truly an inspiration to meet a person who sets an example of care and genuine compassion for his fellow men.

Such a person is 28-year-old Tony Hart, of Los Angeles.

Tony has been called a "one-man Peace Corps" for the many blind, crippled, or deformed children he has helped during the past 9 years.

A full-time employee of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services, Tony has spent much of his spare time arranging corrective surgery for crippled children, eye operations for blind or cross-eyed children, and plastic surgery for deformed children.

He also has arranged for such things as necessary transportation, food, clothing, and schooling for the children he helps.

Mr. Speaker, to tell a little more of the very moving and inspirational story of Tony Hart, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an article by Pamela Davis which appeared in the May 15 edition of the Los Angeles County Employee magazine.

As the article states:

The real story of Tony Hart is told in the shining eyes of a crippled child as he takes his first step, or in the tears of joy in a mother's eyes as her son walks into her arms. Tony Hart may never become rich and famous, but he is already a true success—just ask the children who will never forget him.

The article follows:

ONE-MAN PEACE CORPS: ANTHONY HART MAKES DREAMS COME TRUE

(By Pamela Davis)

Compassion for his fellow man is a quality Anthony Hart takes seriously, and so do the 18 blind, crippled or deformed children he has helped.

A clerk in the Metro-East office of DPSS, "Tony" is a 28-year-old bachelor who saw a need and decided to do something about it.

Tony's story began nine years ago when he climbed into a beat-up Oldsmobile and took a trip to Mexico. While there he met Alejandro Verde and his family.

During the next year Tony corresponded with his new friends through the help of a friend who wrote in Spanish.

The following summer Tony again visited the Verdes and noticed that one of the 14 children in the family was dragging himself around the dirt floor on twisted, match-stick legs.

FIRST OF MANY

"I just couldn't stand it," says Tony. And so 7-year-old Jose Verde, a victim of polio, became the first of many children to come in contact with this "one-man Peace Corps."

After much effort Tony arranged for Jose to enter Orthopaedic Hospital to begin cor-

rective surgery. Today Jose can ride a bike, has his own paper route and is doing well in school.

Over the years Tony has arranged corrective surgery for crippled children, eye operations for blind or cross-eyed children and plastic surgery for deformed children. One of his current charges is a child who suffered a skull fracture, leaving him deaf and dumb.

In addition, Tony must arrange for the necessary transportation, food, clothing and schooling for the children in his care—sometimes as many as four at a time.

HELPING HANDS

"I couldn't do it without help," says Tony. Friends and fellow workers keep him supplied with food, clothes and donations for the children, and major groups such as the East Los Angeles Kiwanis, Catholic Welfare and the North Hollywood Congregational

Church have also made financial contributions. The needy keep him supplied with letters asking for help.

He works with private hospitals such as Shriner's, Los Angeles Orthopaedic, Queen of Angels and White Memorial, who provide as much free medical care as possible. But expenses are still incurred, so bake sales, art shows, and white elephant sales are common activities for Tony.

Those wishing to help can mail contributions to the Community Service Organization for the Tony Hart Project, 714 California Ave., Venice.

Besides his work with the children themselves, Tony helped to raise funds needed to build a school in Sopolote, a community near Rosario, Mexico. The school is now completed, and funds are being raised to purchase enough livestock for a class in Animal Husbandry.

A documentary program, "And Who Is My Brother—The Tony Hart Story," was produced by NBC Television and shown on March 14. It will be televised again in June on Channel 4.

Tony was named "Man of the Year" by the Jewish War Veterans of the Los Angeles area and was also awarded a plaque for his work by Radio Station KABC.

His story has been told in many local newspapers and in the December issue of *Pace* magazine.

But the real story of Tony Hart is told in the shining eyes of a crippled child as he takes his first step, or in the tears of joy in a mother's eyes as her son walks into her arms.

Tony Hart may never become rich and famous, but he is already a true success—just ask the children who will never forget him.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 22, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Lead me in Thy truth and teach me:
for Thou art the God of my salvation;
on Thee do I wait all the day.—Psalm
25:5.*

O God and Father of all men, who changest not in a world of change, who art forever loving, forever forgiving, and forever patient, amid the tumult of these troubled times we would enter the peace of Thy presence, receive the strength of Thy spirit, and go forth to labor with Thee in making this planet a better place in which men can live together.

Help us to build on earth a rule of peace and good will, a reign of human rights where there shall be no hunger, no discrimination, no lack of education, and a realm where man can grow not only in body, but even more in mind and, best of all, in spirit.

"Set our feet on lofty places:

Gird our lives that they may be
Armored with all Christ-like graces
In the fight to set men free,
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,
That we fail not man nor Thee."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 18, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 17241. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duties on certain forms of copper.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 14720. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1973, the existing suspen-

CXVI—1300—Part 15

sion of duties on manganese ore (including ferruginous ore) and related products; and

H.R. 16739. An act to extend for a period of 10 years the existing authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to maintain offices in the Republic of the Philippines.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the compilation and printing of a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress (1774-1970).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3691. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to lower the mandatory retirement age for Foreign Service officers who are career ministers; and

S. 3978. An act to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1971.

A SWEET TAX BREAK

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend it was reported that 60,000 cases of cyclamate-sweetened diet drink, donated by the Carnation Co., are being shipped to Laos as a gift.

It is absolutely absurd to send a low-calorie diet food or beverage to a starving people. It is ridiculous for the American taxpayer to pay through AID the cost of shipping 60,000 cases of a product which is banned for use in America.

This program is as insulting to the people of Laos as it is to the people of America. It is a gift of something which should be thrown away. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I fear that this gift is designed to provide a gift-tax deduction for the producer of a product declared to be unfit. It is a cheap and cruel expression of American generosity.

This is no small thing. It could provide the basis for a multimillion-dollar tax writeoff for the producing company.

The writeoff could be worth many times the cost of producing the banned cyclamate gift. The gift deduction is based upon retail value. The loophole is big and permits producers of banned and defective lotions, potions, and drugs to unload their mischief at a profit.

I am preparing legislation to prevent the use of gift-tax deductions for the disposal of merchandise banned for sale in the United States.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN MANGANESE ORES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6049) to amend the definition of "metal-bearing ores" in the Tariff Schedules of the United States, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do so in order to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for a brief explanation. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. I thank my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means the purpose of the pending bill is to amend the definition of the term "metal-bearing ores" in the Tariff Schedules of the United States in order that imports of man-