

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TEXTILE IMPORTS—ADDRESS BY
ROBERT PHINIZY TIMMERMAN

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Robert Phinizy Timmerman, who is the president of the Graniteville Co., Graniteville, S.C., an old and famous textile manufacturing and processing company made a speech recently in Augusta, Ga., which was reported in the Augusta Chronicle.

This report of Mr. Timmerman's statement gives some good reasons for import control. Mr. Timmerman points out that the 15-month effort of the United States to negotiate agreements with Japan and other major textile exporting nations has been eminently fair and reasonable. He points out that these efforts have failed, because importing nations are not willing to enter into negotiations. He notes that the inevitable consequences of this failure was introduction of legislation in Congress.

Mr. President, Mr. Timmerman points out that no one is asking that textile imports be shut off or that they be sharply reduced, but that we are seeking a moderate rate of growth of textile imports which is realistic.

Mr. Timmerman strikes to the heart of the matter when he says:

Most people are concerned today about hunger and poverty in many parts of the country. Many see an answer in the potential role of the large-employment industries. With rightful access to America's market and with confidence in the future, these industries can sustain, if not expand, job opportunities.

Mr. President, this is quite true. This is one of the primary reasons why the textile industry must be protected—because it supplies jobs for millions of Americans. Mr. Timmerman pointed out that the textile industry has been moving ahead in the area of Negro employment at a rate four times faster than the national average. In fact, Mr. President, Negroes now comprise 12 percent of the total textile employment compared with the national average of 10 percent.

Mr. President, this is a well-done article which reports a fine address by an outstanding industrialist. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Textile Leader Says Proposals 'Realistic'" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle,
June 17, 1970]

IMPORT CURBS URGED: TEXTILE LEADER SAYS
PROPOSALS "REALISTIC"

America's textile-apparel industry, providing one of the nation's largest industrial payrolls, is far too valuable to be traded off to foreign producers, Robert P. Timmerman said in an address to the Augusta Traffic and Transportation Club Tuesday.

The president of the Graniteville Co. said

that textile import control legislation currently pending before Congress is "reasonable and realistic" and will permit countries to compete for a fair share of the American market of the future.

"It is high time to end the insanity of exposing the American home market to indefinite, no-end-in-sight floods of imports from countries that have no obligation to feel legal or moral responsibility toward American employees, consumers or communities, he said.

The executive traced the 15-month-long effort of the U.S. government to negotiate voluntary agreements with major textile exporting nations of the world and pointed out that the United States has been "eminently fair and reasonable."

He said, however, that these efforts have failed, because importing nations have been unwilling to enter into negotiations.

"Bills providing for a settlement now have been introduced in Congress," Timmerman said. "The sooner favorable action is taken, the better."

Timmerman said no one is asking for textile imports to be shut off or sharply reduced.

"What we are seeking is a moderation of the rate of growth of textile imports. What could be more reasonable and realistic?" Timmerman asked.

The legislation pending in Congress placed heavy emphasis on negotiated agreements, he said, and only those nations which refuse to enter into negotiated agreements would be subject to the specific limitations provided for the pending bills.

"Most people are concerned today about hunger and poverty in many parts of the country," Timmerman said. "Many see an answer in the potential role of the large-employment industries. With rightful access to America's market and with confidence in the future, these industries can sustain, if not expand, job opportunities."

Timmerman pointed out that the textile industry has been moving ahead in the area of Negro employment at a rate four times faster than the national average. He said Negroes now comprise 12 per cent of total textile employment, compared with the national average of 10 per cent.

He said that the textile and apparel industry are major sources of employment in big cities as well—providing 244,000 jobs in the garment industry in New York City alone.

PRINCE EDWARD ACADEMY

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity recently of attending the graduation exercises of the Prince Edward Academy. I was deeply impressed by the sincerity of the graduates and their eagerness to get an education and to assume their proper role as good citizens.

The citizens of Prince Edward County have blazed a trail and charted a course which the people of other areas have marveled at and some tried to duplicate. Prince Edward was one of those counties that was tragically affected by the Supreme Court decision in 1954 which almost wrecked public education in the

South. The people of Prince Edward County were farsighted enough to know that properly educating their children was necessary if they were to survive as a progressive community. The white people of Prince Edward County banded together and have forged an educational system that is second to none in the Commonwealth of Virginia. They have a group of dedicated directors, administrators, and teachers. Their facilities are equal or better than that of any other high school in our area. Their graduates are in every major college in Virginia. They have had the advice of the best educational experts available. They have built from the foundation up and their hard work and determination have paid off in that the white children of Prince Edward County have had educational opportunities excelled by none.

It has been a rough and hard road but by sacrificing, working together, and with some cooperation and assistance from their friends throughout Virginia and elsewhere, they have succeeded in providing education for their children equal to any area in the State and thereby furnishing Virginia and the Nation many, many outstanding citizens. Each graduating class has been a credit to the county and to the State.

I salute the people who have made this possible, who by their determination and their hard work have succeeded in accomplishing their purpose under trying circumstances and almost overwhelming obstacles put upon them by a hostile court and unsympathetic bureaucrats who were unsuccessful in their determination to break the backs of the people of Prince Edward and compel them to knuckle under to judicial tyranny and bureaucratic despotism.

The seniors and guests at the graduation exercises were fortunate indeed in their choice of a commencement speaker. Mr. Jesse Helms, executive vice president of WRAL-TV in Raleigh, N.C., delivered one of the best commencement addresses I have had the privilege and opportunity of hearing. It is such a fine speech that I feel that the Members of the Congress and other interested people all over the Nation should have the opportunity of reading same. I am taking the liberty of including the commencement address with my remarks as I believe it is a clear statement of principles that our young people need to read, to ponder, to study, and to follow.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY JESSE HELMS

I am grateful, of course, to Mr. Redd, and to Mr. Barry Wall, who collaborated in obtaining a visa for me to slip out of Raleigh today, so that I could be with you to share in this wonderful, meaningful occasion this evening.

I mean no disrespect either to my town or my state, for I love them both. But there is something very special to me about crossing the state line into the Commonwealth of Virginia. It's an exultant feeling for me to ride through your countryside and reestablish a sort of philosophical empathy with gallant Virginians of the past who, after all, created the miracle of America by breaking

the chains of tyranny. Virginia, to me, is symbolized by such honored names as Patrick Henry, and Jefferson, and Monroe, and Harry Byrd.

My affection for your state does not diminish my love for my own state and its place in history. We have a heritage, too, and we have had our great men. We still have some—and if you will pardon this personal reference to a friend, one of our greatest is the gentleman who addressed you last year; who holds you and your achievements in such esteem that he returned today, with me, to be with you again tonight. I speak, of course, of Supreme Court Justice I. Beverly Lake, who to me symbolizes the ultimate in worthy principle and statesmanship. He has given me friendship, guidance, inspiration and encouragement. I am proud and honored that he has long been my friend. I am proud that he is here tonight.

If you are familiar with the news events of my city, Raleigh, you surely must have noticed that ours has been pretty much of a besieged city in recent months. Raleigh once was known as the "City of Oaks". The implications of the name are obvious, the serenity and beauty of a community with tree-lined streets. And there is an image of sturdiness, of stability, that comes to mind when one thinks of the mighty oak.

Now, I fear, the community once known as the city of oaks is becoming something of a "city of kooks"—a city where anything can happen, and generally does; a city where the ultra-liberal morning newspaper glorifies an undraped streetwalker on its front page while it vilifies J. Edgar Hoover, Spiro Agnew and the President of the United States on its editorial page.

I made a note recently of the strange and curious characters who came to our city during a single six-week period. There was, for example, the patron saint of the Order of the Switchblade—the Rev. Ralph David Abernethy (as Huntley-Bunkley call him)—leading a chanting mob down our Main Street. The Rev. Ralph David got his crowd together to protest what he called "the persecution" of a young Negro woman who had made a little old mistake in an Eastern Carolina county. All she had done—and she bragged about it after her arrest—was rob an elderly grocer, bust a pop bottle over his head, and stomped him into a pulp to make sure he was dead—which he was.

The mob assembled in our town to demand that this woman be set free. The mob contended that it was "racial injustice" for the police to arrest, and for the courts to convict, such a sweet, innocent, fun-loving little girl.

It perhaps goes without saying that this mob had in its midst a host of sympathizers who, on other days, condemn the earnest efforts of hard-working Americans who are making tremendous sacrifices to build and maintain such worthy institutions as Prince Edward Academy. They make clear that they hate everything that America once stood for—law and order, working for a living, free enterprise, faith in God, freedom of the individual, moral principles, and decent sensibilities.

So, the Rev. Ralph David Abernethy came—and, thank the Lord, he went. But in that same six-week period, our airport logged the arrivals and departures of other such notables as Hubert Humphrey, Senator Fulbright, Senator Bayh, Mayor Lindsay of New York, Jacob Javits, Jerry Rubin, Herbert Aptheker, Joan Baez, and others. That, I submit, ladies and gentlemen, is what you call congestion. Come to think of it, "air" pollution "is" reaching the crisis stage!

I am honored to come here tonight, because I have come to an institution that has become—more than you may realize—the marvel of that part of the nation which

yet yearns for a return to integrity in education.

By doing what is right, you are showing the rest of the country what is wrong with the dangerously silly and fearfully destructive policies growing out of stifling federal control of public education.

So, your achievement here, in this era of our country's growing frustration, gives all thoughtful men a chance to contemplate the superiority of an educational system truly dedicated to the best interests of the young. You have not played with words. You have worked for ideals, and for a purpose. You have proved what free men and women can do. You have supplied a definition of excellence. And I congratulate you for it.

From the moment I entered this auditorium a little while ago, I have felt the warmth and excitement that only the commencement season can produce. Graduation time is a gloriously sentimental time. Who can measure the intensity of the sparkle in the eyes of these young people whom tonight we honor? Or the love and devotion so clearly revealed in the proud but misty eyes of the mothers and fathers who have gathered here to see their sons and daughters reach out for another rung in the ladder of life.

One can feel only pity for him who is not sentimental tonight. It is a great night, and one that I suspect all of us will reflect upon for years to come.

The commencement season is a splendid reminder of the changelessness of the durable virtues of life. We often hear that "times are different"—and they are! We are frequently told that our problems are new, that our problems are different. I'm not so sure about that. Men have always been challenged to fight for freedom. In fact, when I hear such statements (that "times are different") I am reminded of the man who said to the little boy: "We have a new moon tonight." The lad replied: "No, sir, it's just the same old moon back again."

So, when we look at the problems of today, we see that they are simply human, man-made problems—and that they are really the same old problems back again. But they can be more than problems: they are challenges and opportunities, crying out for a new generation of young minds to face them wisely, intelligently, morally and courageously.

Commencement speakers have a habit of saying to seniors, in one way or another: "Here's the world, take it." This is a risky statement to make, for I have a feeling that one fine day some senior is going to look at the world—and hand it back.

Sometimes the world doesn't seem like much of a graduation gift. It has gone through a great deal of wear and tear since Adam and Eve tasted of the forbidden fruit. But it can still be an exciting, challenging world—and you young people can—and must—improve it. How much you improve it will depend upon the extent to which you profit by the errors of those of us who have gone before you.

I'm not at all certain that my generation can be proud of its record of preserving the things that have a right to survive. We have talked a great deal about immortality, but I wonder if we have not too often misplaced our emphasis in deciding what is important, and what is not. Is there not room to wonder whether we are in the throes of a moral poverty, far overshadowing any degree of physical poverty that may afflict our nation—or, for that matter, the world?

And the worst of it is that we so often know not what we do. There are growing multitudes who would destroy freedom in the name of freedom. There are others who would strip from our public life the spiritual allegiance upon which our nation was founded—and this is being done under the pretense of freedom of religion.

Freedom of religion? Or, freedom from religion! There is a difference—and a deadly one!

Anyone assigned the honor and the responsibility of participating in commencement exercises is bound to ask himself what he would need to hear if he were again a high school senior. What would be most helpful? My decision was that I should simply pass along to you what my own high school principal told me more than a quarter of a century ago. And that was: What a person really wants to do and be in this world is largely up to the individual. He may experience assistance or resistance along the way, he may have good luck or bad luck, but the sum total of what he does, and what he is, will depend upon his own will, his own initiative, his own imagination, and his own willingness to work at it.

I know that I must often sound doctrinaire about this, but this is the spirit of America. This is, if you please, the miracle of America. Our founding fathers had a respect for the dignity and the responsibility of the individual unequaled in the world before. Thus, the belief that all people would prosper in accordance with the degree of freedom to which each individual was left to seek his own destiny was actually a novel experiment in history up to that time. A lot of people said, at the time, that it wouldn't work. But it did. It was said that people couldn't govern themselves, but they could—and they did. It was said that competition among individuals would prove unworkable—but it didn't! Freedom flourishes among people who have faith in it—who are willing to sacrifice to preserve it.

There are those who today demand that the fundamentals of this nation be discarded in favor of a system that sets up the government as a ruler, as a provider, and as a decider. You young ladies and gentlemen, if you have a resolution tonight, please have this one: Don't believe the voices of the mobs. Think for yourself! Establish your principles, and stand up for them.

There's a second-grade teacher in my town who sends a note to parents at the beginning of every school year. The note reads like this: "If you promise not to believe everything your child says happens at school, I'll promise not to believe everything he says happens at home."

Isn't that a pretty fair bargain for us in other areas of life?

But let us not drift too deeply into pessimism before I assure you that this can be a very good world. It has been very good to me, and it will be very good to you—if you will let it. May I repeat the advice of my own high school principal? What a person really wants to do and be in this world is entirely up to the individual.

This does not suggest, however, that the law of gravity has been repealed. You can't coast uphill. There will be times, and maybe not too long in the future, when your patience will be taxed, and you will be tired and frustrated—and even temporarily defeated. Then, young people, is when you're being tested. Then is when you will find out how much courage and stamina and dedication you possess.

And then is when you will need to remember that you can have precisely as much courage and stamina and dedication as you want to have.

In my time, I have had the responsibility of hiring a great many people, and firing a few. This is the sort of responsibility that gives one a sobering insight into human nature. You cannot know how many times I have wished for just a few more people who were willing to work just a little harder, use just a little more imagination, show just a little more interest in doing their jobs just a little better.

I have run across quite a few, of course, who have demonstrated those qualities. And

inevitably, they have been the ones who have moved ahead, who put themselves in a position to earn more and thus to enjoy more of the comforts and pleasures of life.

And, do you know something? These people never complain. They don't care about a 40-hour week. Indeed, they are the kind of people who became disgusted with those electricians in New York some time ago who went on strike because of the demands for a 20 hour week. The electricians finally settled for 25 hours a week. Well, let me tell you one thing about those electricians. With the kind of attitudes they have, they'll spend the rest of their lives battling for less work, and they will never really know the satisfaction of a fully productive, useful life. They bargain with great force, but they're bargaining away their own real potential.

You can decide—right now, if you like—whether you want to be a forty-hour-a-week clock-watcher, or whether you want to dive into this dynamic mainstream of American free enterprise. You can go either way. It's largely up to you!

Sometime back, Branch Rickey—one of the great major league baseball managers of all time—was asked what he thought was Stan Musial's secret for knocking home runs.

You young ladies may not be entirely familiar with Stan Musial, but I would wager that most of the young men here can tell you how many of the records Mr. Musial set during his fantastic career. Stan Musial will always be known as "Stan, The Man." I think there's some significance to that, too.

Anyhow, Mr. Rickey had a pretty good idea as to the secret of Stan (The Man's) success. You know what it was?

"Well," said Mr. Rickey, "I'll tell you: Stan never waited for the 'easy' pitch. He always took a swing at the hard, fast ball—and when he connected, he knocked it out of the park."

Stan (The Man) didn't take the "easy way" out. So he became a leader, he set a record, and he earned the admiration of millions of people around the world. He wanted to be the best baseball player there was—and I share Branch Rickey's opinion that Stan (The Man) Musial made it.

My advice to you is to be the best there is in whatever endeavor you select. Work at it. Love your work. Do the best you can in everything you do, and there will never be a force strong enough to keep you down. Adopt a philosophy that enables you to regard bad luck, and mistakes, simply as valuable lessons learned. This is what Americans need to understand. Once we do, there'll be a reduction in mental difficulties overnight. Don't let a mistake, or a defeat throw you. Look at it this way: You've learned something.

Remember the story of the man who stopped to watch a bunch of kids play baseball? He hollered over to the rightfielder, a freckle-faced little kid, and asked the score. "51-to-nothing, in their favor," the kid replied.

"Gosh," said the man, "they're beating the tar out of you, aren't they?"

"Naw," said the kid, "We ain't been to bat yet."

All this life asks of you is that you go to bat. If you're going to be a teacher, figure out ways that you can be the best darned teacher in the business. If you have new ideas, try them. If you don't have new ideas, find some!

There's a heavy demand for good doctors, good lawyers, good teachers, good mechanics, good salesmen—good anything! But the market is glutted with people who want to do just enough to get by. If you've got any ambition as that, then get ready to pick up your free groceries down at the welfare office.

Once you have established yourself, however, as a hard-working, clear-thinking part of what can become this dynamic society of ours, you will become a part of the miracle of America. You can't avoid it. For then you will be standing for something. You will be living up to the message that Jesus conveyed

in the Parable of the Talents. And this brings up a subject of dramatic importance to you and to every life you will touch.

It involves your moral integrity. Nobody can shape it for you. Once again, you decide what it will be, how enduring it will be. And this, too, is a test of courage.

Will you establish your own moral code, based on what you know to be right? Or will you follow the crowd? You have been raised in Christian homes, by parents who fear and love God, by mothers and fathers who stood by you when you were sick and troubled, who sacrificed—and who will continue to sacrifice to give you the best that they've got.

But what happens now, right now, from now on, is up to you. The longer you delay the decision, the less important it will seem to you when you get around to it. You've finished one milestone, and are heading into a new one. As you enter this new phase of your life, you will find at times that the cry of the "easy way," the cry of the "expedient," will be presented to you in all its appealing popularity. The adult world is hearing plenty of it, I can assure you.

"Don't be naive," they say. "Coast just a little bit. Cut corners. Everyone does it."

But the man or woman with strength and courage and conviction doesn't do it. And you won't either—if you're really looking for a satisfying, rewarding, constructive life.

Nevertheless, your moral integrity will be tested. Perhaps it already has been, from time to time. But before you take what appears to be the easy way—before you too quickly take the way which seems so popular, before you follow the crowd—ask this question:

"Where is the crowd going? Is this where I want to go?"

Jesus said, "The gate is wide and the way is easy that leads to destruction . . . and those who enter are many."

Young ladies and gentlemen, in your family life, in your business life, in your political life, in your community life . . . you will be tested. So will your Christian faith.

I do not wear my religion on my lapel, but the older I get the more clearly I think I see the true destiny of man. And I can assure you that it is getting more alarming to see what so many of us in the older generations are doing with our destinies.

Billy Graham said sometime ago that too many of our churches are filled on Sundays with empty people. Do you doubt it? Sometimes it is almost as if people are playing "trick or treat" with God. You know how it goes: "If you will do this for me, God, I'll do that for you." Somehow, I don't think God bargains that way. With me—or with you.

On the other hand, I think He has offered us, all of us, a proposition that we will reject at our own peril. The proposition is simple: Faith! With it you have everything; without it, you have nothing.

This is something that our founding fathers understood. Look through all of the documents that are important in this nation's history. Look on your currency, on the coins in your pocket. There it is: "In God we trust." Some deny that simple confession of faith, and would deny it to others. But, Jefferson, Franklin, Washington—they did trust in God. And, in doing so, they had confidence in themselves and their fellow man. They entertained no doubts that God-fearing freedom would work. That's why it did work. Men had the faith to work to preserve it.

That's why our nation grew strong and great and respected. It dared to be free. It dared to have faith in God, and in the freedom that was one of God's greatest blessings. Our present troubles began when we reneged upon our faith!

Immortality is thrust upon no man. Say, if you dare, that there is no such thing as immortality. But when you say it, you deny the existence of Christ and his teachings.

You say that the Spirit of 1776 was nothing more than an accident. You say that Patrick Henry was nothing but a crackpot, or an extremist, who found an audience when he called for liberty or death.

But before you say these things, ask yourself: Just suppose there is such a thing as immortality, that there was a Christ—virgin birth and all—who walked this earth. Just suppose God's guiding hand was behind the Spirit of '76. Suppose Patrick Henry did have a message for free men of every generation when he called for liberty . . . or death?

What then? What if these things are true?—And they are!

What is your responsibility? What are you going to do about it?

I hope, as you move into your years of maturity, that you will give some serious attention to what is happening to your country. You will be told, frequently and sometimes persuasively, that the fundamentals of your country are old-fashioned. You will hear many platitudes about new deals, new days, new frontiers, and great societies. Always there will be the sugar-coating of something for nothing.

But don't take my word for it. Don't take anybody's word. Pray for guidance and then think for yourself. Learn for yourself what really is the difference between America and all of the rest of the nations of the world throughout history. Leave partisan politics out of it. Ask yourself, rationally and reasonably, as General MacArthur put it, whether the strength of America is being sapped by deficit financing indulged in too long, by federal paternalism grown too mighty, by power groups too arrogant, by politics grown too corrupt, by crime grown too rampant, by morals grown too low, by taxes grown too high.

Don't follow the thinking of the crowd. Do your own thinking, and make your own decisions. Then have the courage to dedicate your citizenship to what you know is right—even if, at times, you must stand alone. Nothing short of right is right.

There are dreams all around us. There are things to be accomplished, errors to be corrected, progress to be achieved, work to be done, courage to be shown, faith to be proved. The world is being handed to you, cluttered up as it may seem, and you cannot hand it back.

What you will do with your opportunity is, of course, your business. You can do a great deal for the world, and to it.

Largely this is measured by how you live with people, what influence you exercise, and in what way you exercise it.

No man ever became great by accident. Nor will you. No man ever achieved immortality by chance, nor will you!

But, if enough people begin, right now, to work together, to do the best they can at whatever the task is before them, then most of the mistakes made up to now can be rectified and forgotten.

Faith, honesty, courage, hard work, integrity—these are contagious things, and you can help start a wholesome epidemic which will eliminate the malignancy of laziness and something-for-nothing. By being strong men and women yourselves, you will encourage others to be strong. By daring to stand up for that which you know is right, you will cause others to do likewise. No man is an island unto himself.

One Easter morning at sunrise on a mountain top in Western North Carolina, a group of people, perhaps as many as a hundred, had gathered for a sunrise service.

A little girl, perhaps three years old, was there with her Daddy and Mother and brother. For several minutes she tried to scramble up a huge rock so that she could better see what was going on.

Finally her father realizing what she wanted, climbed up, reached for his son's hand, and instructed him to catch hold of

the little girl's hand. "Hold tight," he said. They did.

It was a simple operation, and soon all three were atop the rock. On that crisp morning, the world seemed to be at their feet. And, you know, in a way it was!

Picture that little girl, standing on that boulder, with her hands on her hips. She looked up at her father, and said: "See, Daddy, if we all hold hands tight, we can go anywhere!"

It goes without saying that I wish each of you the best of success in your lives ahead. I congratulate you on the achievements which placed you in this group here tonight. I also join you in a tribute to your parents for the wonderful things they have done for you, and what they have meant to you.

This is what is called love. This is also what is meant—as that little girl on the mountain top put it—by "holding hands tight."

Thank you very much for permitting me to share this occasion with you, and God bless you every one.

FOREIGN IMPORTS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Times and Democrat, a newspaper published in Orangeburg, S.C., has published a fascinating editorial entitled "Imports Versus Exports." The article discusses the encroachment of foreign imports on U.S. industry and the lack of our exports to foreign countries which create an unfavorable balance of trade. The editor used for his study the import and export figures of five Southeastern ports: Wilmington, N.C.; Charleston, S.C.; Savannah, Ga.; and Tampa and Miami, Fla.

The editorial explores the imports and exports for each of these ports, and it summarizes the situation by stating that—

This means that imports from Japan into these five Southeastern ports rose in one year 14 per cent, to \$155.9 million from \$136.3 million. Exports slipped 12 per cent, to \$88.5 million from \$99.2 million.

The article points out that these facts constitute a good argument for restrictions of Japanese imports, both for the sake of the American industry and for the national economy.

Mr. President, I think that this is an excellent, concrete, factual example of why we need import restrictions and why we need them as soon as possible.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

IMPORTS VERSUS EXPORTS

The ever-increasing encroachment of foreign imports on United States industry and the lack of our exports which create an unfavorable balance of trade is no better reflected than in a report from the United States-Japan Trade Council which proclaims that the five Southeastern ports, Wilmington, N.C., Charleston, S.C., Savannah, Ga., and Tampa and Miami, Fla., handled 14 per

cent more Japanese imports in 1969 than in the previous year.

Japanese imports into Charleston edged up marginally to \$21.8 million from \$21 million in 1968, while exports to Japan slipped to \$7.7 million from \$9.1 million. Major Japanese items entering Charleston were textile yarn, fabrics and articles (\$2.6 million), veneers (\$2.1 million), chemicals (\$1.8 million) and textile fibers (\$1.8 million). The South Carolina port's exports to Japan were in food and animal feed-stuffs (\$2.2 million) and chemicals (\$2.1 million).

The port of Wilmington increased its imports from Japan to \$27.1 million last year from \$22.7 million in 1968. Wilmington's exports to the Far Eastern country, however, slipped to \$37.8 million from \$42.5 million. Chief exports were tobacco (\$35.3 million), while the major import items were iron and steel (\$9.1 million) and textile fabrics and articles (\$4.6 million).

Japanese trade through Savannah increased in both directions. Imports moved up to \$28.7 million from \$23.3 million, while exports rose to \$16.5 million from \$13.5 million. The main exports moving from Savannah were iron and steel, textile fibers and textile yarns, fabrics and articles.

Tampa enjoyed rising imports from Japan last year, but saw an equal drop in exports. Imports were up to \$43.4 million from \$36.6 million, while exports dropped to \$24.6 million from \$31.3 million. Main export items were crude fertilizer, chemicals and metal ores. On the import side were motor vehicles, iron and steel.

Miami reported imports up to \$34.9 million from \$32.7 million, but exports dropped from \$2.8 million to \$1.9 million. Chief imports were electrical machinery, mostly telecommunications equipment, precision instruments, iron and steel. Chief export was in metal scrap.

This means that imports from Japan into these five Southeastern ports rose in one year 14 per cent, to \$155.9 million from \$136.3 million. Exports slipped 12 per cent, to \$88.5 million from \$99.2 million.

Total American trade with Japan zoomed during 1969, with exports rising 17.2 per cent to \$3.5 billion, and imports soaring 19.9 per cent to \$4.8 billion.

These facts, in themselves, put up a good argument for restrictions in Japanese imports, not only for the sake of American industries, and manufacturers but for the national economy. Some equalization should be sought either by the President or by an act of Congress.

RESULTS OF GERALD R. FORD'S 1970 QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, roughly a month ago I sent out my 1970 questionnaire to the 156,040 mailing addresses in my district and meantime I have received 34,577 responses—an amazing 22-percent return.

The responses to my questionnaire produced some most significant results. Chief among these is that the people in the Fifth Congressional District of Michigan consider crime and violence to be the most important problem facing the country today.

It was most interesting to note, in this connection, that an overwhelming number of my constituents favor both the

no-knock provision in the President's anticrime legislation and the preventive detention proposal.

With the permission of the House, I will place the complete results of my congressional poll in the RECORD at this point. The poll results follow:

	[In percent]		
	Yes	No	Other
1. Should the Post Office Department be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis?	73.2	16.2	10.6
2. Do you believe the United States can rely on agreements reached with the Soviet Union?	20.2	75.0	4.8
3. Should the United States gradually expand its diplomatic and trade relations with Red China?	40.7	50.6	8.7
4. Do you favor President Nixon's multi-billion-dollar program to fight water pollution?	80.0	15.1	4.9
5. President Nixon has recommended strong anticrime legislation. Do you favor—			
a. Allowing Federal officers with a warrant issued by a Federal court to enter private premises without knocking if drugs and other evidence of illegal narcotics traffic might otherwise be destroyed?	79.2	18.7	2.1
b. Keeping a criminal defendant in "preventive detention" if his record indicates he might commit a serious crime if freed on bond while awaiting trial?	90.1	8.1	1.8
6. Do you favor busing schoolchildren out of their neighborhood school areas to achieve better racial balance in classrooms?	7.0	91.2	1.8
7. Should balancing the Federal budget to curb inflation be given priority over greater spending on Government programs?	81.7	12.6	5.7
8. Should undergraduate college students be given temporary draft deferments?	43.0	52.7	4.6

MULTIPLE CHOICE

[In percent]

9. Federal farm controls and subsidies should be—	
a. Phased out within 5 years, or	70.2
b. Continued as is, or	8.9
c. Made permanent, with the subsidies reduced	8.9
Other	11.3
Multiple	.7
10. What is the single most important problem in the country today? Pick one.	
a. Air and water pollution	9.4
b. Crime and violence	45.5
c. The Vietnam war	24.7
d. Inflation (rise in the cost of living)	12.8
Other	2.6
Multiple	5.0

RECYCLING OF SOLID WASTES

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the Committee on Public Works, of which I have the honor to be a member, is currently marking up a bill to extend the authorization for the Federal Bureau of Solid Waste Management. One of the major aspects of this legislation will be an effort to encourage recycling of materials found in municipal refuse.

This is a major problem, both technically and economically. We must improve our technical capabilities for recycling wastes, and at the same time encourage markets for materials that can be reclaimed from the garbage can.

It is notable, I believe, that the State of Delaware has just adopted legislation

that will provide for the construction of an advanced recycling plant near Wilmington. The State and the many supporters of this proposal are to be commended.

Two recent newspaper articles appeared on this subject that I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues. One appeared in the Wilmington Morning News yesterday, and describes in some detail the background of the proposed Wilmington plant. The same day, the Wall Street Journal carried an article that details some of the problems facing another recycling operation. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed, with my comments, as a part of the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News June 23, 1970]

HERCULES GETS STATE BID: WASTE RECYCLING PLANT PLAN ACCEPTED

(By John D. Gates and Bob Dolan)

DOVER.—A Hercules, Inc., proposal for the design, construction and operation of a solid waste recycling plant in New Castle County was accepted yesterday by Gov. Russell W. Peterson.

Peterson announced he had accepted the Hercules plan on the recommendation of his Committee on Solid Waste as he signed House Bill 822, appropriating \$1 million for design and engineering work on the plant.

The plant, billed as the first in the world to reclaim all waste materials fed into it, would handle 500 tons of domestic and industrial waste and 70 tons of wet sewage sludge a day, or nearly half the solid waste generated in New Castle County.

The next step will be contract negotiations between Hercules and the state to iron out details concerning what exactly the state wants from Hercules in the way of design work. A Hercules official said these negotiations would probably be completed in from three to six weeks.

Construction and operation of the plant would require more negotiations—as well as more money. These negotiations would involve New Castle County government and, if hoped-for federal funds are available, the federal government.

Cost of the plant from initial design to start of operations would be about \$10 million, according to John N. Sherman, director of advanced programs for Hercules' chemical propulsion division, which submitted the proposal.

Design of the plant allows for eventual doubling of capacity through expansion. After an initial shakedown phase, money realized from the sale of recycled waste products would pay the operating expenses of the plant, according to the Hercules proposal.

Members of the Governor's Committee on Solid Waste said that similar plants may be built in the Dover and Georgetown areas at a later date.

A bill to provide federal aid for pilot waste recycling projects is now being prepared by the U.S. Senate Committee on Public Works, of which Sen. J. Caleb Boggs, R-Del., is the ranking minority member.

The committee hopes to have the bill on the Senate floor for action next month. Delaware hopes to get some of that money to help finance the plant.

State Rep. Robert J. Berndt, R-Hillcrest, who sponsored the bill to fund design work and chaired the governor's committee, said a site for the plant must be chosen soon because Hercules designs will depend on the nature of the site.

The Hercules proposal included a completion schedule for the plant of 22 months from the date of site selection, barring unforeseen obstacles and assuming full financing of the project.

Committee members present when Peterson signed H.B. 822 were Berndt, George Dutcher, New Castle County public works director; Richard Weldon of Bear; Arthur W. Dobberstein of Dover; State Sen. J. Donald Isaacs, R-Townsend; and Rep. R. Glen Mears Sr., D-Seaford.

Berndt said the selection narrowed to Hercules from nine firms which filed proposals. Some withdrew their plans, he said.

Berndt said Hercules was chosen because "They have the talent to do it; they're way out in front of everybody else." He said the firm also has markets for the byproducts.

The proposed plant, designed to be operated by about 50 employees, is to have three major elements.

The first is a digester system for converting organic waste materials to a high quality humus product free from disease producing organisms. A similar plant in San Juan, Puerto Rico, is currently processing 300 tons a day.

The second is the application of pyrolysis techniques—subjecting organic materials to high temperatures—for the controlled decomposition of organic solid wastes such as rubber and plastics.

The third is a residue separation system for the inorganic residue separated from the digester discharge. The separation of metals, glass and grits will be accomplished through a series of screeners, gravity tables and other equipment.

Hercules adapted the systems design knowledge of its chemical propulsion division to come up with its plan. Parts of the system designed by Hercules were the result of Hercules research, while other parts are patented products of other companies.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 23, 1970]

RECLAIMING REFUSE: EFFORTS TO SAVE, REUSE WASTE PRODUCTS SLOWED BY VARIETY OF PROBLEMS

(By David Gumpert)

Six years ago Victor Brown came up with what he thought was a progressive—and profitable—idea. He would form a company to build processing plants capable of shredding and mechanically separating trash into its basic components of paper, metals, glass and other refuse, and then he would sell the recovered materials back to industry to be used again.

That way he would be making money from both the city whose garbage he handled and the companies that bought the separated trash. And he would also be performing a valuable service because the garbage would be kept out of incinerators and landfills, and resources would be saved through the reuse of the materials.

Today Mr. Brown is president of Metropolitan Waste Conversion Corp., which operates a plant that processes 25% of Houston's garbage. He charges Houston \$4.11 a ton to handle the garbage, which is separated into paper, metals and a combination of crushed glass, yard refuse and food waste for garden compost.

AHEAD OF HIS TIME

But Mr. Brown is frustrated and disappointed, and he is beginning to feel he may be slightly ahead of his time. The reason: He's losing about \$2 on each ton of garbage he handles because he can't sell most of the materials he salvages.

Of the 2,000 tons of garbage Mr. Brown handles each week, for instance, 1,200 tons consists of paper. But he can sell only 200 tons. "It's good solid paper—paper that's only been used once," says Mr. Brown. "It represents trees and a lot of other resources, and we're throwing it away and burning it."

Mr. Brown's business is known as "recycling." In recent months, with the surge of public concern over environmental issues, more and more government officials, business leaders and conservationists have pointed to recycling as a fundamental step toward alleviating such problems as pollution and the depletion of resources.

But, as Mr. Brown's experience indicates, several hurdles must be overcome before recycling is likely to become a routine, widely accepted process. At the moment, any broad move to recycling seems to be blocked by a complex set of factors, including unfavorable economics, technological shortcomings and restrictive government regulations.

NOT A NEW IDEA

Recycling is far from a new idea. Many metals and large quantities of textiles and rubber once were routinely collected by scrap dealers and reprocessed. But in recent years rising costs of collecting and processing used materials have discouraged their use.

About half the copper, lead and iron used in the U.S. is still recycled, but only about 30% of aluminum and 20% of zinc are reused. Less than 10% of textiles, rubber and glass is reprocessed nowadays. Of paper, the largest component of municipal waste, only about 20% winds up being used again.

The effects of recycling on conserving natural resources are particularly evident in the case of paper. The Association of Secondary Material Industries, a trade group, estimates it takes 17 trees on the average to produce a ton of paper. Of the 58.5 million tons of paper used in the U.S. last year, 11.5 million tons were recycled—meaning that 200 million trees did not have to be cut. But if 50% of the paper had been recycled, the association figures, the cutting of another 300 million trees could have been avoided.

GLASS FOR PAVING

A number of projects and experiments have been launched recently to investigate possibilities for recycling. At the University of Missouri scientists are testing the feasibility of extracting glass from garbage and crushing it for use as an aggregate in asphalt paving. In San Francisco and in Madison, Wis., the public has been asked to separate its newspapers from other trash so that the papers can easily be collected and recycled. Officials in both cities say the public's cooperation has been greater than expected.

But advocates of recycling say far more work will have to be done before recycling begins to have any significant effect on environmental problems. "I think the approach up till now has been totally unimaginative," says Merrill Eisenbud, professor of environmental medicine at New York University and former head of New York City's Environmental Resources Protection Administration. He advocates government subsidies to encourage industry to become more involved in recycling.

The Federal Government would become heavily involved in recycling activities if legislation now pending in the House and Senate gains approval. Bills in both houses provide for spending some \$500 million in the next few years to support research and the building of recycling facilities by local and regional governments.

Recycling advocates aren't sure if the pending legislation is the real answer, however, since it places most of its emphasis on technology and tends to ignore economic factors. A closer look at Victor Brown's operation in Houston shows how technological and economic problems are intertwined.

In planning his Houston plant, which was built more than three years ago, Mr. Brown figured most of his recycling income would be from the sale of scrap paper to paper companies. But so far he has been unable to sell any of his paper to paper companies; the 200 tons he sells each week go entirely to the construction industry to make building ma-

terials. "We have to fight just to maintain that small market," Mr. Brown says.

Mr. Brown contends the paper industry has rejected his paper because paper companies have such a heavy investment in woodlands and in pulp-making equipment that they simply aren't interested in recycling—an assessment that at least one paper industry executive concedes is partly true.

OTHER REASONS AS WELL

"A lot of the companies are oriented to the trees," says John Schmidt, assistant manager of manufacturing for St. Regis Paper Co. "If you have a lot of land with trees, you aren't inclined to abandon that."

But Mr. Schmidt says there are also other reasons for the difficulties Mr. Brown has had in selling his paper. St. Regis has considered buying wastepaper from Mr. Brown but so far has rejected it, arguing that the paper is mixed in quality, contaminated by other garbage and too expensive to transport from Houston to the company's recycling paper mills in the Midwest and North.

St. Regis officials argue that technology isn't yet sophisticated enough either to separate paper according to quality nor to remove the odor of garbage completely. "When we get to that point, Victor Brown might have a product," says Mr. Schmidt.

Mr. Brown's difficulties extend beyond paper. He says he's capable of turning out 60,000 tons or more of compost a year, but right now he can sell only 5,000 tons annually to agricultural markets. His only success has been in the sale of metals, mostly cans, to the copper industry, which uses them as catalysts in the production process. As a result of his losses, which he says have amounted to about \$2 million over the past three years, Mr. Brown is cutting back on his research and development in an attempt to reduce costs.

REGULATORY PROBLEMS

Besides the economic and technological problems such as those plaguing Mr. Brown, there is the problem of regulatory restrictions. M. J. Mighdoll, executive vice president of the National Association of Secondary Material Industries, argues that many scrap metal, paper and textile dealers have been forced out of municipal centers to less-convenient locations on city outskirts because their businesses are considered "unsightly."

Mr. Mighdoll also contends that export limitations on materials such as copper and nickel, considered vital to national needs, have restricted markets and thus discouraged recycling efforts. He also cites a 10% depletion allowance that provides a tax break to growers of timber as a deterrent to the recycling of paper.

Recycling advocates maintain that many of these factors will have to change before industry will take more interest in recycling. Richard Vaughan, director of the Federal Bureau of Solid Waste Management, urges that the Government "provide the same kind of incentives for recycling" as have been provided for the exploitation of raw materials. He observes, for instance, that freight rates for iron ore and pulpwood currently are lower than those for scrap metal and scrap paper, a situation he argues could be changed by Government regulation.

ASSESSING PENALTIES

Recycling might also be encouraged by adding extra charges on disposable consumer products, making reusable products more attractive and by somehow penalizing manufacturers who shun recycled raw materials when they're available. Such penalties might be imposed through special taxes, though conservationists haven't come up with any specific proposals yet. "These penalties would force the producer and consumer to look for alternatives," says Michael Brewer, vice president of Resources

for the Future Inc., a nonprofit Washington-based research organization.

Many of those active in recycling argue that once the economic problems are overcome, the technological obstacles will easily fall. "All of the exciting things are in technology and all the answers are in economics," says Harold Gershowitz, executive director of the National Solid Wastes Management Association in Washington, a trade group that represents private handlers of solid waste.

Mr. Gershowitz argues, "You cannot separate the need for technology from the need for markets." He suggests that the Government begin creating markets for recycled products by confining its own purchases to recycled goods. The same argument is echoed by conservationists. "If the Government would say it would buy only recycled paper, recycling paper plants would spring up all over the country," maintained Jerome Goldstein, executive vice president of Rodale Press Inc. in Emmaus, Pa., which publishes several conservation magazines. Mr. Goldstein says that he has asked his paper suppliers to seek out only recycled paper for use in Rodale publications.

NIXON POLICY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon policy in Southeast Asia is replete with contradiction. There is, however, one basic fact that runs through all the scenarios of Vietnamization—the presence of 200,000 U.S. troops for an indefinite period of time. Whether we call these U.S. troops "support" or "combat" is really meaningless. The unalterable fact remains—the current Nixon plan for Southeast Asia requires a large U.S. manpower and material commitment in that area well into the foreseeable future.

This is the wrong course, as I have pointed out on numerous occasions. Any impartial study of the sociopolitical problems of Vietnam or of the entire Southeast Asian area, for that matter, and the heavy U.S. commitment, point inexorably to a single conclusion: The Thieu-Ky regime will not be forced into active negotiations while they have a massive U.S. presence. In addition, Cambodian-type operations conducted by U.S. personnel or U.S.-sponsored "volunteers" have done little to forward a negotiated settlement.

Two former Defense Department officials from the Johnson administration, Townsend Hoopes and Paul Warnke, have carefully delineated the problems faced by the Nixon administration. This is a thoughtful and provocative essay and I recommend it to my colleagues:

NIXON REALLY JUST DIGGING IN

(By Townsend Hoopes and Paul C. Warnke)

President Nixon's speech of June 3 has now made undisguisably clear the aim of his Vietnam policy. It is not a total withdrawal of U.S. forces in the next 12 or 18 months, or even in the foreseeable future; nor does it involve a willingness to accept the consequences of the free play of political forces in Indochina. Mr. Nixon's Vietnam policy involves three basic elements:

Endeavoring to reduce U.S. forces to that

level which, in his judgment, will be politically acceptable to American public opinion.

Striving to strengthen ARVN (the South Vietnamese army) to a point where, in collaboration with remaining U.S. forces, an unassailable military posture can be permanently assured.

Hoping to force Hanoi to recognize the enduring nature of that posture, thereby inducing Hanoi to negotiate a settlement in Paris on present U.S. terms.

Behind a smokescreen of ambiguity, there is now the clear shape of the Nixon policy. It is confirmed by the surfacing of U.S.-subsidized Thai "volunteers" for Cambodia and by the lack of administration resistance to indications that ARVN will continue its Cambodian operations indefinitely.

It has been supposed that of the three major considerations said to have produced the April 30 Cambodia decision, what counted most was the concern that continued American force withdrawals depended on "cleaning out the sanctuaries." Even in that context, the Cambodian border crossings were pre-emptive strikes designed not to meet an immediate threat but to reduce enemy capabilities in the area for four to six months, thereby buying time for the "further strengthening" of ARVN.

No doubt that was the thrust of Gen. Creighton Abrams' view (which suggests how unreliable and unpromising ARVN is really regarded by the U.S. command, beneath all the chamber of commerce ebullience about Vietnamization). The President on June 3 made this view his own official explanation for the decision to strike Cambodia.

However, this explanation looks like an after-the-fact rationalization invented by Defense Secretary Melvin Laird. For as Stewart Alsop look at the President's yellow pad (Newsweek, June 1) made quite clear, Mr. Nixon is still tilting with "international communism" in Southeast Asia and his chief concern on April 30 was that Cambodia might go Communist.

The most revealing point on the yellow pad was the Nixon concern that, if neither side moved, an "ambiguous situation" might arise in Cambodia which would make it very difficult for the United States to hit the sanctuaries—i.e., we would be charged by international opinion with attacking a neutral convention and the degree of disarray special scrutiny.

Specifically his conclusion on June 3 that activities in the Cambodian sanctuaries between April 20 and April 30 "posed an unacceptable threat to our remaining forces in South Vietnam" is belied by Laird's statement to newsmen that the attacks represented "an opportunity" because the North Vietnamese in Cambodia, unsettled by the Lon Nol coup, were at that time facing west. More generally, his concern to act precipitately would seem to reflect a failure to understand that in limited war, there are sanctuaries by definition.

Why attack Cambodia rather than Laos or across the DMZ? Why refuse to acknowledge that a certain mutual respect for sanctuaries is what has kept U.S. bases in Thailand essentially free from sapper attacks?

There is a further point. One would have supposed that a President who had publicly eschewed the prospect of military victory and who was conducting a strategic withdrawal had long since made the judgment that the particular coloration of petty non-governments in Southeast Asia did not affect the serious interests of the United States. A statesman who had in fact decided that a genuine U.S. extrication from the area was necessary would indeed be at pains to foster "ambiguous situations." He would go out of his way to avoid a clear-cut Communist-anti-Communist polarization.

THAT "JUST PEACE"

Mr. Nixon's quite opposite concerns and actions tell us something very important.

With respect to Vietnamization, Secretary of State William P. Rogers and Laird have consistently run ahead of the President with their clear implication that the program is primarily a vehicle for total U.S. extrication (even though the war might continue after our forces were gone). Mr. Nixon, however, has always insisted that Vietnamization will lead to "a just peace" and an end to the war.

On June 3, he said categorically: "I have pledged to end this war. I shall keep that pledge." These have been puzzling assertions, since all signs indicate that even successful Vietnamization (i.e., a transfer of the entire military burden to ARVN), could produce nothing better than interminable war. The speech of June 3 and the revelation of the yellow pad now makes these assertions a good deal less puzzling.

They show that what Mr. Nixon means by a "just peace" is Hanoi's recognition of a permanent position of U.S.-ARVN military strength in South Vietnam. Since even the White House has in various ways revealed that it has no illusions about ARVN's ability to go it alone, it is a fair inference from a series of official statements that a "just peace" will require the indefinite retention of something in the neighborhood of 200,000 U.S. troops as well as indefinite support for the Thieu regime.

How Mr. Nixon plans to make these requirements politically palatable at home is not yet clear. Until recently he has kept both his aims and his formulations artfully vague, but now the fig leaf has fallen away.

The difficulty with this vision of the future is that it is a gossamer dream on at least two counts: (1) On all the evidence, the American people are not prepared to sustain a sizable military commitment in Vietnam for an indefinite period, especially under conditions that requires our forces to go on winning victory after meaningless victory in the pattern of the past five years; and (2) there is absolutely nothing in the history of the Vietnam war (or in the present or prospective power balance there) to indicate that Hanoi will come to terms with the Thieu regime.

If Mr. Nixon and his advisers really believe that they can force a settlement in Paris on present U.S. terms, then they remain deluded about the most fundamental political-military realities in Vietnam; they also fail to grasp how very narrow are the margins of domestic tolerance for their conduct of the old war, not to mention the new and wider war they have now arranged.

Negotiations in Paris have failed chiefly because our political aims exceed our bargaining power. Hanoi is not prepared to accept arrangements for elections worked out under the auspices of the Thieu government and in which the winner would take all; and the U.S.-ARVN military position, even at the point of its maximum strength, was not sufficient to compel Hanoi to bargain on our terms. The departure of 110,000 U.S. troops and the promised withdrawal of another 150,000 hardly strengthen our military position.

A VULNERABLE PROCESS

Thus strapped to a negotiating position that cannot succeed, Mr. Nixon is thrown back upon Vietnamization. But owing to the very uncertain qualities of ARVN and to the President's unstated (but now undisguisable) insistence that our proxy regime must be permanently secured, the process of American withdrawal is necessarily slow and ambiguous.

Its lingering nature makes it vulnerable to unanticipated intervening events, like the Lon Nol coup, which knock it off balance and create new pressures for compensatory military action—pressures which Mr. Nixon promptly translates in "opportunities" in the permanent holy war against communism. Its conditional nature—the unspoken determination to hang in there until we have ended the war in a "just peace"—precludes a nego-

tiated settlement and also works against a tacit understanding with the other side with regard to lowering the level of violence.

In this mushy situation, the war is considerably enlarged, and with it, American responsibility for the Cambodian government. The setting in motion of imponderable new political forces (in Phnom Penh, Vientiane, Bangkok, Saigon, Hanoi, Peking, Moscow and Washington) indicates that the struggle in Cambodia will be protracted, will probably spread, will reopen old tribal hatreds and will continue to involve us in situations which the American presence can aggravate but can do nothing to resolve.

Meanwhile, American force withdrawals continue, impelled by domestic pressures. As they do, the truth is borne in upon the administration that the gradual and unnegotiated character of the reductions cannot, below certain levels, assure the safety of the remaining forces.

This unfolding denouement requires that the American people wake up to the self-deception and bankruptcy of the Nixon policy in Vietnam, for it is now a matter of the utmost urgency to bring policy into accord with realities both in Indochina and at home. Our transcendent need at this juncture is for leadership in the White House—and if that is not possible, then in Congress—with the scale of mind and the inner firmness to explain the real choices facing the country.

The task is to lead public opinion toward an understanding that a Vietnam policy based upon these realities is consistent with our national interest, can be carried forward without a traumatic loss of self-confidence and need not cause a lapse into mindless isolation—above all, that such action is infinitely preferable to continued self-deception.

PERSISTENT RHETORIC

We are not getting that leadership. President Nixon seems somewhere between believing in the essential rightness of the war and understanding that the American interest requires its liquidation. He has evolved a policy of substantially reducing, but not ending, the American role.

At the same time, he has been unwilling to abandon the rhetoric that supported our intervention in the first place. One must conclude that either he genuinely believes the rhetoric or is afraid to risk, through candor, even a transient loss of national prestige for the sake of a healthy adjustment to the facts.

Viewed in the light of the political situation in the United States and the military situation in Indochina, the Nixon policy is a grab bag of contradictions, illusions and expedient actions. It seeks objectives that are unattainable while warning that acceptance of anything less would mean "humiliation and defeat for the United States." The increasingly visible gulf between this martial bravado and the known facts is producing a form of official schizophrenia; if unchecked, it could lead to a national nervous breakdown.

Worse still, if the President really does believe his own rhetoric, there is the predictable danger that he will feel compelled to take action more drastic than the Cambodian strikes in certain foreseeable situations—e.g., after U.S. forces have been further reduced but there has been no corresponding improvement of ARVN and no corresponding deterioration of North Vietnamese capability. Indeed, the looming probability, of just such a crunch is what makes it imperative for the country to face the realities now while there is still time for dignified, rational, deliberate choice.

If we continue down Mr. Nixon's path, we could easily reach a situation which seriously threatened the safety of our remaining forces. At that point, we would face a constricted choice between immediate escala-

tion and immediate liquidation. Can anyone believe a wise decision could be made in such circumstances? Given the divisiveness, the frayed nerves and the general distemper that now define our national mood, does anyone have confidence that our political system would not be grievously shaken by the consequences of either choice?

THREE MAJOR POINTS

It is now obvious that Mr. Nixon missed a golden opportunity, during the honeymoon period of early 1969, to lead the country firmly away from a decade of self-deception by beginning to uncoil the contradictions and restore the national balance. He could have taken definitive steps toward liquidating the war and binding up the national wounds.

He could have done this without political risk to himself and indeed with positive benefit for his party and the cause of national unity. Though time is running out, it is still not too late for someone—preferably, of course, the President—to take up this vital task. Three points need to be explained to the American people with absolute clarity.

1. That after five years of major combat, we have done about as much as any outside power could do to shore up the government of South Vietnam;

2. That the tangled political issues which divide Vietnam, growing as they do out of long colonial repression and the ensuing struggle to define a national identity, can only be settled among the Vietnamese themselves;

3. That, contrary to the erroneous assumption on which U.S. military intervention was based, the particular constitutional form and the particular ideological orientation of Vietnamese (and Indochinese) politics do not affect the vital interest of the United States.

Adoption of such a posture would lead directly (a) to a policy of deliberate, orderly, unswerving and total withdrawal of U.S. forces to be completed not later than the end of 1971; and (b) thus to circumstances that could bring about a serious negotiation based on our declared intention to depart.

This kind of negotiation would not be unconditional. We would require the return of our prisoners and the safe withdrawal of all our forces; we would seek at the same time to provide, with Russian and other outside assistance, for the restoration of neutrality at least in Cambodia and Laos, and hopefully in Vietnam as well. This approach is fully consistent with plans put forward at different times by Averell Harriman and Clark Clifford.

It must be faced, however, that the Nixon decision to strike Cambodia has moved us further away from the chances of political settlement. For that act has surely deepened Hanoi's suspicion that we do not intend to leave while it has reinforced Saigon's natural resistance to compromise. In addition, of course, it has put into our laps the problem of working out the political future of yet another country.

GIANTS IN QUICKSAND

Nevertheless, it does not seem impossible that steady, candid, clearheaded leadership, based squarely upon the three points set down above, could steer the American Leviathan through the dangerous transition without running the ship aground or producing general hysteria. For one thing, there is really no choice about leaving Vietnam; for another, there are enormous advantages ahead if we can by skill and steady nerves make a safe and sane passage.

To change the metaphor, Mr. Nixon's "pitiful giant" of April 30 is pitiful chiefly because his leg is in quicksand up to the mid thigh and because he is unresolved about its extrication. But the military, economic and psychological advantages of removing the leg are demonstrable.

With two feet on solid ground again, the

country would regain its global poise. Our influence and power would not evaporate. We would not be rendered incapable of defining and defending our legitimate interests. On the contrary, our ability to reassure our NATO and Japan treaty partners, and our capacity to exert a steady influence on the smoldering situation in the Middle East, could only be enhanced. Our industrial, technical and cultural achievements would continue to astound and attract the world.

At home, we desperately need a breathing space in which to redefine our vital interests, our military strategy, our basic relationships with the rest of the world. We are still operating essentially within the frame of a foreign policy worked out in the late 1940s.

The main tenets of that policy were strong and valid for their time, but they are now badly in need of revision; among other things, they fail to reflect the fragmentation of the "Communist bloc," the recovery of Europe and the deep divisions in our own society that call for drastic realignment of national priorities. We cannot gain the breathing space, we cannot reconcile the younger generation, we cannot conduct a reasoned self-appraisal until the Indochina enterprise is liquidated.

It is important that the American people understand what is going on so that they can effectively assert their right to a policy consistent with their interests.

SUPPORT FOR ACTION IN CAMBODIA

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is inspiring to receive letters from our combat men in Cambodia who fully agreed with President Nixon's decision to attack the privileged sanctuaries in Cambodia. One of the most impressive letters I have received was from 1st Lt. William J. Price, First Cavalry Division, whose home is in Spartanburg, S.C. Lieutenant Price also sent me a copy of his letter supporting the President which he wrote to the editor of the *Spartanburg Herald-Journal*.

Price's letters presented clear, logical, and practical evidence of why President Nixon's decision was the right decision. The success of the operation, as experienced by Lieutenant Price and many others, shows beyond any doubt that President Nixon's bold action was a master stroke of tactical surprise at the right time, at the right place, and under the right circumstances. Lieutenant Price states that—

One reason that the American morale is so high is that we are finally being able to take the offensive instead of the passive role we have been taking in which our hands were tied.

Mr. President, I commend Lieutenant Price for his loyalty, dedication, patriotism, and wisdom. It would behoove all Americans to support our fighting men and our President in order to hasten an honorable and just end to the war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Lieutenant Price's letter to me and his letter to the editor of the *Spartanburg Herald-Journal* be printed in the *Extensions of Remarks*.

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

FIRST CAVALRY DIVISION (AM),
May 12, 1970.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Columbia, S.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to let you know that I'm glad you are supporting President Nixon's move of U.S. troops into Cambodia. I feel that he made the right decision and I admire him of his convictions. I sent the enclosed letter to the Editor of the *Spartanburg Herald-Journal* today and I thought you might be interested in reading it.

My Father is Dr. George W. Price of Spartanburg, S.C. and if you will recall, we played tennis with you at the Spartanburg Country Club tennis courts about two years ago. I certainly enjoyed meeting you and playing tennis that afternoon. I wrote Governor McNair on 3 Feb. 70 concerning servicemen in Vietnam paying state income tax and I also asked him for a South Carolina state flag to display over here but I have never heard from him. If it is not too much trouble, I would surely appreciate a state flag for it would mean a lot to me over here. I did learn about the income tax from my Father.

I am looking forward to leaving Vietnam and the Army this September. That will be a happy day returning to my wife and family in Spartanburg. I certainly have been proud of what you have been doing in the Senate and I'm glad I will be home in November to vote. My wife and I voted absentee for Nixon when I was stationed at Fort Sam Houston, Texas in November 1968.

I hope you and your wife are fine. Thanks so much for your time.

Sincerely,

First Lt. WILLIAM J. PRICE.

QUAN LOI, RVN,
May 12, 1970.

EDITOR,

The Spartanburg Herald-Journal.

DEAR SIR: I have been a resident of Spartanburg for the past 23 years and graduated from Wofford College in 1968. Since September 1969, I have been serving with the 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile) in the Republic of Vietnam.

I have been concerned with the reaction of the American public and especially the college and university students who have been rioting since American troops entered Cambodia the first of May. I had mixed emotions at first concerning our American troops entering Cambodia for I didn't want this war escalated but I know that President Nixon made the right decision now. I admire him for making that decision as it may cost him a second term in office but I hope not.

My battalion, the 2/5 Cav, built the first American fire support base inside Cambodia and I was with the battalion when we made this move. It was quite an experience and most of the troops had mixed emotions at first but now their morale has never been higher for the troops out in the field. We are finding large caches of supplies to include weapons, ammunition, rice, and numerous other things needed by the NVA to continue this war. By entering Cambodia and finding all of these supplies, many American lives will be saved and it will also give the South Vietnamese Army a longer time to build up their army. It will also be quite awhile before the NVA can build up their supplies again to mount a strong offensive.

One reason that the American morale is so high is that we are finally being able to take the offensive instead of the passive role we have been taking in which our hands were tied. The men feel that they are finally accomplishing something and that they are really hitting the enemy where it hurts and possibly this war can come to an end soon. The GI's over here would like nothing better

than to end this war and go home so other Americans won't have to come over here.

I can't understand why there is so much violence and trouble on the campuses of America. I doubt that many of the protesters have been over here and I don't think they really know what it is like here. I didn't ask to come over here and I don't enjoy being away from my wife and family for a year, but since we are so deeply involved in Vietnam, I feel that the American public should support our troops over here for this isn't an impersonal war. This war is affecting the lives of families in every city in the United States.

Being in Vietnam for a year is no fun but one does learn to appreciate all the things we have in America that everyone takes for granted. I feel that I will be a better American after being over here for I will appreciate all the freedoms and conveniences that I took for granted before I came over here. America would be a better place if everyone woke up and tried to work together instead of fighting among themselves and if they didn't take everything for granted.

All we ask is for your support so this conflict in Vietnam can come to an end so the American troops can come home. Our intervention into Cambodia is really paying off for we are really hurting the enemy and this should help speed up the end of the war. Everyone over here surely prays and hopes so.

If the college students want to protest the war in Vietnam, they should have protested the way it was being fought before we entered Cambodia for now we are winning and fighting the war in a way that is really hurting the enemy and his supplies, not just waiting for him to attack us like we were doing before. President Nixon and the American troops in Vietnam need your support so this war can come to an end.

First Lt. WILLIAM JAMES PRICE,
First Cavalry Division (Airmobile), Republic of Vietnam.

BROADCAST NEWS AND THE GOVERNMENT

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Albert Allen, editor and publisher of *Television Digest*, spoke before the National Institute for Religious Communications at Loyola University in New Orleans on June 15, 1970.

Because his topic is a matter of discussion today, I was requested to include his speech in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*.

Mr. Warren is an experienced journalist who has been with *Television Digest* since 1945 and its editor since 1961. During his years in Washington journalism circles, he has covered the Federal Communications Commission, Congress, courts, trade associations, and others.

I insert his speech in the *RECORD* at this point:

BROADCAST NEWS AND THE GOVERNMENT
(Remarks by Albert Warren)

It has been my privilege and good luck to serve as a reporter in Washington for the last 25 years. In addition, I've been writing in a print medium, addressing readers who manage the electronic media, while covering the government officials who regulate these media.

Thus, I've been in the almost unique position of enjoying true journalistic freedom while reporting, day by day, the inhibitions imposed on my colleagues in television and radio.

The chill that raced through television and radio when Vice President Agnew made his first attack last November has subsided somewhat. When he launched that first attack, the electronic media were intimidated—make no mistake about it. Why else would all networks cancel everything to carry live Agnew's speech attacking them? Can you imagine all the nation's newspapers sweeping everything off their front pages and carrying the full text of an Agnew speech attacking newspapers?

Then—why did television and radio react in such frightened fashion? Are they not, like the press, sheltered by that magnificent shield fashioned by the founders of this nation—the First Amendment?

Yes, they are so sheltered, but in an infinitely more complex way—so complex that their freedom is something less than complete, in fact. The simple fact is that stations are licensed by the federal government, which means the power to give and the power to take away. This authority is vested in the Federal Communications Commission. The FCC is a creature of Congress not of the Executive Branch—but its seven members are appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate. Traditionally, the Senate goes along with the President's selections. So a President by appointing a member each year, sooner or later has a majority of FCC members who belong to his political party.

The FCC could, if it so chose, harass a broadcaster in many ways—none of them a direct attack on freedom of the press. It can reduce his revenues in a variety of ways. It can deny him expansion into larger markets or into new media developed by the genius of scientists and engineers. It can sap his energy and funds by putting him and his managers through interminable hearings in Washington while his business flounders and stagnates back home. He can find that his competitors always seem to have "better qualifications" when they compete for improved technical facilities. There are a hundred other possible devices.

However, the Commission is very rarely that vindictive. The framers of the Communications Act, the law under which the FCC functions, did a pretty good job of curbing such tendencies. For example, no more than four members of the FCC can be of the same political party. Congressmen themselves can do a rather neat job of harassing the Commission if it becomes arbitrary. And the courts are another balancing element—though a broadcaster could well die of physical exhaustion or exhausted funds before he exhausted his court appeals.

I think that broadcasters are often too fearful of what the FCC might do. The Commission, in fact, has a generally excellent record when it comes to preserving the broadcaster's news freedom. I've noticed that the farther you get from Washington the greater the respect and the greater the contempt you find for the federal government, including the FCC.

So far, it appears that one of President Nixon's best appointments is FCC Chairman Dean Burch. When Burch came to the Commission last November, people generally expected to see a John Birch instead. Surely, the impression went, the manager of Barry Goldwater's campaign had to be some kind of extremist representing only a minor fraction of the public. But it was under Burch's chairmanship that the FCC unanimously confirmed that the Commission is not "the national arbiter of the 'truth' of a news event"—when a viewer urged it to do something about the networks' "one-sided post-talk analysis" of Nixon's speech on Vietnam.

And Burch has led the Commission, since, in a series of decisions constantly affirming its lack of authority or desire to "do something" about broadcast news coverage. So far, Burch has been considerably less political than many a commissioner who never went through the hurly-burly of political gut-fighting. So far, Burch has taken absolutely no cues from the White House when it comes to broadcast journalism. It's my job to cover Burch on a day-by-day basis, and I'd be astonished if he changed. But—I've been astonished before, and I could be again.

So much for abuse of broadcast news by the federal government. Let's look at use of the medium. Traditionally, networks have turned all facilities over to the President when he requests an opportunity to speak to the nation. I don't know precisely how this tradition started. It was before my time. I don't know whether the networks agonized about it the first few times it came up. I imagine they did. The subject would make a good research project.

At any rate, President's haven't done this so much that the Congress has been moved to do something about it. A principal reason is that a President doesn't want to suffer from over-exposure, from wearing out his welcome, from displacing prime-time entertainment and sports—alienating the viewer.

The political opposition often complains bitterly about the President's easy access to all 60 million television receivers in the country. The political opposition gets a lot of exposure—but it never thinks it's enough.

Currently, Senators Fulbright, Muskie and others are terribly concerned that Congress doesn't have precisely the same kind of access, so that those who oppose the President's Vietnam policy could bring an equal influence to bear. Fulbright states that, although the Constitution provides equal power for the Legislative and Executive Branches, television access to the public makes them unequal in fact. And just last week, he introduced a joint resolution providing that: "Licensees shall provide a reasonable amount of public service time to authorized representatives of the Senate of the U.S. and the House of Representatives of the U.S. to present the views of the Senate and House of Representatives on issues of public importance. The public service time required to be provided under this subsection shall be made available to each such authorized representative at least, but not limited to, four times during each calendar year." Discussing this bill on the floor the other day, Fulbright admitted that it would be a tough job to work out the details.

Indeed it would. The problem, of course, is: Who's the spokesman? Knowing the way Congress operates, I think it could very well wind up selecting one of its most distinguished members, full of honors, a subject of deep affection—and well into his 80's, displaying, perhaps, some slight diminution of faculties.

I hope that Senator Magnuson soon schedules hearings on the bill, by his Communications Subcommittee under Senator Pastore. Actually, television and radio give a lot of exposure to opponents of the President's policies. True, it isn't the same as commandeering the entire medium at one time, but it's substantial.

Now, let's look at abuse and use of the electronics media from another side. Personally, I find reprehensible the tactics of the radical fringes who provoke violence and thus gain access to the viewer—taking advantage of the newsman's natural tendency to gravitate to scenes of conflict. As in the case of Agnew's first burst, TV newsmen were shocked into over-coverage of such tactics. And, again as in the case of Agnew, television journalists have generally recovered from their first over-reaction and are placing such coverage in better perspective, de-

clining to let themselves be used easily by extremists from either direction.

It has been encouraging to see the electronic media gradually coming around to the view that they really shouldn't worry so much about the criticisms from Agnew and Company. It has been heartening to hear Herbert Klein, Nixon's Director of Communications, assure the media that no intimidation is intended. Klein stresses the fact that the FCC is separate from the Executive Branch and heartily agrees that's the way it should be. He opposes giving communications Cabinet rank because it would put the media under control of the President. It's good to get such assurance from a professional newsman. And it's good to hear Dean Burch state that a newsman's confidential notes "should be sacred."

There is a vacancy coming up at the FCC at the end of this month, when the term of Commissioner Kenneth Cox expires. I think this appointment is more important than the selection of a Cabinet member. The President can shuffle Cabinet members overnight, as he did last week. But he can't do that with FCC members. They're appointed for seven years—and they're almost impossible to dislodge. President Johnson appointed Nicholas Johnson to the Commission, and soon regretted it. Commissioner Johnson has driven broadcasters wild with his efforts to break up media concentrations and to force stations into what he considers good programming. (Incidentally, though they're light years apart on just about everything else, Commissioner Johnson and Agnew agree that there's too much media concentration—although, for some strange reason, Johnson picks on the Chicago Tribune while Agnew picks on the Washington Post.) But one of LBJ's lieutenants confided to me that the President did his utmost to force or cajole Nick Johnson out of the Commission—but had to give up.

I hope that Nixon picks a new commissioner with absolutely impeccable credentials, because I think that the nation must have a man or woman with absolute devotion to the First Amendment—regardless of whatever philosophy he has regarding other communication issues. Speaking of retiring Commissioner Cox, by the way, electronic journalism owes that man a lot. He has never deviated a millimeter from his adherence to journalistic freedom. There have been some pretty tough calls to make in this area, and he has always voted for freedom. He has been rough on the industry in business matters—but he has been a rock on news.

I've dwelled on government and the mob. There's the other side—the journalist's responsibility. The newsman has a never-ending, often fumbling, always only partly-achieved, task of seeking out the genuine, of giving it proper weight. There are two principal means of trying to keep this process untainted. One is by guaranteeing a flourishing diversity in news gathering and display. The other is by fostering the utmost professionalism among newsmen.

Agnew was not entirely without justification when he criticized some elements of television and radio for their coverage of the Administration's policies and performance. The main problem is that he is the wrong person to be doing the criticizing. He obviously speaks for the President, even though Nixon says his people should "keep the rhetoric cool," and the President holds the power of appointment and purse over the FCC.

There are some reporters in TV and radio who are biased, who do let their zeal color their efforts. I don't think there are a lot of them—but any are too many. There is a tendency among broadcast journalists to be performers rather than reporters—and it's up to their editors and top management to curb this. There's tradition and practice of objectivity in this profession, and it must constantly be emphasized, replenished and nourished.

There's a natural tendency of reporters, particularly young ones, to absorb the characteristic of the groups they cover. And it seems fashionable, nowadays, to defer to the kids on everything. Political zeal is fine, even for reporters, but it's the job of the nation's editors to confine personal political expression to the editorial pages and clearly labeled broadcast editorials and analysis.

I've touched on some of the major aspects of broadcast journalism and its relation to government. There are many others worth discussing, and I'm sure that other participants in this Institute will develop them. For example, what is the potential of cable television for increasing diversity? And how likely is it that such diversity will be achieved—or will this technology be thwarted? And how about satellite communications—with the same questions asked? Where is Nixon headed, as he puts more and more emphasis on public relations? What are the problems in the relationships between local government and the electronic media? How can we keep the electronic media functioning if violence escalates?

BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS AT NIAGARA UNIVERSITY BY MR. JAMES A. FITZPATRICK

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day, May 30, 1970, I had the good fortune to be present at the graduation exercises of Niagara University located in my district. Niagara University has a long and honored history and is now surging forward in a period of growth under the fine presidency of the Very Reverend Kenneth F. Slattery, O.S.F.S. Her future looks as bright and exciting as has been her past.

Niagara University adjoins the Robert Moses hydroelectric plant and system which is owned and operated by the Power Authority of the State of New York and which is the largest hydroelectric project in the free world. In a sense, then, it was only natural that Niagara University should present an honorary degree to Mr. James A. FitzPatrick, chairman of the Power Authority of the State of New York, in recognition not only of Mr. FitzPatrick's outstanding achievements and abilities but also indirectly in recognition of the contribution of the Power Authority of the State of New York to the welfare of the people of New York State and, indeed, of the whole northeast section of the United States.

Mr. FitzPatrick gave the baccalaureate address at Niagara University and it is an address which deserves the real attention of every citizen in the United States. He offers splendid advice, not only for young people but for all of us, and, in addition, he proposes both an "Operation Understanding" as a means of reconciliation between the generations in our country and also the very interesting idea of a "peace bank" as a method which, if it could be implemented, would eventually achieve international disarmament and end all wars. I commend these ideas and Chairman FitzPatrick's advice to the careful consideration of all persons who

dream of a better world. I am pleased to set forth the text of Mr. FitzPatrick's address:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FITZPATRICK

I am grateful for the opportunity to join with you today and I shall always take great pride in having a degree from Niagara University. I am especially pleased to be participating in a Baccalaureate Service which recognizes the spiritual significance of the education afforded here. I think that this is particularly appropriate at a time when it appears that society has concerned itself too much with the structures and mechanisms of formal learning and too little with developing the attitudes of mind, heart and soul so vital to coping successfully with the problems of our time.

It is also particularly appropriate that your graduation should be held on Memorial Day—a day upon which we recall with pride and gratitude that we live under an American flag and luxuriate in the security and freedom which it symbolizes. It is also a day which affords us an opportunity to reflect upon the devotion and sacrifice of those of present and past generations who, in peace and war, have made this day possible. Among those to whom we are all indebted is Father Slattery under whose leadership this institution has come to play an increasingly significant role in the social and economic development of the Niagara Frontier. That the University's contributions have been so meaningful is due in no small measure to the vision, devotion, skill and enthusiasm with which he has so successfully and energetically applied his talents.

You who are graduating and receiving degrees today have pursued your studies at a time when unusual public attention has been focused upon institutions of higher learning. It is unfortunate that the spotlight upon dissent and discord has temporarily obscured the academic achievement which survives, and the idealism with which responsible youth is pursuing the goals of identity, equality, peace and social justice.

How to achieve these goals must be our common concern. Success or failure will depend in large measure upon the manner in which we proceed and the confidence we engender in each other. It seems that our first challenge is for the young, the old and the in-between to join hands, to communicate, to try to understand each other and then to move toward these goals together, realigning our methods with the standards of conduct and procedure proven to be best suited to assure their ultimate achievement. Each of us will have our own views and each must be afforded an opportunity to freely and openly express those views as we strive for consensus. As we do, it would be well to remember, however, the words of Wendell Willkie who stated: "Our way of living together in America is a strong but delicate fabric. It is made up of many threads. It has been woven over many centuries by the patience and sacrifice of countless liberty-loving men and women. It serves as a cloak for the protection of poor and rich, of black and white, of Jew and Gentile, of foreign and native born. Let us not tear it asunder for no man will find its protective warmth again."

One of our first and foremost needs is to contribute toward a national rebirth of morality, a national rekindling of sensitivity, and a national revulsion against force, brutality and disrespect for duly constituted authority. Only thus can we demonstrate to ourselves and to the world that this country, with its abundance of intellectual talent, has the capacity to solve the social, economic and political problems of our day.

The first requisite for progress has always been order. It thus becomes particularly important that on college campuses, where adult life first stands on the threshold of

opportunity, where life should be filled with happiness and satisfaction, where aspirations and ideals need only inspiration and encouragement, students not permit themselves to be used as pawns by those who would subvert the academic process to the apostles of discord and violence. Niagara and its students are to be commended for the degree of wisdom and restraint that has been evidenced here in this regard. I hope that you have come to realize that education is a privilege—not an unconditional right—a privilege that can, should and inevitably will be curtailed or terminated for those who abuse it at the expense of those who desire and support it.

If speakers such as I are to do more than mouth platitudes, we must propose solutions. This is obviously no easy task. Conscious of my own limitations in this regard, I would nevertheless like to respectfully advance some suggestions.

Turning first to the problem of identity, I suggest that the greatest source of man's identity is his intellect or soul. This sets him apart from the animals. It is thus a travesty that some embrace animalistic behavior in search of what is termed identity.

My suggestion is that identity be sought in excellence, dignity, decorum, in superior achievement or in outstanding performance rather than in attitudes, behavior or courses of conduct which attract attention but which give little evidence of true learning, provide neither respect nor genuine satisfaction and constitute an instant barrier to communication between generations.

In an effort to eliminate the communications barrier I propose what I would call "Operation Understanding"—a national search for dialogue initiated by adults throughout the land inviting small groups of students into their homes to discuss the issues of the day. I am confident that if approached in the proper spirit, it would be a mutually rewarding experience intended to substitute compatibility for confrontation.

Turning to international peace, I suggest that we continue legitimate military, diplomatic and political pressures to see it achieved, evidence more understanding for those seeking to extricate us from our present conflict, maintain the national solidarity and military strength necessary for negotiation and defense and propose means of achieving ultimate international disarmament—thus ending all wars. In this latter regard, I propose, as I have on prior occasions, the establishment of a "peace bank"—an international fund to be administered by the United Nations. Into this fund the world powers would annually deposit a progressively larger percentage of the moneys otherwise budgeted for arms and armament. Proceeding on the theory that no nation can honestly afford both guns and butter, the result would be a reduction in the weapons of war. The fund would be used to feed the hungry; to educate the illiterate; to create, with the fed and educated, new markets for the world's goods and new skills to produce them; to thus substitute production for destruction.

Idealistic? Unquestionably! Naive? Many will think so! As a minimum, however, the concept, if embraced and proposed by the United States, would test the will of all nations to follow us down the path of peace. It is principally through providing more for the "have nots" of the world that we can lessen the probability of conflict with "the haves." It has always been thus. Furthermore, it is only through a vast reduction in the presently staggering cost of arms and armament that all nations may make meaningful advances in solving the social ills which plague us.

Youth's impatience in this regard is understandable and the urgency of the need cannot be ignored. Moving forward we must have the wisdom to proceed without leaving

ourselves vulnerable to, or defenseless against, those who would seize upon this impatience or upon present internal turmoil, tensions or dissension and use them to destroy us.

While seeking disengagement from military conflicts, we must not forget that the price of freedom has never been cheap. History demonstrates that every major military move this country has made has been for the purpose of protecting freedom. Mistakes have been made and will be made, and, when made, should be acknowledged as such. However, it takes no courage to surrender, and much won at great sacrifice can be suddenly destroyed by turmoil at home which can only prolong our agony abroad.

I feel that all of youth's concern with peace is not with freedom from war. I feel that there is a longing for a kind of personal tranquility which most of us have lost, abandoned or failed to provide in our emphasis upon the material—our quest for status—our headlong pursuit of both business and pleasure and our concern with self. It has left too little time for fostering and enjoying natural and domestic environments of beauty, peace and serenity.

As you graduates leave Niagara today, I suggest, in spirit of this Baccalaureate, that you re-embrace and take with you the virtues of faith, hope and charity—graces that can be sweet in this troubled age as they have been throughout man's existence on this planet. Faith, we are told in Hebrews, "is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." "Hope," said Aristotle, "is a waking dream." We are admonished in I Corinthians: "Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Charity never faileth."

Faith—Hope—Charity. These can be the bridges to understanding. They can span the gulfs between ages and people. Faith, hope and charity. They can help us in seeking a renewal of spiritual dedication. They can be a means by which we achieve, for once and for all, for now and forever, the perennial goals of wisdom and tranquility and justice.

The challenge remains with the young. Generations before yours have dreamed the waking dream of hope as yours does now. They have sought and struggled and built—block upon block.

Today, imperfect though they may be, the world and the nation and the communities which you will inherit are monuments to man's courage, to his inventiveness, to his resourcefulness, to his labors and to his faith.

St. Thomas Aquinas has told us that "Three things are necessary for the salvation of man: To know what he ought to believe, to know what he ought to desire and to know what he ought to do." I feel sure that the education which you have received here at Niagara has put you in a position to know what you ought to believe and what you ought to desire. Your challenge then, as it is the challenge of all peoples and ages, is to know what you ought to do and have the courage to do it. There are those who would destroy to build anew. They expound on what is wrong and would tear apart the blocks that are the foundations of what is right. You cannot build by destroying.

"A true critic ought to dwell rather upon excellence than imperfections," Addison told us two and a half centuries ago. As you accept your share of the challenge and emerge into this imperfect society, help to form the building blocks that your generation can add to the structure of civilization. Continue to seek an end to conflict, poverty and injustice for all people and for all time.

Have faith in yourselves, in this country, in its institutions and in the much-maligned Establishment which, despite its faults, has made this the greatest country in the world and afforded you the greatest opportunities ever provided in any age.

Have faith that, given a chance, sanity will prevail in this country, communications will

improve and government will listen to voices honestly raised in support of orderly change.

Have faith that this change can be accomplished through the established democratic process. Have faith and believe, as we believe, that your intelligence, idealism and energy and that of the great majority of your peers afford society with unparalleled opportunities for progress and improvements.

Have faith, above all, in your religion. Without it life loses much of its flavor, and with it you will find solace in many a storm. Have hope that together we may come to mutual understanding, that we may achieve harmony and collectively pursue the right and the good. Above all have that type of charity which embraces all people and all nations.

In closing, I should like to have everyone here join me in a prayer of thanksgiving for all the benefits which this University has provided today's graduates and a prayer of petition that equal opportunity will be afforded all who knock at its portals in the years ahead. To you graduates I would like to leave a baccalaureate message much simpler but more meaningful than anything I could say—something which expresses the sentiments of all of us here—your families, your teachers and friends—as you move forward on the path of life. It is found in the words of James Metcalfe who wrote:

"Dear friends of mine, there is no way . . . in which I could address you . . . with more sincerity of heart . . . than just to say God bless you . . . my words could wish that all your cares . . . would be a little lighter . . . and I could send you greeting cards . . . to make your hours brighter . . . my lips could call good luck to you . . . or whisper happy landing . . . and I could promise you the depth . . . of faithful understanding . . . but I am sure no other thought . . . or message would impress you . . . as lovingly or lastingly . . . as asking God to bless you . . . and so I say God bless you, friends . . . in every good endeavor . . . and may His guiding grace be yours . . . forever and forever."

AWARD WINNING ESSAY FROM THE ARKANSAS "YOU'VE GOT A LOT TO LIVE!" CONTEST

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, a young resident from northeast Arkansas has recently expressed his views on what America has to offer to and expect from all of its citizens. This essay by Robert M. Flippo of Powhatan, Ark., was recognized as the best of all entries from Arkansas in the "You've Got A Lot To Live!" contest.

Because Mr. Flippo's essay expresses a view of America that all too often is forgotten in our present Age of Discontent, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

POWHATAN, ARKANSAS,
March 25, 1970.

Hon. WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER,
Governor's Office,
Little Rock, Ark.

DEAR SIR: In a time of plenty such as the world has never known, the signs of discontentment are all about us. We see it in the violence in the streets and in the confusion among our own people. Despite all this, "You've Got A Lot To Live!" Our forefathers fought and died for our freedom to

think, speak, work, love, and worship. Our unique way of life is a product of our own history. It is ours to keep, build upon, and pass on to future generations.

We continue to ask for more freedom, but freedom has come to mean freedom from unpleasantness, hardship, discipline, duty, and self sacrifice. The late Dwight D. Eisenhower once wrote: "Americans are poisoned with too many things; having many things creates a desire for more things. It is probable that the want and need of things have been the stimulants toward the change and complications we call progress."

In my study of history, I have learned that rulers, either from the left or right, have done to human beings. I have found how any resemblance of self government in some countries cannot endure and how people are used as sheep and puppets. I believe that America, with its great heritage, will not stand idle and let the world fall to dictators. Instead, it will strive to fulfill the four dreams of mankind: Peace, Food, Freedom and Human Dignity. I know that America has this to offer.

William Danforth's book, *I Dare You*, outlines a Four-fold Development. Our lives are to be lived as a square with each side labeled Think Tall, Stand Tall, Smile Tall, and Live Tall. These are our living tools. We have not one life to live but four lives. To live by the square is not a task but rather an opportunity. By reading and studying the history of our country, I can think tall by being better informed. By pondering on good things, I can stand tall for what is right. By developing my own potentials, I can smile tall. Danforth wrote: "Be your own self, whether with a prince or a pauper." Be courageous. It is not always easy not to go along with the gang and be called "Chicken." Moral courage is essential to self respect. Live tall. A good name is a man's most priceless possession. I cannot live the "don't care life." I, personally, do not approve of demonstrations, riots, vandalism, drinking, narcotics, or crime.

An old Persian legend relates how a bug lived in a rug. While inside, all he saw were his problems, and he never ventured out to take part in the world. The bug died inside the rug, never realizing that he had lived in the world's most beautiful rug. I can best help America fulfill its potentials by living the Four Square Life—not like the bug in the rug. America has a lot to give, and "You've Got A Lot To Live!"

Very truly yours,

ROBERT M. FLIPPO.

COLLEGE YOUTH

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, in these days of emphasis on a supposed "generation gap" and of "confrontations" between "youth" and nonyouth, it is refreshing to read a common-sense analysis of the difference between the two. It is nothing more nor less than experience in dealing with life's problems.

One of my own constituents who is wise in the ways of the world but young in spirit has placed his finger on the crux of the whole matter in a way which I believe merits our attention.

For that purpose I place in the RECORD the following editorial on college youth from the pen of Luther R. Jones, editor

of the Coal Valley News of Madison, W. Va.:

THE COLLEGE YOUTH MUST LEARN FIRST HOW TO GOVERN THEMSELVES

(By Luther R. Jones)

It has been said—All the world is a stage. We are each and everyone participants on this stage. The young people who are bent on changing a number of things in a number of places are performers on this stage.

These particular young people are very dissatisfied with the way things are run. They think some corrections are in order and that they know how to get those corrections. If they didn't try to tear up a number of things that have taken a number of years to build, if not a few lifetimes, we might not agree but we would tolerate what they are doing. We certainly agree that some attention should be given to what they are saying and they are often right—not always by any means. And most certainly they are wrong when they are destructive and they are wrong to resist authority.

But they will accomplish some changes. However they cannot accomplish all the changes that they wish and get them at the price they wish. But the young people fail to comprehend certain important factors. We admit that some of them are smart, in fact smarter than many of their elders. However it might be well to observe that the sort of education they are acquiring at college, while it does afford credentials, it does not encompass all the education that is acquired in any lifetime or in any segment of a lifetime.

We gain a world of education by experience and everybody spends a lifetime in gaining experience.

But the young people who go to school can imagine—and often are smarter than their parents. But their parents are usually able to weigh circumstances better than they. I am speaking about the trouble-making students—who are said to be above twenty per cent of those attending colleges and universities.

This twenty per cent, and perhaps a number of others, are dissatisfied with the way things are run. They want to change a number of things and some things ought to be changed. However they overlook an important factor that will impose certain regulations upon the world no matter how much trouble some young people may cause. Many thousands of years have passed and man has attained only a limited amount of knowledge. The little or much that he may possess is nevertheless dependent upon the knowledge of his forbears. No matter how much destruction and attempts to have our own way, time usually answers all problems. It seems that man will destroy himself before he learns one valuable lesson. The way to progress in education is not by destruction.

Another important lesson of history, if we ever learn it, is that real education is acquired by the experiences of life before our training in school is worth much to us. Young people acquire large amounts of knowledge by their attendance at school and by their studies under proper guidance. It takes experience to evaluate that knowledge and a certain amount of time is always necessary to give them that experience.

If it has taken all the past ages to acquire the knowledge which is at our command now, you can feel sure that the knowledge which we attain in school can only be evaluated by some experience at the very least.

We have customs and laws to regulate people and people are regulated only by the knowledge and experiences of life. The character and acts of people are regulated by customs and laws. There is no question but what the youth who go to college have acquired a vast amount of knowledge, but

the people require that the laws of the land shall be made by those who have also had experiences. The elders have been tolerant to the youth. In fact the youth would not be here were it not for the elders. The elders furnish most of the money for their sons and daughters to go to school and remain at home laboring as best they can to keep their sons and daughters in school.

The laws and customs were already made, in most cases, long before these same sons and daughters went out to attend the various colleges and universities over the land. They may think that they should be allowed to help make the laws. But the laws are the product of any age, and mature people, even though they are not educated in school, are chosen by such processes as we have to add their bit to the laws of the land. It is too bad that the youth are not permitted to help make those laws. That is so because of their lack of experience.

It makes no difference how much trouble different ones may cause, the laws and customs of the land will be handed down to them, and time will require that all people, irrespective of age, must first obey the law before they can govern others.

HALF A SPENDTHRIFT

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, there are those in the Congress who make a great deal of noise about military cost overruns, but ironically these same people fail to apply similar logic or devotion to the judicious expenditure of tax revenues for domestic purposes—and it would be difficult to believe that any Member could be naive enough not to think that we have more than our share of wasteful and contrived domestic social schemes.

Which then causes one to wonder—just what is their point? Waste is waste no matter where it may be found. If we are going to get exercised about high tares, boondoggling, and the like then let us be consistent.

For those who might be inclined to apply a double standard to waste in Government spending, I submit the following excellent editorial from the San Diego Union of May 10, 1970:

TOTAL RESPONSIBILITY

The avowal by 12 liberal senators that they are going to give the \$73 billion defense budget "rigorous and detailed" examination is suspect because of their inclination to harass the military whenever possible.

It is, however, an excellent idea. All spending by Congress should be subjected to the most detailed analysis possible by members of Congress.

If, however, the 12 senators and all others face up to their total responsibilities, they will not limit their scrutiny to defense spending alone.

Defense outlays already have been cut by \$10 billion in the last few years. The \$73 billion represents 7 per cent of the Gross National Product. In 1968 the defense budget was 9.5 per cent of the nation's output of goods and services.

We believe the senators should give equally rigorous and detailed examination to urban

development programs that have skyrocketed from \$21 billion in 1964 to \$44 billion in next year's budget. Other areas ripe for scrutiny include spending for environment, which is up 50 per cent in just two years to a total of \$1.1 billion; spending for health, education and welfare—which has increased from 34 per cent of the national budget two years ago to 41 per cent today, or federal subventions to local governments that have multiplied fourfold in a decade.

Like defense, all are in a sense essential to our national well-being, but none should be considered a sacred cow when taxpayers' funds are involved.

And while we are on the subject of expenditures, let us make a few additional comparisons and observations, for when we discuss domestic expenditures, there are clear-cut discrepancies evident here as well.

For example, during the decade 1960-70, outlays for agriculture and rural development increased by 91 per cent. The only categories which increased by a smaller percentage were national defense, international affairs and finance, and veterans' benefits and services.

There is a tendency on the part of all too many people to take the food on their table for granted. When asked where food comes from, most people would think little further than beyond their neighborhood grocery store. This of course is completely wrong, and the luxury of taking the farmer for granted has worked great harm and hardship to the vitality of rural America.

In the meantime, expenditures for natural resources during the same decade period are up 144 per cent; community development and housing up 214 per cent; education and manpower up 486 per cent; space research and technology up 869 per cent; and health a staggering 1,655 per cent.

Just think for a moment—had the growth in the total Federal budget been restricted to the growth in agriculture expenditures, the fiscal 1970 budget would have been \$176.2 billion—\$21.7 billion below the level it is now expected to be. Not only would we have been free of inflation, but just think how different our budget situation would be. Instead of experiencing deficits, we would have surpluses. Legislation to raise the limit of the national debt, such as has just recently been passed, would have been unnecessary. In fact, the debt could have been reduced. Then we could have given the American taxpayers a significant tax break with good conscience and with the assurance of meaningful success.

As things stand now, we are already faced with the talk of the necessity of rescinding next year the tax relief that has yet to even be placed into effect. And as though drugged by lavish over-indulgence, the Congress continues to spend, spend, spend, to add new bureaucratic layers on top of the already burgeoning structure, they hitch new burdens to the taxpayers in the name of liberalism, and to cling to the discredited cliché that "we are the richest Nation in the world and can afford anything" as an excuse for avoiding the realities of our limitations.

How long must we wait before we wake up—must America go down in history as the first Nation to be driven to the poorhouse in a Cadillac?

THE ARMS TRADE—PART XV

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the unrestrained and increasingly more dangerous international trade in arms, according to a recent report in the New York Times, is alive and well in Latin America.

Brazil, we learn, is about to buy 16 Mirage 3-E supersonic fighters from France and two advanced submarines from Britain; Argentina is about to buy 16 American Skyhawk jets and has just ordered 12 Canberra jet bombers and two destroyers complete with Sea Dart missiles from Britain; Chile is planning to buy 10 F-5 Freedomfighter jets and nine training planes from the United States; and Colombia has expressed interest in purchasing American Skyhawks and F-5's.

Now, at no time during all this activity has anyone in authority in Washington, London, or Paris ever asked: "Where's the war? Who is being threatened? What are these planes to be used for?" The attitude in all three capitals seems to be: Sell all the arms you can and only worry about the consequences later. To top it all off, the article states that Brazil has no airfield capable of handling the jets it is buying. But no matter, if the hard questions are being avoided, why should we expect there would be any concern for such a minor detail as this?

Mr. Speaker, this is but one more example of why there is a need for the world's major industrial powers—particularly the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, and France—to curb this trade. The introduction of these weapons into Latin America can only be regarded as a potential source of mischief. Surely they will add nothing to the defense of the Western Hemisphere or even to any individual country within it.

Once again I ask that our Government take the lead in seeking ways to bring this dangerous and uncontrolled trade under control.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, June 7, 1970]
WEAPONS PURCHASES SPUR FEARS OF LATIN ARMS RACE

BUENOS AIRES, June 6.—A flurry of orders for advanced jet fighters and missile-equipped destroyers has brought fears of a new arms race among major South American countries.

Last month Brazil, the continent's largest country, announced she was buying 16 Mirage 3-E supersonic fighter-bombers from France, and Argentina, the second largest strengthened her navy by purchasing 16 supersonic Skyhawk jets from the United States.

The Argentine Government also placed orders with Britain for 12 rebuilt Canberra jet bombers and two destroyers armed with the latest Sea Dart missile system and fully automatic guns.

More purchases of advanced weapons by the continent's underdeveloped countries appear to be in the offing.

Chile is reported planning to buy 10 F-5 supersonic fighters and nine trainers from the United States and Colombia has had talks with Washington on buying Skyhawks and F-5 Freedom fighters.

NIXON REVERSES POLICY

With lucrative orders going to France, Britain, West Germany and Italy, the Nixon administration has modified the policy of the Johnson era by declaring its readiness to supply the expensive armaments.

Until 1967, the United States had a virtual monopoly of the Latin-American market. Even now, a large part of the continent's armed forces are equipped with World War II Sherman tanks, and antiquated planes dating from the war or the early nineteen-fifties.

A pledge was made at a 1967 conference of Hemisphere heads of state attended by President Lyndon B. Johnson to keep down military spending "not indispensable for carrying out specific missions of the armed forces."

But later that year Peru bought from France a squadron of 16 Mirage jets, the first in Latin America.

Washington vainly sought to persuade Lima not to buy the jets. One reason for the United States position was the irrelevance of modern weapons to apparent military needs. Supersonic fighters and rapid-fire tanks have little advantage over existing equipment in antiguerrilla campaigns, usually waged in remote jungle or mountain areas.

GOVERNMENTS NOT CONVINCED

But the South American Governments were not convinced. Brazil, Argentina, and Peru have nationalist military governments. In countries such as Chile, civilian governments are under constant pressure from military chiefs whose support, or at least neutrality, is crucial to the governments' survival.

Argentina is developing a domestic arms industry. An \$80-million program, spaced over several years, includes the construction of tanks under French license for Argentine use and export to neighboring countries.

Argentina also has ordered two guided missile destroyers in Britain at a cost of more than \$72-million. One will be built in Buenos Aires with the Vickers Shipbuilding group supplying the materials and technical assistance.

Brazil, the second-ranking arms contender, disclosed on May 16 that she had bought the 16 Mirage 3-E fighters from the Marcel Dassault company in France as the nucleus of a supersonic fighter force.

She has also ordered from England, two Oberon class submarines.

Brazil has no airfield able to take the supersonic planes, but the Government has announced plans to build one north of the capital of Brasilia.

Since 1964, Brazil has bought 400 military planes, mostly transports and trainers, but it also plans to produce three kinds of jets herself at the rate of two a month.

Chile and Colombia are tightlipped about their arms plans, but the United States State Department disclosed on May 15 that there had been discussions with them about the sale of military aircraft and that their governments expressed interest in possible purchases of jets from the United States.

However, a State Department spokesman said Washington did not really know whether

the expression of interest by the three countries could be translated into firm orders.

"In principle," he stated, "we would be prepared to sell aircraft of this type, if firm requests are received."

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON'S MOST RECENT CONSTITUENT QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my most recent newsletter in the RECORD. I do so in order that it may be available to all Members so that they may inspect the results of our most recent constituent questionnaire on issues confronting this and the other body.

Text of my newsletter follows:

FROM U.S. CONGRESS: FLETCHER THOMPSON
REPORTS TO YOU

YOUR VOICE IS HEARD

DEAR FRIEND: In the photo below are a part of the thousands of responses to our last questionnaire. Some surprises were in the answers and some in remarks written along with the answers. It was interesting that 92% supported the right of Vice President Agnew to criticize bias in the news media while, at the same time, many of these indicated a liberal leaning. Freedom of speech and freedom of the press is treasured by all, regardless of political philosophy.

A BATTLE WON

One of the first bills I introduced when I came to Congress was to provide for automatic cost of living increases to those drawing Social Security. Now, 3½ years later, we finally succeeded in having this made a part of the law. Beginning Jan. 1, 1973 and each 3rd quarter of the year thereafter, if the cost of living goes up, Social Security benefits will automatically increase so you will not be robbed by inflation. Results like this make serving you worthwhile.

A PRESIDENT'S PLEDGE

President Nixon has pledged to the nation that not only will he reverse the eight-year trend of escalation, but that he will at the earliest possible moment end American troop involvement in Southeast Asia without breaking our pledge to help South Viet Nam stay free of Communist domination. He has consistently moved toward this end. So long as his actions are based upon ending American involvement and, at the same time, allowing the South Vietnamese time to take over the fighting themselves, I feel the American public should support him.

FROM THE BATTLEFIELD

It's hardly possible to express more eloquently the reasons for the Cambodian operation than did an Atlanta serviceman writing to his mother from Vietnam. With her permission, I inserted portions of his letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and they are reproduced below. His words made me proud to be his Congressman:

"Mother, please write our Congressman, our Senators and our President and let them know that I and many, many other servicemen in Viet Nam are behind him in his decision to go into Cambodia. It will shorten the war and could save Southeast Asia from Communism. You don't know how it's been to fight someone who, when he gets tired or

starts getting beat runs across some line and laughs at you because you can't come after him. He can come back anytime he wants to, and you have to wait for him. Now, we're the cat and he's the mouse. By crushing them in Cambodia, it means that a lot more Americans will come back alive from Southeast Asia.

"A lot more people in Southeast Asia can sleep without the fear of losing a child or an oldest son unwillingly, or to watch their family shot for not wanting to be Viet Cong. It means not having to sleep with the fear of being waked up by a mortar or rocket attack.

"Oh, God bless our President, and I pray that our country will back him. But my country is full of selfish and close-minded people. They've never tasted war, or had to live with the threat of being shot or having to do what they're told at gunpoint. Maybe our people have too much freedom, for they seem to abuse it. Today it's what you want that's right, not what's right is what you want. May God forgive our self-minded country."

RESPONSIBLE STUDENTS

Most students who visited me in Washington expressed their genuine concern over Vietnam in an orderly, well-mannered fashion. I appreciated the fact that they took their time and money to come to my office. Particularly, I think it is good to have a responsible exchange of ideas. Most had a good historical background on Southeast Asia but I felt some were too idealistic in expecting Hanoi to negotiate. Hanoi has never made a single concession in Paris since we have been in the so-called peace negotiations.

HIPPIE THREATS

A small group of hippies who do a disservice to American college students by trying to palm themselves off as "typical" young college students threatened to come into Atlanta to campaign against me unless I stop supporting Nixon's Vietnamization program with step by step troop withdrawals. They want me to insist instead on immediate unilateral withdrawals which could cause a greater loss of American lives and a Communist takeover of all Southeast Asia. Though it may be at my political peril, threats will not deter me from reasonable action and support of our men in Vietnam. I believe Georgia students will agree with me on this.

MISCONSTRUING AMERICA'S WILL

Moscow may well read into the student demonstrations against the Cambodian operation the mistaken idea that Americans are unwilling to stand by their word when the going gets rough. This could be the reason for their increased activity in Egypt and the Middle East. The Reds may have been misled to believe Americans will not support their allies when it is difficult to do so. Such a misinterpretation of student dissent over Vietnam can be very dangerous to world peace if applied to the Middle East.

VIOLENCE IN THE SCHOOLS

Each school in the District of Columbia has a full-time policeman assigned to keep order . . . but violence has become so great in some schools that the Appropriations Committee has authorized \$2,000,000 to build a special school for servicemen's children at Bolling Air Force Base. The specific reason given was to protect the children of our servicemen from bodily injury by being forced to attend the nearby Anacostia schools in D.C. Possibly the money should have been spent to stop the violence in the D.C. schools rather than running away from it.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

More replies were received to our last questionnaire than any we have sent out in recent months. Particularly interesting were some of the side comments. It will take me

a month or more at night to review all these . . . but it is a big help to me in my service to you. Meanwhile, I thought you would want to see a tabulation of the thousands of replies received thus far:

	[In percent]		
	Yes	No	Undecided
Do you favor:			
1. Selling jet airplanes to Israel to be used for its own defense? (Israel has not asked for a free gift.)	75	14	11
2. All classes of mail, including magazines and third class, paying 100 percent of their cost of postal delivery?	87	9	4
3. Relaxing drug laws and legalizing marijuana?	9	87	4
4. Vice President Agnew exercising his right to criticize bias in news media?	92	6	2
5. Letting local citizens have a voice in airport location?	85	8	7
6. President Nixon's efforts to change the philosophy of U.S. Supreme Court?	88	11	1
7. Forcing teachers to teach in certain schools solely because of their race?	4	90	6
8. Requiring racial balance in schools by—			
(a) Bussing	4	90	6
(b) Gerrymandering attendance zones	16	75	9
(c) Closing schools	4	90	

It is a high honor for me to serve you in Congress.

Yours very truly,
FLETCHER THOMPSON,
Member of Congress.

(NOTE.—Printing and paper paid for by myself and with donations sent in for that purpose.)

COPERNICUS, THE FIRST MODERN

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, 1543, 427 years ago, there died in Frauenburg, Prussia, a man who may be called the first modern, for he was the father of modern science and the founder of the scientific method that has become the keystone of the modern world.

Nikolaus Kopernik—or Copernicus, to use the more familiar Latinized version—was trained for the church, but postponed taking orders so that he might continue his scientific studies. He died, little dreaming of the religious upheaval his work was to cause, unaware of the fact that an editor's note had been inserted in his book calculated to create the impression that his statement that the earth moved around the sun was theory rather than fact. Despite this disclaimer, Copernicus' book remained on the proscribed list of the church for a century and a half.

Copernicus resumed the study of as-

tronomy where Ptolemy had left off more than 1,000 years previous. The centuries between the two great searches of the skies were almost barren of scientific advance. The centuries immediately following Copernicus found science remaking the world.

Copernicus, dissatisfied with scientific theories and dogma, abandoned the practice of seeking facts to support a hypothesis and sought to discover physical truths, regardless of whether they supported a theory or not. This method has been the basis of modern scientific research.

Throughout the world, people of Polish ancestry have honored Copernicus on his achievements. Scientists and educators have paid him homage. For the Polish people, the observance of his scientific breakthrough has a double significance because Copernicus, in addition to being the first modern scientist, was a Polish patriot—an outspoken foe of the arrogant Prussianism that was exemplified in Copernicus' time by the Teutonic knights, as in modern times by the Nazis and Communists.

In the state archives of Sweden, at Stockholm, is a document brought back by Gustavus Adolphus from his expedition into Poland. It is in the handwriting of Copernicus and, over his signature, it denounces the Teutonic knights for their ruthless invasions. This makes Copernicus particularly significant to the Polish people; but to all people of the world who believe that the truth shall make men free, the name and the memory of Nicholaus Copernicus should be objects of veneration.

A LETTER FOR ALL LOYAL AMERICANS

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of a special subcommittee investigating the New Mobe, its leaders, actions, and effect on America, I was privileged to hear the testimony of two courageous American wives whose husbands are prisoners of war. I believe that all Americans would benefit from a reading of their testimony before our subcommittee. I especially suggest to my colleagues that each take time to study and consider their testimony.

One of these courageous women, Mrs. Edwin A. Shuman III, has written to me. I believe her letter was meant for all loyal Americans. I insert it at this point in the RECORD and commend it to all for prayerful consideration:

VIRGINIA BEACH, VA.,
June 18, 1970.

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: Thousands of aviators have been sent into combat in Southeast Asia. Many died there. Over fifteen hundred are missing or captured. The fate of some of these men is unknown. The fate of the majority is known all too well from the reports

of released prisoners. Have you read the testimony of Lt. Robert Frishman? He said, "You could hear guys up and down the passageways getting beaten and guys yelling and screaming, and sometimes they would come and they would stick a key in the lock, and I would say, 'Here I go. I guess it is my turn; let's see if I can hack it this time.' Then they would leave, and I would just sit at my bed and I would be awake the rest of the night just wondering if they were going to come in and take me out there."

Ask yourself how long you, as a man, could resist and survive under these conditions. How can any American who has the power to help alleviate this horror sleep at night, knowing how the nights are in the Hanoi prisons.

These men were sent into battle with their hands tied, not allowed to hit significant targets, while the enemy's ports and supply centers were left open and untouched. They have been captured and are under orders from our government to give nothing but name, rank and serial number, even under torture and starvation. Was there ever such an impossibly unjust situation?

While these men struggle to survive, the arguments in Congress go on day after day. We, the families of the prisoners, hear almost monthly now of resolutions passed showing concern, days of prayer proclaimed, and even a mass meeting arranged. In the final analysis however, even though these gestures are a slight relief from the years of silence, the fate of the Americans held in Southeast Asia remains unchanged. Letters of condemnation to the prime minister of North Vietnam have not secured the release of these men. No thinking person can really expect the North Vietnamese to release their trump card, the prisoners, without something in return.

It is a sad day indeed for our country when we beg to the enemy for the release of our prisoners of war and sit quaking in fear that every military move we make will incur the wrath of the communists. It is also a sad day when we, the strongest country in the world, will not finish what we have started. The basic issue has not changed, although we vacillate and bicker among ourselves. The enemy is the same. Since our country was founded we have resisted those who would oppress others. We stood firm against the Nazis and the Japanese in World War II, and now we are faced with the threat of communism which seeks to subvert from within and devour from without. It is long past time for the Congress to pass decisive and strong legislation to facilitate the end of this war.

My husband, Edwin Arthur Shuman III, who was captured by the North Vietnamese the seventeenth of March, 1968, wrote me from prison in Hanoi the eighteenth of January, 1969.

"Pray that the Paris talks will bear fruit and that 1969 will find us reunited."

How can the Paris talks bear fruit unless we give the North Vietnamese everything they are asking for—the countries of South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia and total withdrawal of all American forces, or unless we are in a position to force them to negotiate? Since the North Vietnamese will not talk as long as they are able to continue fighting, we have three obvious alternatives. We can make them come to an agreement if we have the courage to take strong military measures, we can give up immediately, or we can continue to withdraw gradually as we are doing now—a process which will continue for years. Is Congress prepared to face the unrest in the country if we continue on our present course?

If you limit the President's power to pursue the course he deems fit what do you offer as an alternative?

My fervent hope is that Congress will act quickly and decisively to end this war and uphold the honor of our country so that the

sacrifice of those who have died will not have been in vain. I believe it is very important that if and when the prisoners of war return to this country they do not have to face the bitter knowledge that their sons have to fight the same enemy they resisted but their fellow countrymen at home would not. It is also important to give their sons a strong leadership to respect and follow.

No answer to this letter is needed. We will receive our answer when Congress assumes its rightful leadership and the world-wide announcement is made that the hundreds of American prisoners of war have been released and have walked across their own bridge of no return.

Most sincerely,
SUE ALLEN SHUMAN,
(Mrs. Edwin Arthur Shuman III.)

BLUE WATER OPTION

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, in the ongoing effort to defend ourselves against a possible nuclear attack, we have constructed missile installations throughout the country. In so doing, we have attempted to establish a second-strike capability. Now, in the face of recent information indicating that the Soviet Union is producing missiles armed with warheads of huge megatonnage, the credibility of our second-strike force is in question.

One response to this new challenge is to build an antiballistic-missile system to protect our installations. Such a system would not only be costly but would be only partially effective. Moreover, our population would still be hostage to our land-based installations. Therefore, it is incumbent upon those of us in positions of responsibility to seek out viable alternatives. One alternative which deserves serious consideration is a proposal which would phase out our land-based missiles and replace them with missile-equipped submarines and/or surface vessels. Mr. Guy Wright has set forth very well part of the rationale for the latter strategy in an article in the San Francisco Examiner.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Wright's article in the RECORD:

BLUE WATER OPTION

In the high, bloodless places where war becomes a chess game, there is talk of something called the "blue water option."

It is a plan to restore the nuclear stand-off, to make atomic war unattractive by making it a no-win affair.

According to this theory, the most likely cause of war between America and Russia isn't aggression but fear. One side may become convinced the other is about to launch a missile attack and feel compelled to strike first out of fear.

The purpose of this first strike would be to knock out the opponent's missiles, not his cities; it is simply a misfortune that incineration of cities would be an unavoidable side-effect.

To discourage a first strike, both countries are building anti-missile systems, the nuclear age version of ack-ack, to knock down the enemy's incoming missiles before they reach their targets.

This is frightfully expensive and of du-

bious effectiveness. And it heightens rather than allays the dangerous fears on both sides.

The "blue water option" is a different approach. The two nuclear giants would phase out their land-based missiles and replace them with missile-armed submarines.

Then neither side would need to fear a first strike against its territory, because the target of a first strike, the opponent's missiles, would be gone.

And with no land-based missiles there would be no need to build anti-missile defense to protect them.

In the high, bloodless places where these things are discussed, the main stumbling block is getting the Russians to agree to the switch.

But do we need their agreement? What if we went ahead with the "blue water option" by ourselves?

It seems to this bar-stool strategist we would accomplish the same result.

Let's suppose we removed all our missiles from their bases on land and placed them in submarines prowling the depths of the sea. What would this do to Russian strategy?

The Russians might be less fearful of our starting a war, but the temptation for them to strike first would be removed, since our missiles would not be in our country but scattered in the oceans of the world.

(There is no foreseeable technology that would enable them to detect and destroy all our submarines simultaneously.)

So our unilateral switch to the "blue water option" would remove the rationale for a first strike by the Russians, since they could not destroy our ability to retaliate.

But how about a first strike by us? If we think it through, that becomes irrational too.

Let's suppose we adopt the "blue water option" and the Russians stick to land-based missiles protected by an anti-missile defense system.

Now let's suppose our man in the White House presses the button for a first strike by our missile submarines deployed in the seas.

Nuclear warheads would rain down on Russia. But unless her anti-missile defenses were a complete failure, and our shooting was awfully good, we couldn't knock out all of Russia's missiles.

She would have a capacity to retaliate—and our country would lie defenseless before that retaliation.

Surely these considerations would dissuade us from launching a first strike. And surely the Russians, who are good chess players, would size up the game and realize they needn't fear one.

No nuclear detente is absolutely fool-proof, but it seems to me the "blue water option" has its advantages. It is far less costly than an anti-missile system. It would ease tensions rather than heighten them. And it's something we can start on our own.

MAKING THE MOST OF THE TAXPAYER'S DOLLAR

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Office of Economic Opportunity has successfully negotiated a contract with one of the major pharmaceutical manufacturers of oral contraceptives which could result in savings of millions of dollars for the tax-

payer. The OEO through its family planning program is one of the major purchasers of oral contraceptives. In 1968 and 1969, the average cost to the various OEO projects ranged from 60 to 65 cents per cycle. Prior to 1968 the average cost per cycle was 87 cents. However, by presenting its case to the manufacturers and through competitive bidding OEO has successfully negotiated a contract with the Syntex Laboratories of Palo Alto, Calif., which enables OEO projects to purchase oral contraceptives directly from Syntex for the average price of only 18 to 21 cents per cycle. This is a cost reduction of over 40 cents per cycle.

The contract with Syntex not only permits OEO projects to purchase the full range of Syntex contraceptive products, at a substantially reduced price, but the price will decline even further as the volume of purchase increases. The contract further does not obligate any OEO project director to purchase the Syntex products. Nor, if the project director chooses to purchase from Syntex, is he precluded from also purchasing oral contraceptives from other pharmaceutical manufacturers.

Initial purchases under the agreement with Syntex made during the period of April 1 to June 5 totaled 250,600 cycles. This represents a savings of slightly over \$100,000 in just 2 months. Further, the amount saved will provide family planning services for 1 year to an additional 2,000 women. Looking into the future, the projected savings over a 5-year period is between \$15 and \$25 million.

Now, what OEO has done in negotiating this contract is not exactly new. The Agency for International Development has a similar agreement with the G. D. Searle Co. According to my information G. D. Searle sells its oral contraceptives, Ovulen and Envid, to AID for use abroad at a cost of 17.25 and 17.75 cents per cycle. I think it is interesting to note that the impetus for the AID and OEO contracts came from the same gentleman who was formerly with AID and is now with OEO.

OEO and AID are not the only Government agencies purchasing oral contraceptives for dissemination to the public. The Department of Defense also purchases a wide range of contraceptives from a number of manufacturers. In no instance does the prices which DOD pays approximate the low price negotiated by OEO and AID. For example, DOD purchases Syntex's products for 25 and 40 cents per cycle as opposed to OEO's cost of 18 and 21 cents. G. D. Searle's Ovulen and Envid are sold to DOD for 45 and 53 cents per cycle as opposed to AID's cost of 17.25 and 17.75 cents per cycle. DOD also purchases oral contraceptives from the following pharmaceutical firms: Parke-Davis at costs of 35 cents, 49 cents, and 52 cents per cycle; Meade-Johnson at 68 cents per cycle; Upjohn at 59 cents per cycle; and Wyeth Laboratories at 64 cents per cycle.

Another large purchaser of oral contraceptives for use in its family planning program is, of course, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Since each of HEW's grantees is allowed to negotiate its own agreement

with the pharmaceutical manufacturers it is difficult to obtain exact cost figures. However, information supplied my office indicates that the average cost to HEW is around 75 cents per cycle. This is over four times the cost to OEO and AID.

HEW is aware of the contracts which OEO and AID have negotiated. But, apparently because of organizational differences between free standing agencies and departments, and other factors, HEW and DOD have not succeeded thus far in obtaining the same kind of favorable prices. I have introduced a bill which would coordinate all domestic population and family planning programs within one agency, the National Center for Population and Family Planning under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. With this type of reorganization and centralization of family planning activities I would hope that cost savings would result from not only the purchasing of oral contraceptives, but in a multitude of other ways. Certainly the rather impressive projected savings over the next 5 years of \$15 to \$25 million as a result of the OEO contract with Syntex should encourage other agencies to seek the same type of savings.

Finally, it should be noted that Government agencies are able to purchase oral contraceptives at costs below those paid by retail outlets due to the very large volume of the purchases. A check of the retail stores in my Houston district revealed that the Syntex line of contraceptives sells from \$1.50 at a discount store to \$2.50 in other retail stores. In the Washington, D.C., area I understand the lowest cost per cycle for oral contraceptives is approximately \$1.10.

The pharmaceutical manufacturers have shown a willingness to cooperate with Government agencies in their family planning programs. I hope other Government agencies will be able to capitalize on the fine work done so far by AID and OEO in making the most of the taxpayer's dollar.

TED BELL'S APPOINTMENT
A TRIBUTE

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the following tribute to Dr. T. H. Bell and his wife, Betty, appeared in the Salt Lake City Deseret News June 18, 1970. It supports my belief that Ted Bell would make an outstanding Commissioner of Education. The article follows:

TED BELL'S APPOINTMENT A TRIBUTE

(By Laver K. Chaffin)

Even though it may not be a permanent appointment, Dr. T. H. Bell's assignment as acting U.S. Commissioner of Education is a high tribute to him personally and directly and to Utah education by association.

It's little short of remarkable that Bell would be chosen to head the nation's top public school agency after being in Washington only two months.

In terms of ability and qualifications, however, the appointment is a very wise one.

"Ted" Bell, as he is known throughout Utah and among school leaders across the nation, is fitted for the job, not only by experience, but also by education, temperament, personal and professional ethics and uncommon wisdom and practicality. And very importantly—he's backed by a wise, intelligent and practical partner, Betty Ruth Bell.

Ted has been teacher, coach, superintendent—in both small and large districts, college professor and state superintendent of public instruction. His activities in national educational organizations, such as the Council of Chief State School Officers and the Education Commission of the States, have acquainted him with both national school leaders and nationwide school issues.

His greatest assets, however, are personal.

He has demonstrated an uncommon ability to get along with and work with people, even where there are strong differences of opinion. He can disagree without being disagreeable. He is able to make his position clear without being abusive or insulting. He has the patience to stick to an objective until his goals are reached.

Bell is not the kind of an administrator who bulls his way in a straight line, pushing aside all obstacles (and people) until his objective is reached. He's more like the mountain climber who picks his way around the obstacles too tough to master in a frontal attack.

Although confident, the acting commissioner is not enamored with his own ability and wisdom; he has sufficient humility to recognize a mistake. He listens to others and does so genuinely, accepting advice and counsel whenever it can advance the cause.

He has the courage to make tough decisions and it may have been this ability, which he already had demonstrated in Washington, which won him the recent appointment.

All these traits added together make Ted Bell a very resilient administrator. He can survive setbacks which would defeat less able leaders.

This column believes that Ted Bell will have a much better chance of winning the permanent appointment as commissioner than some will suppose. Whether he wins the position or not, his selection has put him in very exclusive company. He will continue to be a top-level school leader—in the U.S. Office of Education or somewhere else.

As already mentioned, one of his strongest personal assets is Betty Ruth Bell. Like her husband, she refuses to accept defeat.

Several years ago she was very seriously injured in an automobile accident near Las Vegas, one which demolished the family station wagon. One of Betty's arms was nearly severed and she was told she likely never would enjoy full use of it again.

If you could have seen her water skiing on Lake Powell last summer with grace and skill, you'd never have guessed she suffered a serious injury of any kind.

She's just as tenacious in supporting her husband and caring for their growing family.

All this is to say that the Bells' apparent stroke of good luck is no accident. They simply were prepared when an opportunity came along.

THE 1970 CENSUS COMING

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the letter I sent to the good people of my 27th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, to advise them concerning the 1970 census program.

At a time when our population is rapidly expanding, the need for Government action expands accordingly. But Government policy must be based on current data which we obtain in the census every 10 years. Therefore, the need for an accurate census is manifest.

The letter to my congressional district has resulted in excellent cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of the Census in its difficult but urgent task of securing accurate statistical information on which to base U.S. economic and welfare policy.

My congratulations to the fine people that composed the Federal census employees who have performed an outstanding job in our congressional district and produced excellent results. Under the leadership of William McClelland, former chairman of the board of commissioners of Allegheny County, the census for 1970 was efficiently managed, without any complaint by our citizens to our congressional office, and we received many good comments on the courtesy and cooperation of the census team.

The letter follows:

THE 1970 CENSUS COMING

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1970.

DEAR FRIENDS: I am writing to let you know the coming United States 1970 Census in our District on Wednesday, 1 April, Census Day. The population census is required every ten years under the U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 2.

I find that this year the Census is both a population and a housing census. The requirement for information on housing has been added by Congress in order to have facts to work out legislation to meet the current housing shortage caused by high interest rates and inflation.

On Saturday, 28 March each home receives in the mail a census form to be completed—to be mailed in the return envelope on Wednesday, 1 April. Every fifth household will receive a longer census form, with extra questions so that a fair sampling both on population and housing can be obtained for our Country. Census questions must be answered truthfully and to the best of one's knowledge.

Our Census District consists of our South Hills 27th Congressional District in Allegheny County, and all of Beaver County. In this large area, I have been able to recommend that the head office be located in a central location for our District, 250 Mt. Lebanon Boulevard, Mt. Lebanon, Pa., 15234, which intersects Castle Shannon Road. This office is open Monday through Friday, from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm. The telephone number is 343-4833 if you would like to inquire for further instructions to learn procedures.

I am glad to advise you that this Federal Census office in our District is being set up on a bi-partisan basis, consisting of 35 office workers and 300 field workers. These workers are carefully selected people residing in our area and are full time Federal employees during the time of the taking of the Census.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. FULTON.

PS.—I know it will interest you to learn that the first Census was taken in 1790 when the United States had 3,929,214 citizens. In 1860 our U.S. population had risen to 31,443,-

321. By 1900 we had 75,994,575 people and in 1930 122,775,046. Already the computers in the U.S. Department of Commerce in Washington, D.C. are estimating as of 1 April 1970 the population will be 205 to 211 million people! What a wonderful nation this is, isn't it!—It is our country—and we are all proud to be United States Citizens.

Regards,

JIM.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION
REBUTS LIFE STORY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my constituents wrote to me after reading the May 22 issue of Life magazine in which the publication reported, according to my constituent, that this Nation's veterans' hospitals were rat infested, filthy, overcrowded, and grossly understaffed and that these conditions were brought on by underfunding or lack of funds, which presumably were due to a careless Congress and a redtape ridden executive branch.

While I deplore anything but the best of treatment for our war veterans in our VA Hospitals, I do think the Veterans' Administration should have an opportunity to answer the serious charges of neglect made by one of our Nation's leading magazines. Accordingly, I am inserting the reply of Mr. Donald E. Johnson, the Administrator for the Veterans' Administration, to my inquiry in the RECORD and I recommend it be given your very serious attention:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., June 11, 1970.

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROYHILL: Thank you for your inquiry requesting my views on the Life Magazine article of May 22, 1970.

From the obviously contrived cover page and the many staged hospital photographs right down to every biting word of narrative, the Life article gives a totally distorted picture of the VA medical program.

Life describes the VA medical program as the largest in the world, and yet in not one picture or one word of the text did the magazine find a good word to say about this vast health complex that is ably serving more sick and disabled veterans than ever before in history.

Everything in the article seems arranged to heighten Life's theme of "From Vietnam to a VA Hospital—ASSIGNMENT TO NEGLECT," including the cover of the magazine. The designed contrast in the two photographs on the cover should be evident to every reader.

The top photo on the cover—in bright color—shows happy and smiling servicemen during a moment of respite on the Cambodian front. The lower photo—an untitled study in plain black and white—shows a single veteran posed in an attitude of dejection. Aside from the obvious color and lighting contrasts, neither picture is at all typical. Certainly not all of our boys fighting in Cambodia are happy and smiling, and I can say with even more assurance that not all VA patients—including the one on the cover—are in a perpetual state of dejection.

The same unsmiling patient is pictured in the first photograph in the article itself. Life says he "waits helplessly to be dried." These patients are not left unattended in the shower room. Actually, hospital attendants help bathe these paralyzed patients, and then dry them immediately. In this instance, the busy attendant was asked to step aside while the "wait helplessly" picture was taken.

When we first saw the Life article it was noticeable that in only two of the 10 photographs of the Bronx VA Hospital were any VA hospital employees clearly visible. This seemed strange considering that the hospital is served by more than 1,600 VA employees as well as hundreds of helpful volunteers. Then we learned that employees were asked to stand outside camera range—apparently to heighten the impression of patient neglect.

Our official investigation at the Bronx hospital resulted in many sworn affidavits volunteered by reliable eye-witnesses telling in detail how this and other Life photographs were posed or staged.

Although Life officials deny any staging or posing of pictures, it is interesting to note that the veteran-patient featured in most of the Life pictures has, according to the New York Sunday News, admitted that some photographs were indeed posed or exaggerated.

We take issue not only with the photographs that appeared in Life, but also with the selection of the photographs finally used.

For instance, Life staffers visited the Washington, D.C., VA Hospital on three separate occasions, talked freely to many patients, including severely disabled Vietnam veterans, and shot scores of photographs. Many of the pictures centered around the hospital routine of a 22-year-old Vietnam amputee.

This young man told the Life reporter he thought his VA treatment was good—much better, in fact, than the military hospital from which he transferred. Other Vietnam veterans made similar comments. Yet, none of these veterans who praised VA care rated one word or one picture in the final article.

The truth is that each month VA hospitals receive literally hundreds of unsolicited letters from veterans and their loved ones expressing gratitude for the excellent VA care these veterans received.

We take exception to much of the text of the Life article as well as the misleading pictures. For example, there has never been a single verifiable report of a rat ever having been seen in the hospital. And most certainly the VA hospital system is not a "medical slum" as branded by Life.

Offended by the Life article and other recent media attacks on the VA medical program, the Council of Deans of the American Association of Medical Colleges at a recent meeting unanimously went on record in two particulars.

First, the Council, composed of the Deans of the 101 medical schools in America that set the pace for the very best there is in medicine, condemned—as completely unjustified—what the body referred to as intemperate and inaccurate attacks on the VA program. The distinguished Council then reaffirmed its complete confidence in the continuing ability of VA hospitals to render high quality medical care.

The Life reporter held a nearly 90-minute interview with me in my capacity as head of the VA. What survived of this in-depth interview was a single sentence in the final article, and even this one sentence was belittled by Life in the very next line of the article.

Here are just a few of the VA facts about the so-called "medical slum" given the reporter, all of which were totally ignored in Life's final summation:

The highest medical evaluation board in the land is the Joint Commission on Hospital Accreditation. Sponsoring the commission are the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American

College of Physicians, and the American College of Surgeons. All of VA's 166 hospitals are fully accredited by this commission.

(Had the Life reporter bothered to inquire at the Bronx VA Hospital, he would have learned that the Joint Commission made its periodic inspection of this hospital just last December. The commission's January 10, 1970, report on the hospital said, "The medical staff and administration are commended for the evidence shown of continued high quality care given to the patients in this facility." The Bronx accreditation was renewed without reservation.)

VA hospital staffs include many of the real experts in American medicine. More than 2,200 of VA's 5,100 doctors are board certified specialists as the result of three to five years of extra medical training.

VA hospitals are now funded at the highest level in history. The basic medical care budget for Fiscal Year 1970 was a record \$1,541,701,000. President Nixon has asked Congress for \$210,000,000 more than even this record sum for Fiscal Year 1971, which starts July 1, 1970. The extra money for the new fiscal year will permit the hiring of 5,700 more medical employees, bringing the agency to an all-time high employment peak.

The real tragedy of the Life article is not the erroneous impression left in the mind of its millions of readers, but the fact it does great damage to the very program it says it is trying to strengthen.

The article has been demoralizing to the many thousands of dedicated hospital employees whose sole mission is to serve sick and disabled veterans. It will make even more difficult the recruitment of scarce-category health field employees needed to take care of these veterans. As a result of the article, we have noted real apprehension among young Vietnam veterans destined for transfer from military hospitals to VA installations—an alarm that is needless and totally unfair to these men, for VA will give them the best of care.

By constantly preaching the theme of neglect, the article is also a reflection on the wonderful citizen-volunteers who regularly visit and help veterans in every VA hospital across the land. There are more than 100,000 of these volunteers who give in excess of nine-million hours of their time each year to bring a touch of home into our hospitals.

I trust that these comments will assure you in regard to the Life article. I want to assure you, too, that our medical personnel will continue to provide the best possible medical care, for our hospital staffs feel just as I do that we are privileged to serve America's finest citizens—our veterans.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. JOHNSON,
Administrator.

Enclosure.

A USEFUL DIALOG ON TEXTILE IMPORTS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, our economy is so complex that imbalances of power are common. Although imbalance of economic power is not in itself evil, when men working in a particular industry see their jobs rapidly disappearing, they may be suffering from an unnecessary injustice.

Many of our 2½ million men and women employed in textile and apparel

industries are presently being phased out of their jobs. This is unnecessary and therefore unjust because those who gain through depriving our domestic textile and apparel industries of work are not in urgent need of bloated profits. The large retailers can do very well and still allow for high levels of employment among U.S. clothing workers, by limiting their purchase of imported clothes. Compromise will allow both retailers and factory labor a fair deal.

I insert the text of the "Labor News Conference" into the RECORD to inform the Congress and the American people of a side of the story which has not been adequately told.

The document referred to follows:

LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE

Subject: Export of U.S. Jobs.

Guest: Murray Finley, vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO and manager of the union's Chicago Joint Board.

Reporters: Neil Gilbride, Washington correspondent for the Associated Press; Harry Conn, editor of Press Associates, Incorporated.

Moderator: Frank Harden.

MUTUAL ANNOUNCER. The following time is presented as a public service by this station and the Mutual Broadcasting System.

HARDEN. Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL-CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL-CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Murray Finley, a vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO and manager of the union's Chicago Joint Board.

Several months ago, four Chicago newspapers refused to publish an advertisement explaining that members of the Clothing Workers union were picketing a Chicago department store protesting the sale of imported men's apparel made by workers paid wages far less than American levels. As a result the union filed a lawsuit against the newspapers, which is now on appeal. Legal and communications issues involved in the case may well seriously affect other trade unions in situations where monopoly control of communications media may be found. Here to question Mr. Finley about this particular case, and the implications it may have for other unions, are Neil Gilbride, Washington correspondent for the Associated Press, and Harry Conn, editor of Press Associates, Incorporated. Your moderator, Frank Harden.

And now, Mr. Gilbride, I believe you have the first question?

GILBRIDE. Mr. Finley, what is the status of your union's suit against the newspapers? Has there been a decision on it yet?

FINLEY. We had a decision in the District Court—the Federal District for the Northern District of Illinois. The court ruled against us on a motion for summary judgment by the newspapers.

We have since appealed the decision to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. The briefs have been filed on our behalf. The decision will probably not come down until sometime in the fall.

GILBRIDE. What did the lower court say, in effect, in turning you down on this?

FINLEY. The lower court ruled, in essence, that newspapers are private property and that the government has no right to order the owner of a private property how to use his property.

CONN. Mr. Finley, specifically what were you trying to say in the ads?

FINLEY. If I may go back just a bit, Mr. Conn, our organization has been deeply con-

cerned with the increasing imports of apparel from abroad, particularly from low-wage areas. Part of our campaign has been in terms of working out international agreements so that there is regulation of the flow of imports. We were forced, on occasion, to picket stores—retail establishments—peaceful picketing to inform the customers of the various stores that are carrying the imported men's clothing.

CONN. Strictly informational picket lines?

FINLEY. Yes, strictly informational, so that the consumer could decide whether or not he wanted to buy such items.

We got involved, in August of last year—in picketing Marshall Field—one of the large department stores—and was, to our knowledge, the largest importer of men's suits, at the time, in the city of Chicago. It was informational picketing.

We felt, though, that to be effective with our picketing and to get our story to the consumer—the problem that we're facing with imports, what imports mean to jobs, and what we want to do about the problem—we felt the only way we could really be effective on a large scale was to place ads in the four Chicago newspapers—full-page ads, paid ads—telling, in simple language, why we were picketing Marshall Field. This is how the suit began.

GILBRIDE. Well, Mr. Finley, is your position that the question of freedom of press goes to advertisements and that a newspaper should have to accept anybody's advertisement?

FINLEY. Yes, subject, of course, to the condition that it's not libelous or illegal on its face, or asking something that is clearly unlawful.

But, as to advertising on an issue of importance—advertising which is clearly legal—in my judgment, particularly where you have a monopoly situation, newspapers should be required, under our Constitution, to accept those ads and to carry them.

GILBRIDE. Did the newspapers in this case give you any reason why they would not carry your ads?

FINLEY. Well, it depends. To see the background—in Chicago, there are four newspapers owned by two companies. The Chicago Tribune Company owns the Tribune, which is a morning paper and owns Today, which is an afternoon paper. Field Enterprises, Incorporated, owns the Sun-Times, which is the morning paper, and the Chicago Daily News, which is the afternoon paper. These are the four daily newspapers in Chicago. No other newspaper in Chicago has a circulation over 40,000. These papers have circulation from 400,000 to 1 million, on Sundays, for the Chicago Tribune.

When we offered these ads, one company, the Tribune, raised a couple of legal questions and asked us to change the language. We agreed to do it. So there were no legal objections. Then they just turned it down, without giving us the reason.

The Field paper, in my recollection took the position, "we're turning you down because you mention another company without their permission"—which company was Marshall Field. We answered them, by the way, one, that we have no objection if you will get Field's permission to do it, and two, the fact is, they carried ads at the same time we were trying to get ours published—ads attacking other institutions, without getting an okay from those institutions.

CONN. Mr. Finley, Marshall Field is one of the largest advertisers in the Chicago papers. Do you feel that was an important factor in their decision?

FINLEY. In my mind, definitely—without any question, Field knew about our proposed ad, by the way.

CONN. At the time you wanted to place your ad, did Marshall Field have any ads about Hong Kong suits for sale?

FINLEY. They were carrying a series of ads on not only Hong Kong suits, but ads about

imported suits—Italian suits. They were carrying ads about jackets and other imported articles from all over the world—a whole series of ads.

CONN. So, your contention is that one side of the issue was presented, but the other side was not?

FINLEY. Their ads, Mr. Conn, went to the point of what great advantages in styling, and skill and tailoring, and so forth were in the garments that they were offering—imported garments. We had no opportunity, frankly, to give the other side of the story on that.

GILBRIDE. Mr. Finley, what's the most important issue to your union in this particular case? Is it to establish the right of anybody to advertise in a newspaper, or, do you think this is the best way that you can carry on your fight against imported clothing?

FINLEY. Fighting the import of clothing is carried in a number of ways. We have been trying to encourage our government to enter into international agreements with other countries. This is what we are seeking by agreements on the flow of imports into the United States.

Let me give you a little background.

An international agreement was negotiated through GATT—the General Agreement of Trades and Tariffs—in Geneva—covering imports of cotton textiles. We believe in this approach.

There is no international agreement covering imports of wool or man-made fibers—synthetic fibers.

So one, we are seeking to get international agreement on this.

If we are unable to get that, then we seek, through legislation—the bill submitted by Congressman Wilbur Mills (D-Ark), setting forth the numbers that could come into this country, based on an increasing percentage.

Now, we found out that no foreign country is going to enter into an international agreement, if major retailers—such as Marshall Field—will buy, without any limitation, imported articles. Why should they enter into such an agreement? They can sell them, and there is no need for them to do so. So therefore, we would go to a retailer like Field, we would picket them—informationally—to discourage them from encouraging foreign countries, hoping that we can get them to enter into an international agreement.

Now, in order to carry this story more fully, the need for advertising has become more and more evident. We can pass out leaflets. We can do all the things that trade unions do. But nothing, in our judgment, would have been more effective than telling the people of Chicago, in a full-page ad, why we were picketing Marshall Field—the story of imports, from our point-of-view.

GILBRIDE. Would you hope, through such ads, to get them to stop buying such clothing, or, to support legislation?

FINLEY. Stopping purchases would automatically help, very candidly, encourage other countries to enter into negotiations. If major retailers—because of the information and public understanding of the problem—stop buying imported apparel in major quantities, it becomes of interest to foreign countries to enter into an agreement with our country. Then they would know that they can have an increasing market, but by regulation of exports from their country to ours. It would help.

In addition, by the way, it would also be helpful in inducing Congress, in our judgment, to pass legislation, if we couldn't get international agreement.

Congressmen know how their constituents feel. If there is an increased awareness among their constituents of the threat to jobs by an unregulated flow of imports, we know Congress would be much more sympathetic—increasingly sympathetic to the

idea of legislation. And, many Congressmen are sympathetic already.

CONN. Mr. Finley, it's the contention of the American Retail Federation that the drive that the textile and apparel unions have for import quotas from low-wage countries is denying the American consumer the right to select—the right to have lower-cost goods. How does your union answer this argument?

FINLEY. There are two.

First, in the specific case—where we were picketing Marshall Field—American consumers were not getting the benefit of lower costs. Very candidly—and this was admitted to us—I had discussions with high officials of the company—they took a greater markup. For example, take suits that sold for—I think it was \$125 or \$130 retail, in Chicago. Those suits for what they cost, should have sold for less than \$100. Very frankly, they got a greater markup. The American consumers did not get the benefit. The lower cost was not passed on to them. They were told, it's imported, it has certain characteristics, and they paid more for it than they would have for a suit with that kind of labor cost purchased in the United States.

So, in this case, the American consumer did not get the lower cost.

Also, when the Retail Federation tells us that any regulation of imports is denying American consumers, it disturbed me. And I'll tell you why.

Take any store in this country—whether it's a Field or a Macys. When they compete, they compete with a Gimbels or some other retailer who pays the same wage levels for their workers. Now, the advertiser competes with American standards of advertising.

The only guy who is asked to compete with 7¢ an hour is the guy who makes the suit. That's our member.

CONN. You say 7¢ an hour—you mean wages?

FINLEY. In Korea and in Taiwan—South Korea and Taiwan it's 7½¢. Japan is higher—37¢ an hour to workers making men's suits. Now everybody in the whole import process competes with an American competitor—at American level. But, they want our tailor who makes the suits and gets \$3.30 an hour—in Chicago—to be the guy who's got to carry the competition with 37¢ an hour in Japan, or \$60 in Italy.

When the Retail Federation talks about the American consumers, it's the most immoral thing. They compete only with American competition.

Now, if you took a Marshall Field, and across the street there was a store called "Nagasaki" and the workers in that store were getting 50¢ an hour, and the president was getting \$5,000 a year, instead of \$100,000, I'd like to hear how they talked about that kind of competition.

That bothers me. It's an immoral argument on their part.

Only our people have to carry the burden of the competitive costs.

GILBRIDE. Mr. Finley, could you give us some idea of the scope of this problem? Do you have any idea what, roughly, the volume of sales of these imported goods is in this country? And, can you estimate the job losses to your union in recent years?

FINLEY. Yes, let me say this. It depends on the category of apparel.

Today, imported shirts are equal to one-third of American production. In suits, it's around seven percent—suits, sport coats, and so on. But the issue isn't merely the total number. It's the rate of growth from '68 to '69, synthetic and wool imports increased 45 percent over the year before. In certain areas, it went as high as 200 percent.

The rate of growth is what frightens us. We realize that while we can live with the figures today, in terms of men's suits, if there is not regulation, we know that in another five years, the figure will be unbelievable.

Now, as to the number of jobs lost, let me just give you the figures in Chicago. There are close to one thousand fewer jobs today than there were a year ago. And, I'm not talking about this present month, with the recession aspect. But, prior to the beginning of the impact of the recession—at the end of last year, there were almost a thousand fewer jobs in apparel, in Chicago, than there were the year before.

Now, if you look at the increased growth of imports and relate it, percentage-wise, to the number of jobs lost, the figures are almost exact. It's as simple as that.

CONN. Mr. Finley, is this part of the story that you wanted to tell the people of Chicago when you were denied the right to place the ads?

FINLEY. This is exactly the story the ad told. It told why we were picketing Marshall Field and Company—and it goes on to set out the number of jobs affected, the cost levels, and so on—and why we felt that it was in the interests of the American consumer to not buy.

We're not against foreign trade—let me make that clear. We only say that there has to be a degree of regulation so that thousands of people aren't suddenly dumped out of jobs. We're willing as the population grows and as the market increases, to let the number of imported suits sold in this country grow. We'll grow—our industry will. We can grow together. But, we don't want imports to grow at our expense, and we are not asking to grow at the expense of imports.

That is what we were trying to say in the ad that the papers refused.

CONN. Some people, such as Thomas Watson of IBM, advocate that labor-intense industries, such as apparel, and textiles, and leather goods, and so on, ought to be farmed-out to low-wage areas—that maybe there is no longer a place for them in the U.S. economy. How do you counter such arguments?

FINLEY. Two and one half million people are employed in the textile and apparel industries in this country. Unemployment today is five percent—the latest figure. What Mr. Watson would do with those 2½ million, I don't know. Where he is going to farm them out, I don't know. These industries are large employers, by the way, of minorities. Our's is a semi-skilled industry—although some jobs are skilled—but basically, the bulk are semi-skilled, and relatively easy to learn, and earn a decent wage. They are, as I said, the largest employers of minority workers—the largest employers of women. Some 75 percent of our members are women employed in this industry. If this industry is wiped out, by permitting it to go to 7c or 30c an hour, what happens to these 2½ million people? Where do they go? Is Mr. Watson going to employ them at IBM? Do they go on welfare? Will this be to the interests of our country?

GILBRIDE. But Mr. Finley, what is happening to those who have lost their jobs so far—do you have any idea?

FINLEY. I would assume that those minority workers who have lost jobs in our industry have had trouble, because they can't become machinists, steelworkers and so on overnight.

I would guess there would be a correlation between loss of jobs and unemployment and the problems of the unemployed. There wasn't a simple turnover into other areas, because of the nature of the skills involved and other factors.

There are only so many places that kind of group can be employed.

Now, let me make another comment on this.

You know, we don't even believe in "free trade" in the United States. Let me explain. We have a federal minimum wage. If you want to manufacture in Mississippi, or in Alabama, or in Illinois, you've got to pay at least \$1.60 an hour, in order to sell your goods across state lines.

If you want to manufacture in Puerto Rico and sell in the U.S., you've got to pay a minimum wage of almost \$1.60.

We accept the fact that it's alright, in the United States, to have a slight minimum, of \$1.60. In order to compete with each other in this country, you've got to pay overtime for hours over 40. We accept this as a decent principle.

What makes it holy if you cross the Pacific Ocean and pay 7c an hour—and unlimited overtime becomes okay. Now, if there were international fair standards, by the way—labor standards—then we would have no objection to opening it up to anything. If they paid \$1.60 or \$1.50 an hour, gave reasonable overtime and had no child labor, then we would say "fine." But, why is it alright if in this country, we accept the principle that if you want to sell from one part of this country to another, you've got to maintain at least certain minimum standards? Why should it become holy, if it comes from Taiwan, or Honk Kong, or Italy, or Japan, to pay any wage?

CONN. Mr. Finley, do you feel that free trade is a realistic approach today? Is there free trade? Is free trade, for instance, possible between Japan and the United States?

FINLEY. Well, let me put it this way—you shouldn't ask us, ask the Japanese, they are the most "non-free-traders" in the world. You can't sell manufactured products to them. They have a total trade barrier around their country.

CONN. What quantities of clothing does Japan buy in the United States?

FINLEY. None.

CONN. Is it because of the price factor?

FINLEY. You can't sell to them—you just can't.

CONN. Why? Do you mean they won't permit it?

FINLEY. Right—that's right.

GILBRIDE. What, Mr. Finley, is the government's attitude toward a situation where we cannot sell our goods—the United States cannot sell its goods—in Japan, but Japan can apparently send large quantities of goods into this country?

FINLEY. I can only go on their word. Whether they mean what they say, we can only speculate.

This Administration said that they were in sympathetic agreement with our problem in textile and apparel, but wanted first to work it out by agreement. We are in accord with that. And, so far as we know—from what they have told us and the President and the Secretary of Commerce have said this—they understand our problem and are in accord with our position.

GILBRIDE. A number of other unions, Mr. Finley, have voiced the same concern over this problem in their industries—many different industries. Many of them are testifying in Congress on this. What do you think is going to come from Congress—any legislation to help you?

FINLEY. I'm very hopeful that the Mills bill or something similar will be passed by the House of Representatives. To our knowledge, a majority of the Congressmen already favor the legislation, and from what we know of the Senate, we think a majority there also favor it.

We are hopeful and semi-optimistic, that if we can't do it by agreement, it will be done by legislation.

GILBRIDE. Basically, what would the legislation do, restrict imports?

FINLEY. The legislation, as proposed by Congressman Mills, would go back to the 1968 levels, and import growth would go according to market growth.

But it also provides that if international agreements were entered into, those agreements would supercede the law. It doesn't foreclose international agreements.

CONN. I gather, Mr. Finley, that your first

preference is a voluntary approach, but if you can't get that, then you want the Mills bill. Is that correct?

FINLEY. Yes—yes, that is correct.

GILBRIDE. Why do you think, Mr. Finley, that this problem has grown so in recent years—among so many industries, affecting many unions?

FINLEY. Well, I'm not in a position to talk about all the many industries. But one reason is that American capital has set up apparel plants in other countries, with American know-how, American investment and American design. Some of our giant mail order houses have actually and deliberately fostered the manufacture of apparel in low-wage areas.

CONN. Are many of these foreign firms actually American-owned—the competing firms?

FINLEY. Not all, necessarily—but a number of them are. In Japan, no, but in many of the other countries of the Far East, the answer is yes—they are American-owned.

HARDEN. Thank you, gentlemen. Today's Labor News Conference guest was Murray Finley, a vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO, and manager of the union's Chicago Joint Board. Representing the press were Harry Conn, editor of Press Associates, Incorporated, and Neil Gilbride, Washington correspondent for the Associated Press. This is your moderator, Frank Harden, inviting you to listen again next week. Labor News Conference is a public affairs production of the AFL-CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Broadcasting System.

MALIK ON DISSENT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ISSUE OF THE DAY

(By Jack Anderson)

Malik on Dissent.—Ray McHugh of Copley News Service reported on a recent visit in Lebanon with Dr. Charles Malik, who said: "President Nixon's calling in history is to reestablish pride in America. If he can't, God help you and God help us all. Your liberals and intellectuals in both parties have betrayed the United States, not wilfully, but nonetheless disastrously. Why is America in trouble in many parts of the world? Simply because there has been a retreat of Western ideas, coupled with a parallel retreat of conscience within the United States. People are no longer sure the United States is what it used to be. The hippies, the student demonstrations, the neo-isolationism, are only the most alarming aspects of a softening of your inner fiber . . . and an absence of strong voices. President Nixon, I think is now determined to provide that voice. He is determined, even at the risk of great unpopularity, to force the United States to face up to its responsibilities. We must all pray that he is successful in Vietnam and Cambodia. You need a victory. Once you have that, you may once again find the confidence that can help all of us solve our problems. What is happening in America goes far deeper than any clever political maneuvering. An alarming state of mind has infected your intellectual community, a kind of arrogance. I am ashamed to say that Harvard, of which I am so proud, is no longer a great university. Every American and every university must reflect on this retreat, this withdrawal of spirit. Freedom is not anarchy. Freedom is responsibility."

AN INTERVIEW WITH A FORMER MEMBER OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY WHO WAS ALSO AN FBI INFORMANT

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for several years now, radio station WISN-Milwaukee, with Don Froehlich, the news director as the primary interviewer, has conducted a program entitled "The Sound of Ideas." On this regular Sunday program, people of many walks of life, and with a wide variety of opinions, are provided with opportunities for free discussions of their points of view.

On May 18, Mr. Froehlich interviewed Mr. Jerry Kirk, a former member of the Communist Party, and an FBI informant. The subject was the campus unrest in our country. I commend the reading of this interview to my colleagues:

AN INTERVIEW WITH A FORMER MEMBER OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY WHO WAS ALSO AN FBI INFORMANT

DF: Good evening. There is much outrage being voiced on hundreds of college and university campuses today. Young people are protesting, some by boycott, some by marching, some by vandalism and arson. There have never been as many students in protest as there are today, and the majority are not the fire-bombers, the window-breakers, and the property destroyers, but the sympathizers who sometimes find themselves more deeply involved than was their intention. Some people have pretty strong feelings about the hard-core demonstrators, where they get their support, and if they are linked in a concerted effort to disrupt nationwide. Our guest this evening might be able to give us some insight on that subject. We'll be talking with Mr. Gerald Kirk, former mid-west director for the DuBols Club, former member of the Communist Party, former member of the Students for Democratic Society, and an F.B.I. informant. Jerry, let's first get a general over-all view from you as a young person . . . You are only twenty-one, right?

JK: Right.

DF: As a man who has been involved with protest groups . . . on the present campus unrest situation. What does it mean to you?

JK: Well, it's an unfortunate combination of true idealism on the part of the overwhelming majority of the people involved, and some very—what I would call—insidious movements and actions on the part of people who are, in no uncertain terms, part of the international socialist movement. They brag about it. They talk about it. They take money from it. They travel to Cuba, North Viet Nam, Prague, and Moscow. And these people, many of whom are well-known leaders of the anti-war movement, are trying their best to bring that anti-war movement around to the position of the international socialists. I'm talking about North Viet Nam and Moscow. And the unfortunate combination is that most of the younger people who are involved in this are very idealistic and don't realize these things.

DF: Then what you are saying is there is a hard-core group which is being followed by the young idealists, probably—definitely—without their being aware of it.

JK: Most definitely. Most definitely.

DF: How can we prove this?

JK: Well, you can prove it in one very short and very easy way: You can accept the fact that I'm telling you the truth, and I

can tell you what I learned when I was a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

DF: Well, let's go into some of the things that you did learn.

JK: Well, I joined the Communist Party, U.S.A. in August of 1966. I was recruited basically by two people. One was a man named Ted Pearson who was the chairman of the Illinois section of the Communist Party Youth. And the other was a Michael Zaggarel, who was the national youth secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

DF: You were then 17.

JK: I had just turned 18 a couple of days before. It was in August, and my birthday is in August.

DF: Why would they have singled out a Jerry Kirk, do you suppose?

JK: Well, because I had been active in S.D.S. and because I had been active in the W. B. DuBois Clubs of America, and that was the primary reason for their selecting me. They wanted me to go back into S.D.S. and into the DuBois Clubs and work in those. The reasons were obvious; they wanted me to bring it to what they called a Marxist-Leninist position. They wanted me to move the kids in those organizations around to the position that Moscow and the North Vietnamese wanted them to be in. I was told that in no uncertain terms, if I had to lie and tell the students that I wasn't a member of the party and that I hated the party and that I thought the party was middle class and no longer revolutionary, I was to do that. Anything to get the job done.

DF: And you joined at that time?

JK: I joined the Communist Party at that time.

DF: Were you, before that time, informing the F.B.I. of your activities?

JK: I was. Yes, I was.

DF: And how did this come about?

JK: Well, it started when I first got to the University of Chicago in 1965. Some people I knew in S.D.S. wanted me to go on a couple of demonstrations, one of which was against Hubert Humphrey, of all people, and I was rather curious and rather suspicious, because these were well-to-do young people who were talking about a revolution of have-nots, and I didn't see any have-nots. A couple of the people who asked me, one of which is a fellow named John Kaplin whose father, for example, wrote the score for "The Spy Who Came in From the Cold" for Columbia Pictures, Sol Kaplin. John is a rather well-to-do young man whose parents live on, I think, West End Avenue in New York. That was where most of the S.D.S. kids were coming from, not necessarily West End Avenue in New York, but very, very well-to-do families. Bernadine Dorn's father is the head of a big trucking firm, and she's in the Weatherman Faction of S.D.S. Howard Machtinger, another man in the Weatherman Faction of S.D.S., has quite a fairly well-to-do background. Jeff Blum, another man who is in the Weatherman Faction of S.D.S.—his father is Mr. Blum who used to own a large interest in the Baltimore Orioles. So they are all very well-to-do people. In fact, Mr. Blum is a multi-millionaire. I was rather suspicious, so I called the F.B.I. as a lark, in the beginning. And I asked what are you fellows doing about all this, and they said, well, we're trying our best to keep the peace with as little violence and with as little rick-rack as possible. They talked to me for a while, and they convinced me that it was important, and so from that day on I was working for them as what one might call a counterspy and informant.

DF: Then you were approached to join the Communist Party after the original contact with the F.B.I.

JK: Most definitely. The sequence was: I joined the S.D.S. from S.D.S. I was recruited into the DuBois Clubs, and from the Du Bois Clubs I was recruited into the Communist Party. After I was recruited into the

Communist Party, I was given training as a Communist Party Member, and then my first assignment was to go back into S.D.S.

DF: All right. Let's get down to this immediate problem of the campus unrest. Your claim is that there has been for some years a movement underfoot to bring about evidence of what we are seeing today.

JK: Very much so.

DF: And let's develop that.

JK: Well, after I was recruited into the Party, I was sent to an up-state New York training camp for the Communist Party. Some people called it Camp Wetabuck; others called it Camp Unity. And I was there with over a hundred young organizers who were members of the Communist Party. There were a few people who were not members, but they thought they would be soon. Some of the people who were there who were my teachers were Betina Aptheker; Danny Rubin, who was a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.; Gil Green, a man who was convicted under the Smith Act for being a Soviet agent, who went underground; Carl Winter who was editor of the Communist Party newspaper; and people who are now members of the Black Panther Party and who influence the Black Panther Party on the west coast. One of whom was Franklin Alexander, whose relatives—brothers and sisters—some of whom are members of the Black Panther Party on the west coast.

DF: And you underwent certain instruction which would lead to what we are seeing today?

JK: Most definitely. We had textbooks from the Soviet Union, one of which was called, "Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism," and Betina Aptheker, who was instrumental in the Berkeley Free Speech Movement, with Mario Salvio and others, was one of those people who told us that we must make a concerted effort—and this is in 1966, you remember—to bring the anti-war movement to the position where it would be in line with the ideas of Moscow and North Viet Nam and other socialist nations that were involved in national liberation wars and things of that sort.

DF: And you were to do this through the young people, is that it?

JK: Through the young people and then the colleges and the universities, and then the ghettos. And we were to do all we could to make sure that, if necessary, the young people didn't know we were members of the Communist Party. One person who was there with me was a man named Bob Franklin who is now in South America working with South American revolutionaries. Another man who was with me was Peter Orris, who was one of the co-founders of S.D.S. at Harvard in 1964. He was a member of the Communist Party. The last time I saw Peter Orris he was the head parade marshal at the Inauguration demonstrations against Mr. Nixon. He was the man who was in charge of communications.

DF: Jerry, you mentioned two elements involved in the campus unrest, the great majority of idealists and the hard-core group who are set definitely on anything but peace. I find another group—maybe some would fit into your categories—and that's the group of administrators and some faculty.

JK: Very much so.

DF: How do they fit into this? Let's take specifically something with which you are more familiar, the University of Chicago, where you attended.

JK: Well, that's an interesting situation, because I can mention two specific things that happened. One last year—one quite some time ago when they had the large sit-in at the University of Chicago that lasted two weeks. And during that sit-in, many people there, including myself, thought that President Levi had taken a position which, I suppose, was the only one he had open to him—but many of us are now of the opinion that

he made a mistake, if not a very, shall we say questionable action. And that was that he gave legitimacy, he gave a bit of respectability to the whole idea of certain kinds of protest. You see, he let the protest go on; he let it stay; he allowed it to continue for two weeks, so that people got the impression that there were only two choices. And the two choices were non-violent versus violent protest of a certain kind. There was no alternative of the sort that would mean questioning the whole process of where the protest was leading. Now, the second questionable action he took, which was more obvious in my opinion, was during the recent student strikes at the University of Chicago, which I believe are probably still going on, because when I left Chicago they said they were going to continue until this Saturday, I guess tomorrow. And that was when the strike started, President Levi told his security force to disarm themselves. Now you must remember that at that time there were members of the Black Panther Party on campus giving talks, saying that the students should get guns and bombs and things of that sort and kill the pigs, so to speak. And Mr. Levi told his security guards to disarm themselves. There was quite an uproar. It got to the point where the Chicago Police Department—certain people in it—said that they didn't like the idea, simply because they needed more men on the street, you see. Now that's another questionable activity. I think Mr. Levi and certain professors think that this protest is home-grown and that it can be managed in that way. And that is not at all true, because they give respectability to it, which it shouldn't have, because it is not a home-grown movement.

DF: Then, in your opinion, these are not local situations. There is a thread tying together the university campuses as far as their demonstrations are concerned, and the main purpose underneath.

JK: Most definitely. I'll give you an example: Before Mark Rudd and his friends in S.D.S. at Columbia helped to create the Columbia situation several years ago, Mark Rudd went to Cuba. Another example is Rennie Davis, who worked with me in a thing called the Center for Radical Research. His advisor and my advisor in that program several years ago at the University of Chicago was a man named Earl Durham. Earl Durham is a member of the Black Liberation Commission for the Communist Party; he is a member of the National Commission for the Community Party, U.S.A. Dennis Davis, at one point, came to me during the project at the Center for Radical Research, and said he wanted to give me a certain job in the project, and I asked him why, and he said because Earl Durham told him that I would be a good person, and he respected Earl's opinions. And so now, after that Center for Radical Research project, Rennie Davis has been to North Viet Nam, and he has been in contact with Herbert Aptheker; Tom Hayden, who works with Rennie Davis, went to Viet Nam with Mr. Aptheker; and Professor Stoughton Lynd and people of that sort.

DF: Jerry, we can't deny that there has been a certain amount of success when almost thirty percent of the university and college campuses have been at least partially shut down. Where is it leading? What do we end up with?

JK: Well, this might be hard for a lot of people to accept, but I will tell you very frankly that from what I have learned as a result of four years of being involved with this, I will tell you in no uncertain terms that I think it very possibly could lead to a declaration of martial law all over the United States. I realize that is hard for a lot of people to accept, but that is exactly where it is going. You see, you have a situation in which, and I know this for a fact because I can quote you from a textbook we had in the camp that the Twentieth Congress

of the Community Party of the Soviet Union adopted a policy in which they said that they would try to use violence and non-violence as a pincers movement, so to speak, so that people would be so frightened of the violence that they would promote something that was not good—for example, martial law. And if you have a situation in which more and more students get involved—bystanders are killed, as in the situation at Kent State—you will have more and more people getting more and more worried. And eventually, I do believe in a very short time, have people throwing their hands up in the air saying, "Federal government—do something!" And the only choice open will be martial law.

DF: Jerry, there are hundreds of thousand of young people who are sincerely interested in the peace movement and have no connection at all with this movement, the movement of the Communist Party that you describe. What is your advice to them?

JK: My advice to them is to sit down and think for a little while. Sit down and think and think it through hard. And realize that every time they go out and scream and yell about the capitalist system being the total problem and the only out being a socialist revolution, they had best think that they are cutting their own throats. They had best think that a man who is a truly disciplined Marxist—and I know, because they tried to teach me how to be one—has no compunction whatsoever, has no guilt feelings whatsoever about removing just that kind of a person. You see, they don't understand that they are the middle-men; they aren't the ones out on the line. They are the people who will be caught; they are the ones who will be innocent bystanders. They will be the ones who unwittingly promote a thing which can result, frankly, in their deaths, as well as a situation in which a lot of our constitutional liberties can be suspended.

DF: Thank you very much. Our guest has been Mr. Jerry Kirk, a former member of the Communist Party, an F.B.I. informant who has given us some insight this evening on his past experiences and on how he feels about the present campus unrest across the United States.

SOUTH KOREANS BREAK THEIR WORD BY TAKING NORTH PACIFIC SALMON

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the South Koreans have broken their word that they would not fish for salmon in the North Pacific. Several months ago a statement was initiated by the Governments of the United States and South Korea to the effect that they would not permit their fishermen to take North Pacific salmon.

Sunday, the Coast Guard boarded one of these vessels 100 miles north and west of Unimak Island, Alaska, and salmon was found hidden beneath some herring nets.

This is a serious breach of faith, Mr. Speaker, and I have discussed this matter with the State Department in an attempt to halt the taking of salmon. So far, nothing has been done.

At the time of discussions with the South Koreans over this salmon fishery, I suggested that American inspectors be permitted aboard South Korean fishing

vessels to make sure they do not take salmon. This suggestion was denied by the South Koreans.

Now, however, if the South Korean Government is sincere in that it wants to resolve this serious problem, I again suggest that U.S. inspectors be permitted aboard their vessels.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I will support the move now in the Senate to attach an amendment to the foreign aid bill cutting all foreign aid to South Korea pending resolution of this fisheries dispute, and I urge my colleagues to join me in this move when this bill goes to a conference with the House.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has a clear duty tomorrow to override the President's veto of H.R. 11102, the Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1970.

As with the President's earlier veto of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill, this veto has properly become a test between the executive and legislative branches on priorities for limited Federal resources. The President, committed to his priorities in Indochina, must exclude other possibilities for those resources.

The Congress, which frankly passed this Hill-Burton bill earlier this month in a routine manner, must now reconsider its priorities. Does the continuation of a major medical program constitute a higher priority than, for example, an equivalent amount for armaments?

The question on H.R. 11102 is not yet this pure question of priorities, but it should become that question before we vote. The House must decide tomorrow whether it can continue to rely on the President's judgment on what our priorities are.

Sometimes otherwise insignificant issues must bear profound burdens. The vote on extending this Hill-Burton program is a suitable vehicle for these considerations of priorities. For the President himself, last year, told this Nation of our "massive crisis" in medical care. The continuation of the Hill-Burton program will not solve that crisis. Continuation of all of our present Federal medical programs will not constitute a solution. But abandoning these existing programs without replacing them with better ones will only defer but perhaps prevent a solution.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the President has chosen the wrong issue for a showdown on priorities. Let the President veto a defense appropriations bill which seems to him too large. Let him veto a SST bill or even a public works bill. We would then hesitate to question his judgment. But to speak of a medical crisis and then veto a major medical program

1 week before it expires is not to inspire our confidence in either his perceptions or his conclusions.

I urge the House to override this veto.

PROSE POETRY BY HARRY SAKS HECKHEIMER

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, among the many inspiring people I have had the honor to meet and represent in the 23d Congressional District of New York, few are more remarkable than Harry Saks Heckheimer. Now 93 years old, Mr. Heckheimer continues to take careful note of all that is happening around him, adding new experiences to his already rich life, and expressing his thoughts in prose poetry.

In 1968, I was happy to place in the RECORD Mr. Heckheimer's poem entitled "I Am a Man." I now take pleasure in commending to my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD his latest prose poem:

THE LORD COMETH

(By Harry Saks Heckheimer)

I do not have to sit alone and ponder, I know she is safe up yonder, I can hear her voice a calling, when are you coming Henry?

Be patient Dear, wait just a little longer, there is so much left for me to do here, I cannot do up yonder.

Now all my shackles broken, I breathe the odor of spring flowers—winter has done it best.

I got all the things we prayed for, I know it took a lot of time, but Freedom always takes a lot of time.

My bosom heaves, when between the autumn leaves, I hear the crescendo of that cry "all is peace, all is peace."

Their Stones of Granite, do not stand alone, the ivy entwines broken, and the muffled Drums beat equal in their rhythm, the chiseled names on every stone from wherever men were borne.

I hear you Honey, I'll be all dressed up, in the garments of hope not only of desire, I'll tie my bundle with the silken cords of right.

All the people from everywhere, all the colors of skin or hair, it's coming time Honey, let me hear you say again, when are you coming Henry?

Honey keep my seat, covered with the blush of human love, for now when I go into a bus, or train, even the ocean flights of men whatever does befall we shall all lie down together.

I am feeling like Moses, at the Red Sea, when he saved his people and cleaved the Waters; yes, perhaps we past a rubicon and forgot it too, but we caught up and we are coming fast.

Those pyramids were not built in a day, you cannot take the weeds out to let the flowers in, just by asking; but, little by little the roses will grow up.

Honey, the Home ain't there anymore, the bursting wind and water, the broken windows, and the fractured ceilings, water leaking through every floor, no the new ones are like our home where you are.

When the Lord smote the Rock, there was no brine in the water, it was wine, forever flowing never ceasing, the soft

caress of life the innocence of a baby's kiss, men may propose and terminate the Tabernacles, but, the springs of creation, never cease to ferment.

I sit down at the Table of Life, a table whiter than alabaster, set with blooms, from the little cans that once stood on our window sill, some who sought their fragrance are gone, but life goes on.

I was sitting here and thinking, it is better to have bacon and beans, than cakes with wine, and not in fear, no knocking at your door unless he has the papers?

At voting time, it felt like "brass" turned into "gold", our old Boss stood beside me and like me put his little peace of white paper in the Box, he laughed and said "Henry" some day you may be an Alderman.

We have lived together, and if, we want to survive, we must stand together; frown you may on repellent youth, and the rhetoric of the discontented, inevitable shadows of the silent will not destroy the House that GOD Built.

The Night Lamp of being, forever extolling, forever burning, man may trim its wick, but faith, the strong, will create Candles lit by perseverance, for man only stumbles toward the shore, incalculable designs of nature drive on and on.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT SENT TO
NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS—
JUNE 22, 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has passed an historic voting rights bill, which:

First: Limits to 30 days the State residency requirements for U.S. citizens to vote in State, local, and national elections;

Second. Imposes a nationwide suspension of literacy tests as a requirement to vote;

Third. Extends the Voting Rights Act of 1965 for 5 years, and

Fourth. Reduces, after January 1, 1971, the voting age to 18.

The 18-year-old vote has gained widespread, bipartisan acceptance and support. Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson publically supported lowering the voting age. President Nixon has, too. Both major political parties, in their 1968 conventions, called for an 18-year-old vote. Nationwide public opinion polls continue to show heavy support for lowering the voting age to 18.

That attitude is reflected in the substantial margin by which the Congress approved the Voting Rights Act of 1970. However, debate on the issue has pointed out a sharp division over whether the 18-year-old vote should be granted by Federal statute, or by an amendment to the Constitution. The question is whether or not the Congress has the authority to alter the voting regulations established by the States.

Opponents to the statutory route to lowering the voting age argue that the Supreme Court will declare Congress action unconstitutional. Although the is-

sue is a close one, I believe the Congress has acted within its constitutional prerogative. I believe the present law, which denies 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds the right to vote, represents a denial of equal protection under the law, and I believe the Court will sustain that view.

In 1966, the Supreme Court ruled that Congress has the constitutional authority to make its own determination of what constitutes a denial of equal protection, and to pass legislation to correct it. That kind of precedent would indicate, at least, that the Court will sustain the judgment of Congress in this case—if the Court is convinced that Congress has acted on a reasonable basis.

One of the root feelings of young people today is that they are called upon to bear the responsibilities of citizenship—including the burden of military service—but are not permitted to participate in the political process; 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds pay taxes and they are treated as adults under the criminal laws of our land, yet they have no voice in the selection of those who create and administer the laws.

Furthermore, young people today are capable of making intelligent voting decisions based on education and political awareness. For example, 79 percent of today's 18- to 21-year-olds have high school diplomas, while only 17 percent of their counterparts in 1920 had graduated from high school. While 47 percent of today's 18-year-olds attend college, only 18 percent were in college in 1920.

Opponents of the statute also argue that equal protection under the law should be confined to preventing voting discrimination against minorities. While they cite the equal protection test as the basis for supporting the literacy test ban and the residency requirement change, they are inconsistent, it seems to me, in not applying the same logic to the 18-year-old vote.

And, finally, they argue that the Supreme Court could not rule on the constitutionality of the 18-year-old vote statute in time to prevent confusion in upcoming elections. A number of recent decisions by the Court indicate that it is willing and able to reach a quick resolution of constitutional issues affecting election procedures.

In passing the Voting Rights Act of 1970, the Congress has responded to a suffrage issue of some 200 years in our history. We have expressed our intent to bring some 12 million disenfranchised young Americans into the political process of their Nation.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW
LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 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 sadis-

tically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

ALWAYS TIME FOR A LAUGH

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article published in the Journal of Commerce, April 3, 1970. It discusses the activities of Mr. Ralph Nader and his activities concerning the Federal Trade Commission.

The article follows:

ALWAYS TIME FOR A LAUGH

(By Eric Ridder)

We were rather entertained to discover last month that we—too—are in disfavor with Ralph Nader and his so-called raiders. I can't say that we find ourselves in entirely good company. Last summer Mr. Nader and his group let out a well-publicized blast against the Federal Trade Commission.

The fact that we commented in negative terms on the Nader FTC report nettled him enough to win us some mention in his report on the Interstate Commerce Commission, which was unveiled last month in terms that suggested it constituted the greatest discovery since the law of gravity.

"Most journalists," the Nader group wrote solemnly, "are easily induced into becoming servants of the bureaucracy." Since he followed this immediately with a reference to our editorial, "Whose Guardian Angels?", of last July 23, that naturally produced considerable merriment here.

But now let's proceed. Here is what Mr. Nader said: "Although almost completely inaccurate, the article was based on a private meeting between some ICC upper staff, Ralph Nader and Robert Fellmeth."

My comment on that would be this: "Whose Guardian Angels?" was not an article but an editorial. It dealt with opinions (most about Mr. Nader) not with facts. It was written with no knowledge whatever of any meeting Mr. Nader says he and Mr. Fellmeth had with any ICC staff members.

I now pass on to the next sentence, which is even wilder:

"It (the editorial) was apparently written by the agency itself without so much as a phone call by the Journal to determine its accuracy."

It is rather fortunate for Mr. Nader that he inserted the word "apparently" in that sentence for otherwise he might have found himself in deep trouble. What he means by the "phone call" is intriguing.

If ICC wrote the editorial, to whom was the phone call supposed to have been made? To its chairman? To us? If, on the other hand, we were credited with writing it, should we have called Mr. Nader to inquire whether our rather low opinion of his works and creditability was justified?

The fact of the matter—and let me put this plainly enough so even Mr. Nader can understand it—is that nobody but nobody from outside this office ever writes our editorials. No federal agency has ever done so, none has even been invited to do so and I don't think that during the past 20 years there have been more than one or two instances in which one of these agencies even knew that we were in the process of writing an editorial concerning its own operations.

The fact that Mr. Nader and his staff of student volunteers seem unable to grasp this

rather simple fact is a rather sad commentary on the limits of his group's comprehension.

If they could be so completely wrong in framing a couple of sentences referring to a single editorial in this newspaper, how much credence can be given to their efforts to assess the shortcomings of agencies as complex as FTC and IOC?

You say it. I don't need to.

\$1 BILLION FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise first to congratulate my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for bringing to the floor a recommendation that \$1 billion be spent during the next fiscal year for water pollution control. This figure, which would mark a 66-percent increase over the administration's proposals and a 25-percent increase over last year's spending, reflects that the committee has joined the legions of those who have become sensitized to the growing environmental problems in our Nation.

Yet, I must urge my colleagues also to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) which would increase the appropriation to the total authorized amount of \$1.25 billion.

It was not long ago that those of us crying for Federal help in the battle against water pollution received no answer. This was particularly irritating to residents of the Cleveland area, who are plagued with both the world's only water or fire hazard and a lake which numerous ecologists and marine biologists have already pronounced dead.

As we all know, however, this year has been one of awakening for millions of Americans. Earth Day; nationwide television, radio, and newspaper coverage; and thousands of local programs have hammered home the theme of environmental decay. The result has been a tremendous upsurge of public interest in cleaning up our environment. In fact, the tides of opinion have been so strong that many of us interested in social progress on all fronts have been worried that the ecology issue was being used in some quarters to mask the pathetic lack of movement in meeting other equally serious problems such as housing, civil rights, welfare, and employment. That possibility still exists.

Nevertheless, the fact that today we are considering only the problem of water pollution is no reason for paralysis. As I have said many times, there are plenty of Federal resources available to begin solving all of our domestic troubles—if and when we start to restructure our present spending priorities. This bill is such a beginning. As of April 30, the Federal Government owed the State of Ohio more than \$10 million in back payment support for sewage and waste treatment facilities. Passage of this measure,

with the Dingell amendment, would allow over 50 percent of these commitments to be met, plus additional moneys for new projects. In that regard, I would again commend the committee for freeing \$200 million specifically to make up these back commitments.

Of course, no one should be foolish enough to believe that enactment of this bill will be a cure-all for our water pollution problems. Besides money, several other major impediments still stand between the American people and clean water. The principal one is industrial waste, which this bill does not even purport to touch and which is unquestionably the chief villain in the Cleveland area. That evil will never be eradicated until State and Federal Governments find the political courage to take on some of the giants of American industry.

In addition, there are some serious difficulties in the way the present bill is administered. As is often the case with Federal programs which rely upon State administration, the large metropolitan areas that are in the gravest need of support have not been afforded equitable treatment. In Ohio, for example, 58 percent of the funds supplied thus far for treatment facilities have been allocated to localities representing less than 25 percent of the population. A second serious deficiency resulting from State control is that interstate, river-basin planning has been virtually eliminated. Pollution problems know no State boundaries—and neither should the solutions.

But I realize that those are not issues with which the Appropriations Committee is expected to deal. It is the business of the legislative committees, and I hope they will turn their attention to them in the near future. In the interim, we have a good bill and a good amendment before us, and I urge their speedy enactment.

LETTER ON AMENDMENTS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a letter I received from Mr. Volodymyr Y. Mayesky, vice chairman of the Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc. While I do not question the patriotism and loyalty of any Member of the Congress, regardless of his position on the pending amendments, I thought my colleagues would be interested in how an organization who knows something about communism feels regarding this entire matter.

The letter follows:

ORGANIZATION FOR THE DEFENSE OF
FOUR FREEDOMS FOR UKRAINE,
INC.

Washington, D.C. June 11, 1970.

DEAR SIR: The Cooper-Church and the McGovern-Hatfield amendments are open appeasements to the communist aggression policy which has its center in Moscow. What Kremlin's masters with their puppets in

Hanoi could not get by themselves they would achieve with the help of some Senators. The amendments, if approved by the U.S. Senate, would not only seriously undercut the President's authority at a critical time, destroy the President's program for withdrawal with honor from Vietnam and humiliate America but also would spell disaster both at home and abroad.

The Cooper-Church and the McGovern-Hatfield amendments make a cruel mockery out of a concept of freedom and humanity. The approval of the amendments would mean approval of the continued slavery of the captive nations under communist oppression and would give the communists a carte blanche to occupy any country they desire. The captive nations, our first line of defense, would then turn away from America.

The amendments, if approved, could conceivably ultimately jeopardize life and freedom in America and the rest of the free world. History would be merciless in its treatment of the U.S. as the leader of the free world for that blunder.

How the American people feel about the Cooper-Church and the McGovern-Hatfield amendments should be answered next November by means of the ballot.

Sincerely yours,

VOLODYMYR Y. MAYESKY,
Vice Chairman.

ARTURO TOSCANINI JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS PRESENT PETITIONS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, June 16, I had occasion to meet with a most unusual and interesting group of students from the Arturo Toscanini Junior High School, located at 1000 Teller Avenue, Bronx, N.Y. The main reason for their visit was to present to me petitions they had circulated concerning a number of problems that directly affect them and our entire community.

I want to say that I was most impressed with these students. They conducted themselves extremely well. They succeeded in collecting more than 1,100 signatures on their petitions—an achievement that required careful planning and organization, and great perseverance and effort. The content of their petition, stated in both English and Spanish, shows real thought and understanding, particularly with regard to the effects of the war in Indochina on the conditions of life in our cities here at home. I believe my colleagues in the Congress, and other readers of the RECORD, will find this petition interesting, and the text follows in both English and Spanish:

As concerned human beings we the undersigned, feel that the war in Indo-China must be stopped immediately. As people of the community we must act now to show our concern for those young men who have died or will soon serve in this unjust war.

Because of the money spent on the war we now have:

1. Overcrowding in the schools.
2. Lack of recreational facilities.
3. Inadequate health and social services.

4. Poisoned air and water.
5. Narcotics in our schools and neighborhood.
6. Inadequate housing.

We cannot continue to live in a country where these things are going on. We must let our representatives know we will not be silent.

Join us—stop this unjust war.

Como seres humanos preocupados, nosotros, quienes hemos firmados abajo, sentimos que la guerra en Indo-China debe terminar inmediatamente. Como gente de la comunidad debemos obrar ahora para demostrar nuestra preocupacion por los jovenes quienes han muerto o quienes serviran pronto en esta guerra injusta.

Por causa del dinero gastado por la guerra tenemos ahora:

1. Condicion sobreestada en las escuelas.
2. Falta de facilidades de recreo.
3. Inadecuado de servicios de salud y social.
4. Agua y aire venenoso.
5. Narcoticos en nuestros escuelas y en nuestros vecinos.
6. Alojamiento insuficiente.

Podemos continuar vivir en un pais donde estas cosas quedan? Debemos informar a nuestros representantes que no estaremos silenciosos.

Juntos terminen esta guerra injusta.

STUDENT DEFERMENTS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on April 23, 1970, President Nixon presented a message to the Congress concerning reform of the Selective Service. In his address the President stated:

It is my judgment, and that of the National Security Council, that further occupational, agricultural and student deferments are no longer dictated by the national interest.

I wholeheartedly agree with the President, particularly as pertains to student deferments. I would suggest that an underlying cause of much of the current student unrest lies in our present policy of draft deferment. Campuses throughout the country have become a safe haven from the draft for a number of our undergraduate and graduate students. The law as written provides merely that a student be enrolled and a member of the student body, and by the manner in which it is written, opens the door to those who wish to escape or postpone their military obligation in hopes the Vietnam emergency will be ended.

Though most of our students today attend college to seriously pursue an education some are there just to avoid military service. As a result of attending college only to avoid the draft these students today have a guilt complex. They thus try to rationalize their escapism and in so doing decry and blaspheme the Vietnam war and the "establishment." By this rationalization they salve their guilt complex and in effect end up biting the hand that feeds them.

Veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict provide excellent historical evidence of citizen soldiers who without benefit of lenient college defer-

ments, entered the armed services, performed their military obligation and returned to society and our college campuses. These men, mature and serious, older than other classmates, and with established goals, were intent on getting an education, and on preparing themselves to meet their responsibilities rather than evade them. These veteran students attained new heights of scholastic achievement.

There is a low rate of military service today among men of the highest educational attainment resulting from the fact that a number of them were able to reach age 26 in a deferred status through a combination of educational, dependency, and occupational deferments. Some of these individuals are now Junior members of the faculty of our colleges. They have preceded our current crop of students under similar draft deferments and, without the benefit of military service themselves, have encouraged and joined with radical students causing campus unrest. In seeking to justify their own evasion of responsible citizenship, they have preached that doctrine to their students under all manner of camouflage.

As Dr. Stuart Altman of the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force said recently:

The draft has required college graduates to perform contortions with their lives. They scramble to get into the Reserves, enter deferred occupations, get married and have children, or do extended graduate work to avoid the military. We face a surplus of PhDs now in almost all areas. The draft has forced this overeducation of a large segment of society.

While I cannot agree with Dr. Altman that the students that have used deferments to avoid military service have been forced to do these things—their own selfish and immature unwillingness to meet the obligations of citizenship have led them to these evasions—the fact remains that student deferments have provided the means.

President Nixon, as did President Johnson before him, has called for an end to student deferments. As far as I am concerned, the sooner the better.

HOUTHAKKER COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR SCRAP OPPOSED

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the Houthakker Committee recommendation for reverse tolling of scrap, and I favor the drastic curtailment of the export quota for copper and copper-base alloy scrap.

How can anyone doubt that we are going to have a tremendous employment of American labor? The export of scrap would cause more inflation, not to mention the balance-of-payments problem.

The congressional district I represent is probably the largest copper district

in the country and it is ridiculous to claim that there is a shortage of smelter capacity in the United States for scrap. I know we have the processing capacity and that the curtailment of the smelting of copper concentrates makes more smelter capacity for scrap, since scrap does not contribute to the sulfur problem.

Mr. Speaker, our plants melt scrap to make copper and are therefore deeply interested in the Houthakker Committee copper report of May 27. The "alternative 3" proposal recommends the unrestricted export of copper scrap when it is to be refined abroad and returned to the United States. We should bear in mind that the London market is paying more for scrap than the U.S. price. If there are no restrictions, more scrap will be exported and hundreds of men will be thrown out of work in the congressional district I represent.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard for me to understand how our Government can possibly make such a recommendation as "alternative 3." I also favor the restriction of exports of copper and copper-base alloy scrap for the rest of this year.

INDIANA ADJ. GEN. JOHN OWENS ANSWERS NATIONAL GUARD CRITICS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we have at times "instant experts" ready to declaim loudly on things they generally know nothing about. The following from a recent Indianapolis Star tells about one of them, and the fine answer given him by Indiana Adj. Gen. John Owens:

OWENS SAYS INDIANA GUARD TRAINING "VERY ADEQUATE" FOR ANY EMERGENCY

The training of the National Guard is "very adequate" to control civil disorders, Indiana Adjutant General John N. Owens declared yesterday.

"We are a group of men the Governor can call on to meet any type of emergency, man-made or natural," he said in answer to charges in a study by an Indiana University professor.

The professor, Dr. Phillip S. Kronenberg, charged that Guardsmen might be "trigger-happy" if ever confronted by a major civil disturbance because a majority of them are untested in this area and most are "green troops."

In answering these observations, Owens pointed out that more than 25 per cent of the Guardsmen are veterans of one or more wars and have been at the scene of civil disorders in Indiana several times.

Many of the officers and non-commissioned officers of the Indiana Army National Guard have been on duty at several civil disorders in the last 20 years. They were at the violence-ridden Perfect Circle Corporation strike at New Castle in 1955. Owens was one of the commanders there.

"We moved in tanks and pointed guns down the street—that's when the mobs dispersed," he declared.

"We just don't have any other agency, organized, commanded and trained with equipment within the state confines to do this

type of work," he added. "The Guard is self-contained and self-supporting."

And its reaction time is swift. Company-size units, about 200 armed men, can be on the scene of disorders within an hour after the Governor authorizes the use of Guardsmen. Owens said. A battalion-size unit, about 1,000 men, can be operational within four to five hours, he added.

Members of the Guard have received much intensive training at Camp Atterbury in controlling civil disorders, with some of the training coming from men who have had instruction from the regular Army at Fort Gordon, Ga., where many civil police receive similar training.

"We all have the same training program nation-wide—I'd say our training is very adequate," Gen. Owens declared.

In the appraisal of training, he pointed out that one unit, Company D, is very much battle-tested. It came home last year after a year in Vietnam as the highest decorated unit in the Army, he said.

"If that is calling us poorly trained," I'm darned proud of it," Gen. Owens declared.

Indiana Guard leaders study the activities of Guard units in other states when they participate in quelling disorders. Such units have been called out more than 200 times since 1967 across the country. That is a lot of experience, the adjutant general said.

The Guard, he said, is called out by the Governor after it has been clearly determined that civil authorities—municipal and state police—no longer can control a disorder. This usually is because of a lack of men and equipment.

In recalling Dr. Kronenberg's visit to his office, Owens said he told the professor that "you are going to have to look at this with an impartial view," and I don't think he was impartial.

"I'm sorry the Federal government gives people money to do this sort of thing," Owens said. "He's only getting the side of it he wants. The government isn't paying anyone to write a sequel to this."

"There are too many professors running around the country on Federal grants writing stories like this instead of teaching."

IF YOU WERE THE PRESIDENT OF A SMALL PRIVATE SCHOOL COMPLEX AND SOMEONE OFFERED YOU \$10,000 TO BUY AN AD, WHAT WOULD YOU SAY IN IT?

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the June 19 issue of Life magazine carried an advertisement which I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues.

This advertisement was by the Orchard Lake Schools in Orchard Lake, Mich., but it was financed by Mr. Leo Stein, a Detroit philanthropist, who believed the work of Orchard Lake Schools deserved wider national attention.

This very generous donation by Mr. Stein ought to be duplicated all over America so that the American people could learn more about the fine educational institutions that exist in this country, which for all sorts of reasons never reach the public eye.

Orchard Lake Schools is a unique institution in America. It is a source of

great inspiration and is able to tell its story in a magazine of national distribution through the goodness of Leo Stein.

The Very Reverend Walter J. Ziemia, head of Orchard Lake Schools, has used this opportunity in a most eloquent way, and I insert Reverend Ziemia's advertisement in the RECORD today to illustrate what happens when good educational institutions and a benevolent philanthropic neighbor get together for a common cause.

IF YOU WERE THE PRESIDENT OF A SMALL PRIVATE SCHOOL COMPLEX AND SOMEONE OFFERED YOU \$10,000 TO BUY AN AD, WHAT WOULD YOU SAY IN IT?

The first thing you'd say would be "thank goodness for people like Leo Stein" for footing the bill for this advertisement. Then you'd have to admit that you almost wished you had the money instead. You can think of a dozen places you could use it on campus.

But, Leo Stein wouldn't budge. "Father, you people have been in business for 85 years and nobody's heard of you. You need the advertising more than you need the money."

Orchard Lake, who? I'll have to agree with Leo on this point. Although the Orchard Lake Schools have operated in the Detroit area for 85 years, not too many people have heard of us. Oh, occasionally you meet someone who has: "Yes, of course, you mean that seminary out there." And they're right; there is a seminary but there.

Sort of a small educational conglomerate. Leave the Detroit City Hall, head north for about 40 minutes and you come to beautiful Orchard Lake. On the northeast shore sits "the seminary," the Orchard Lake Schools. About 120 acres. Seventeen buildings. A school with three separate academic programs and institutions: Saint Cyril and Methodius Seminary, Saint Mary's College and Saint Mary's Preparatory.

The schools were founded in Detroit in 1885 to take care of the needs of Polish immigrants by educating young men for the priesthood and the professions. In 1909, the Schools moved to larger quarters at our present location. Since we first opened our doors, more than 12,000 students from almost every state have studied with us, of which more than 2,000 were ordained as priests.

The Polish Notre Dame. I imagine one reason for our relative lack of fame is due to the specialized scope of our service, which is to Polish-Americans. This means we aren't identified with the State of Michigan, or Detroit, or any other specific geographic community.

We are, however, the center of Polish learning and culture for some 10 million Americans of Polish descent. In many ways we are changing and adapting, but basically we've stuck pretty close to our original goal of providing leadership for America through a three-fold cultural formation—Catholic, American and Polish. We're not as famous, but in a real sense we are to Polish-Americans what Notre Dame is to Irish-Americans.

What do we have to offer? Orchard Lake does not claim to be all things to all people. But what we do in our specialized areas of endeavor, we do very well indeed. Here's what our three academic institutions offer:

Saint Mary's Preparatory—a four-year secondary program of pre-college studies in a disciplined, boarding school environment that prepares young men for future study and service.

Saint Mary's College—a four-year liberal arts program offering majors in Theology, Philosophy, Polish and the Communications Arts in a small residential atmosphere of individual attention.

Saint Cyril and Methodius Seminary—a four-year program of graduate studies in

Theology which prepares men for the priesthood, the permanent diaconate and lay leadership in the Catholic Church.

Also, Orchard Lake embraces three unique service centers: Center for Polish Studies and Culture, Center for Pastoral Studies, Polish-American Liturgical Center.

We came through a lot together. By ordinary standards, Orchard Lake is small. But what we lack in size we more than make up in service, closeness and devotion. People really care about the place. The faculty. The student body. The alumni. That gallant group of men who annually put on the hundred-dollar-a-plate dinner honoring our Founder, Father Dabrowski. Thousands of friends. Maybe it's because we've had to fight so hard and scramble so long to keep the Schools going.

We've never forgotten those days. That's why we try to make it as easy as possible for every student to attend our schools. At Orchard Lake, students pay less than half the cost of room, board and tuition. For example, the total yearly cost of attending either the Prep School or the College is only \$1,000—which we consider to be one of the biggest educational bargains to be found anywhere.

The point is this, the Orchard Lake Schools have so much to offer that a gentleman like Leo Stein is willing to put up \$10,000 so that I can tell you something about them.

You can get complete information about the Prep School, or College, or Seminary, or the Centers by writing to me, The Very Reverend Walter J. Ziemia, at the Orchard Lake Schools, Orchard Lake, Mich.

HUMAN RIGHTS FOR FORGOTTEN AMERICANS

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, for months and years our prisoners of war have suffered in silence, their families have agonized practically alone; the Government of North Vietnam has been recalcitrant; neither the Red Cross nor the YMCA, in spite of valiant efforts, has been able to alleviate the suffering of the prisoners or the agony of their families; no church group or Council of Churches has made any appreciable effort to assist or console the prisoners or their families; the United Nations has been impotent.

The National Presbyterians have adopted a feeble pro-North Vietnamese resolution urging both the Allies and the Communists to "cease fire and exchange prisoners." They know this proposal, and numerous similar offers, has been made by the United States for years.

Governments, churches, international organizations, and all individuals of this planet should be concerned about the rights and circumstances of the war prisoners.

Even war prisoners have rights which should be respected and safeguarded.

John F. Loosbrock, editor of the Air Force Space Digest, presents another view of the POW tragedy. I urge every Member and every citizen who has any concern for a fellow human being to read the following editorial dated June 1970:

WAR PRISONERS HAVE HUMAN RIGHTS TOO (By John F. Loosbrock)

One can make a very good case, in purely military terms, for the missions into the Parrot's Beak and the Fishhook in Cambodia. It is sound military doctrine to strike, and strike hard, at an enemy's supply caches and his command and control centers. One has only to recall the immense contribution to the ending of our own Civil War, made by Sherman's March to the Sea. The history of war is studded with other examples.

The box score on weapons, ammunition, and food supplies already netted in the Cambodian raids is impressive (see page 14), and it is good to know that a significant, though incalculable, number of young Americans now serving in South Vietnam will have their fair chance of living to a ripe old age as a result of these operations.

The political side effects of the Cambodian raids are another matter. However one may feel about the necessity for the action there, its divisive impact on the American body politic is as much a fact of life as are the obvious military pluses involved in limiting the enemy's ability to hurt our own troops and those of our allies.

One of the most distressing side effects we have noted is the increasing tendency to substitute knee-jerk reflexes for the rule of reason, to replace honest debate with the parroting of *ersatz* slogans. It is possible, we feel, to be moved to sorrow and anger at the unnecessary and tragic deaths of the four Kent State students without betraying in any way one's belief that a Communist-dominated Asia would be a deadly peril, not only to the United States, but to free men everywhere. But the polarization of our society is making it ever more difficult to discuss almost any issue from more than one point of view.

A friend of ours warned us years ago: "When you walk down the middle of the road, you can get hit from either side." He was right, and it saddens us to have to admit it. But because he was right, important issues, on which all Americans, regardless of color, creed, or political persuasion, should be able to unite, get lost in the shuffle.

A case in point is the plight of the Americans who are known to be either prisoners of the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong or who are missing and believed to be prisoners. Only one week before the massive gathering on the Ellipse protested the Cambodian operations to the President, the nation, and the world, a much smaller, less vocal, and less photographed crowd gathered only a block away in Constitution Hall.

Families of the war prisoners and of the men missing in action were there, from all parts of the land. There were speeches, requests for help, calls to action, and promises of support. But media coverage was sparse and, we suspect, the Hanoi government was much more impressed and hardened in its intransigence by what happened on the Ellipse seven days later.

The Air Force Association and this magazine took the lead in the matter of the prisoners of war last fall when we published in our October issue Lou Stockstill's magnificent article portraying their plight. Much has happened since in a positive way, as is outlined in detail beginning on page 32. But what remains to be done shows clearly in the statistics—thirty-one men have been released (nine by Hanoi and twenty-two others by the Viet Cong in South Vietnam); 450 are still in prison to our certain knowledge; and 1,096 more still languish in the shadowy land of "missing in action," leaving behind women who know not whether they are wives or widows.

There is much talk of human rights among those who protest the war. But there also is a basic human right involved in the matter of the war prisoners. Any prisoner, no matter

how heinous his crime—whether he is imprisoned for criminal, civil, or political reasons, or whether he is a legitimate prisoner of war—deserves the basic human rights guaranteed by domestic and international law. In the case of a prisoner of war, his family is entitled by the Geneva Convention to know where he is held, and to communicate with him.

The North Vietnamese say our men are not prisoners of war but war criminals, and hence not protected by the Geneva Convention. That is pure hogwash. The Geneva Convention does not go into the matter of the legitimacy or illegitimacy of a war. If a man is in the military service, is wearing his country's uniform, and is captured, he is a prisoner of war and entitled to humane treatment under the Convention, which North Vietnam has signed.

Surely here is a cause in which all Americans can come together. We can appreciate the purity of motive with which more and more Americans are opposing the war in Southeast Asia. This is their right and their privilege. But we can also hope that the protesters, who say they are so concerned and who say they care so much, will direct at least a portion of that concern and that care toward their own countrymen whose basic human rights are being trodden upon by the contry whose flag flew last month on the Ellipse.

If it is all well and good, when one disagrees with the President of the United States, to march on Washington and "tell it to Nixon," is it not even more pertinent and even more constructive to take up the cause of the American war prisoners and "tell it to Hanoi"?

I urge everyone to write the presidents of any nation which could be influential in persuading North Vietnam to accord humane treatment to prisoners of war.

The following addresses are suggested:

Cambodia: Mr. Thay Sok, Charge d'Affaires, Embassy of Cambodia, 4500 Sixteenth St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20011.

(25c per 1/2 ounce air mail).
Agence Khemere Presse, Ministry of Information, Phnom Penh, Cambodia.

La Depeche Du Cambodge, Phnom Penh, Cambodia.

France: His Excellency, Charles Lucet, Embassy of France, 2535 Belmont Road, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008.

(20c per 1/2 ounce air mail).
Le Monde, Paris 8, France.
Le Figaro, Paris 8, France.

India: His Excellency, Nawab Ali Yavar Jung, Embassy of India, 2107 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008.

(25c per 1/2 ounce air mail).
Times of India, New Delhi I, India.
Hindu, Madras 2, India.

Poland: His Excellency, Jerzy Michalowski, Embassy of Polish People's Republic, 2640 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

(20c per 1/2 ounce air mail).
Trybuna Ludu, Warsaw, Poland.
Zycie Warszawy, Warsaw, Poland.

Romania: His Excellency, Corneliu Bogdan, Embassy of Socialist Republic of Romania, 1607 Twenty-Third St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008.

(20c per 1/2 ounce air mail).
Scinteia, Bucharest, Romania.
Romania Libera, Bucharest, Romania.

Sweden: His Excellency, Hubert de Besche, Embassy of Sweden, 2249 R St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008.

(20c per 1/2 ounce air mail).
Dagens Nyheter, Stockholm, Sweden.
Svenska Dagbladet, Stockholm, Sweden.

USSR: His Excellency, Anatoly F. Dobrynin, Embassy of the USSR, 1125 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

(25c per 1/2 ounce air mail).
Pravda, Moscow A-47, U.S.S.R.
Izvestia, Moscow A-47, U.S.S.R.

A letter to any friend, relative, or associate in one of the above-named countries could also be helpful.

At some future time one of your family could be a prisoner. Now is the time to begin to safeguard his human rights.

VIOLENCE AND SABOTAGE—CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans were shocked to learn that the Constitution had been extended to guarantee delivery of Communist literature advocating violence and sabotage through the U.S. mail.

Such a decision has been handed down by a panel of Federal judges—prohibiting the Postmaster General to refuse to deliver revolutionary publications from Red China.

The American people, long weary of seeing constitutional rights extended to activists destroying the Constitution, are asking questions. When the Constitution has been destroyed what sanctuary will the destroyers then have to hide behind? And what will happen to those judges so active in perverting the Constitution to destroy constitutional government.

A news clipping follows:

[From the Evening Star, June 23, 1970]

JUDGES BAR POSTAL BAN ON PUBLICATION

A three-judge federal panel has ruled that the postmaster general cannot refuse to deliver foreign publications to subscribers in this country because he thinks the material is objectionable.

The judges said the Constitution protects the right of American citizens to receive mail, whether the item is mailed here or abroad. The case involved "The Crusader," distributed by Robert F. Williams of Peking, China.

The postmaster general, on Aug. 29, 1967, banned distribution of the May 1967, edition on grounds it advocated violence by Negroes in American cities and sabotage by Negro soldiers in Vietnam.

Williams, the City Light Books Inc. of San Francisco; Conrad J. Lynn of Pomona, N.Y., and Christopher Koch of Bennington, Vt., filed a suit protesting the action.

The government claimed it had the right to refuse delivery to the bookstore and to Lynn and Koch because the literature tended to incite arson, murder or assassination in violation of law.

NATIONAL MONETARY LETTER

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, believing that due attention should be directed toward improving our country's monetary policy, with its direct effect upon inflation and our mounting national debt, I recently attended a meeting on this subject in the office of Mr. David M. Kennedy, Secretary of the Treasury.

While at that conference, I read a copy of a letter which had been mailed to President Nixon on May 5, 1970. It was written by Col. Curtis B. Dall of Washington, D.C., on the subject of our monetary policy. It makes reference to H.R. 17140, introduced by my distinguished colleague, JOHN R. RARICK, on April 21, 1970, and discusses some of the dangers about money problems which have occurred here in the past.

On account of the current financial problems, and on account of the necessity for us to take all constructive steps to fight rising prices, I feel this letter would be of interest to my colleagues, and, therefore, I insert the letter from Colonel Dall to President Nixon, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 5, 1970.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: When reading a copy of a recent "CONGRESSIONAL RECORD", I came across a most important subject, on page 12884 of the issue of April 23, 1970. It was titled "H.R. 17140—Restore Confidence To Our Money Through Constitutional Government". Continuing, "Mr. Rarick, Mr. Speaker, the American people are bombarded with fearful reports on war, poverty, pollution, inflation, strikes, and violence, yet the foremost concern to every citizen is his money, and its buying power.

"Because of this, I have introduced H.R. 17140, a bill to vest in the Government of the United States the absolute, complete, and unconditional control over our money through Government ownership and control of the 12 Federal Reserve Banks.

"I have taken this action because of an ever increasing lack of public confidence in the private monopoly which presently is in charge of our money. . . . Since the Federal Reserve bankers lack the responsibility to perform their duty, then Congress must conclude that the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 has, by experience, proven itself a failure."

Mr. President, I am well aware that you do not have the time to reply to but a small percentage of the great numbers of letters addressed to you, by concerned citizens. But, because this matter directly affects the value and purchasing power of our money—most vital to every American Citizen, I seek your thoughts and position on this piece of legislation, now making its first appearance in the Congress. How can its valuable message be best spread far and wide, as a real public service?

Without doubt, strong opposition can be expected from the appointees and lobbyists of the preferred International Banking interests, aiming to defeat this Bill, in order to maintain their monopoly by applying various pressures on the Congress and by encouraging the publishing of distorted articles on this Bill in the news media, here and abroad.

I am a Princetonian, and well recall how Woodrow Wilson was pressured by his political handlers to approve the original Federal Reserve Banking Act, in 1913, and how that Central Bank System had to be avidly "sold" by Foreign interests to the American people. That system, purportedly, was to guarantee the ending of Inflation and Deflation cycles, or Boom and Bust—forever! It was supposed to aid Small Business and free the Farmer from the evil practice of price and commodity manipulations by Wall Street's international money powers, well coached from Europe.

Has not the present Federal Reserve Banking System strayed very far indeed from its stated objectives of 1913, by dint of scores

of self-serving Amendments? Regrettably, so it appears.

I also recall reading that, in 1920 and 1921, the newly born Federal Reserve Board engaged in a deliberate conspiracy to create a Depression which was most successfully and scientifically carried out, with the result that thousands of American Farmers were foreclosed, made homeless, and many business failures resulted from that Act's "elastic" money policy. "Elastic", was it not, for the Central Bankers, but what about the resulting extensive damage to the public, duly planned? Why, and for whose benefit, is the present planned Money Squeeze and today's excessively high interest rates? Have we learned naught since 1921, and since 1929-30?

Mr. President, I also recall, in the Spring of 1933, when in Washington visiting at the White House, with my then Father-in-Law, Franklin Roosevelt, that another well planned Money Squeeze was duly put-on by the Federal Reserve Bank System, and thousands of banks were being forced to close their doors. Their assets and corporate structures were then eagerly scooped-up by the top management and friends of the Federal Reserve Banking System, a maneuver causing vast suffering and ruin to thousands. Therefore, in view of the costly background and unenviable record of the Federal Reserve Banking System, I read with deep interest in the aforesaid "Congressional Record" those welcomed words referred to, coming from a dedicated Congressman, so timely, so well expressed!

Mr. President, today, this Country needs to have a New System of "American" banking, devoid of all costly foreign financial alliances, a system which will free us all from the present policy of enriching a few, at great cost to all citizens. The Federal Reserve System should be legally abolished. Economic emancipation will then take place! Informed and patriotic Americans can develop a new System for review, in 90 days' time. It can be made available. Then, Congress must take the next step, at long last!

Hence, a word from you as to your approach and views about this matter would be most timely and well received by millions of Americans—as you are the duly Sworn and Elected President of All the people!

This Bill, H.R. 17140, could readily prove to be the forerunner of the most important legislation to come before the Congress in the last 25 years. Twenty-five years; It would save the American people billions of tax dollars, annually, and thereby could cause a drastic cut in the unnecessarily heavy tax burden now placed upon our shoulders.

I look forward with great interest to being favored with a reply from you, on this vital subject.

Respectfully yours,

CURTIS B. DALL.

VOICES OF REASONABLENESS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the Glen Ridge paper presents a very timely message. Reason rather than violence must prevail for our citizens both young and old. I would like, therefore, to bring this to the attention of my colleagues:

VOICES OF REASONABLENESS

Two highly respected voices were raised, this week, against the excesses of student

militants. President Goheen told graduating Princeton University seniors that "The flight from reason may be the greatest danger facing us today." Reason in many instances has been replaced by a tendency to see problems in "sweeping emotion-charged terms," he said.

"We must see that excessive impatience can undermine the most effective means we have for recognizing and then effecting those changes for a more peaceable, just and humane world."

Many persons are now awake to the grave faults and imperfections in our society but he warned "violence can cripple the promise of reform inherent in the current discontent and restlessness of many Americans."

Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine put it in a different way when she delivered a speech in the Senate on the 20th anniversary of one she made challenging the threat from the radical right inherent in McCarthyism then rampant. "I speak today," she said, "because of what I consider the great threat from the radical left that advocates and practices violence and defiance of the law."

"Extremism bent upon polarization of our people is increasingly forcing upon the American people the narrow choice between anarchy and repression," the Senator warned. "And make no mistake about it, if that narrow choice has to be made, the American people, even if with reluctance and misgiving, will choose repression."

COMMUNIST-STYLE HISTORY STOPS VISITOR TO RUSSIA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is necessary in analyzing world problems to note that the world will not have lasting peace and true freedom until the Soviet Union adopts policies consistent with international law and with respect for the rights of other nations. Too often analysts of the Soviet scene do not take note of the fundamental defects and falsehoods inherent in the Soviet structure. In a column written in Moscow during a recent factfinding tour, Ray McHugh, Washington bureau chief of the Copley News, provides an effective analysis of the distortion of history in the Soviet Union. His column appeared in the Thursday, May 7, San Diego, Calif., Union which I insert at this point:

COMMUNIST-STYLE HISTORY STOPS VISITOR TO RUSSIA

(By Ray McHugh)

Moscow.—One of the fascinating—if disconcerting—things about any visit to a "Socialist" country is one's exposure to the reality of Communist-style history.

According to a guide in Moscow, the Red army won World War II almost single-handed. And, she spoke with conviction. That was the only version she had ever heard.

An educated woman in Leningrad remarked, "Isn't it terrible what Czechoslovakia tried to do to us? How ungrateful. After 25 years the Fascists are still at work."

In Yalta, walking through the subtropical grounds of the Livadia Palace where the Big Three chiefs of state met in 1945, I turned to my companion and asked:

"What went wrong?"

"What are Soviet students and citizens

told about the history of 1945-1949 when the World War II alliance fell apart and the cold war took shape?"

"Roosevelt died," replied the companion. "It is that simple."

In Yalta, the four-term U.S. president remains a hero. The oldest main street in the city is named Franklin D. Roosevelt Avenue. It was renamed April 12, 1945, the day Roosevelt died. There is no mention in Yalta of Premier Joseph Stalin or British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, the other two participants at the 1945 meeting.

"If Roosevelt had lived," my companion said, "every Soviet citizen knows that there would have been none of these differences."

"The men who followed him—Truman and his aides—they were reactionaries."

STALIN SEEN MAKING CONCESSIONS

"No matter what concessions Stalin made, Truman was determined to revive Germany as a future threat to the Soviet Union."

My eyebrows must have gone up, because my companion became more vehement.

"It is true! Stalin tried, but there were those in America who wanted to rescue fascism without Hitler."

We walked in silence for several yards, then paused to peer through the iron grillwork into the palace's inner garden, the sunlit retreat where Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill redrew the map of Europe and North Asia, contingent on Russia's entry into the war with Japan.

I tried again.

"But why has the Red army remained in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria?"

"Doesn't it seem to you strange that these countries that were violently opposed to communism should suddenly become Socialist?"

"East Germany may be a different situation, but what of the others?"

My companion stiffened.

"These countries are our brothers in socialism. Each of them recognized that only the Red army could protect them against new fascism."

"What we do not understand is why America is not interested in peace. The Soviet Union has done nothing but hold out the hand of friendship to America. You have rejected it."

As a guest in the Soviet Union, I should have dropped the subject, but I asked:

"Do your histories tell of the Berlin blockade in 1949-1950, when American and British planes literally kept West Berlin alive?"

"What blockade?" was the answer.

The questioning stopped.

VIEW ACCEPTED WITHOUT QUESTION

But here were three Soviet citizens, all educated beyond the college level; yet each persisted in a one-sided partisan view of history. And each accepted it without question.

This is the legacy of a one-party system, a controlled press and a government bureaucracy bent on inflicting only its own point of view on more than 200 million people.

It was interesting to read the April 15 recollections of C. L. Sulzberger, New York Times correspondent who spent most of the war years in Moscow.

Sulzberger, who was on intimate terms with many of the leaders of that era, wrote:

"Just before his death, Roosevelt, disturbed by Soviet accusations of double-dealing, warned Stalin: 'It would be one of the greatest tragedies of history if, at the very moment of victory now within our grasp, such distrust, such lack of faith, should prejudice the entire undertaking after the colossal losses of life, material and treasure involved. Frankly, I cannot avoid a feeling of bitter resentment toward your informers, whoever they are, for such vile misrepresentations of my action.'"

I did not ask my Yalta companion if this message appeared in Soviet histories. It wasn't necessary.

CHILDREN COMMENT ON THE SST

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include these letters from sixth grade students in my district, sent to the Coalition Against the SST. Their pithy comments are worthy of examination. The letters follow:

BEDFORD, IND.,

May 25, 1970.

DEAR SIR: I am writing concerning the Super Sonic Transport Planes. I don't see why you would spend \$270 million on 500 SST planes while you will probably sell only half of them, when they are a main cause of pollution, and are only spending \$106 million on the war of pollution. In other words, you would be spending more money for pollution than against it. Personally I think you would be wasting your money on SST planes.

Thank you for taking the time to listen.

Sincerely,

LISA WESTFALL,

Sixth grade student of Burriss School
in Mitchell, Ind.

MITCHELL, IND.

DEAR SIR: I do not want that airplane.

PHIL SMITH.

MITCHELL, IND.,

May 25, 1970.

DEAR SIR: About the S.S.T. I think we should not spend all of this money on a plane. And all it will do is make bad air that we can't breathe. With the money we could feed the starving people of the world. The loud booms when the plane reaches the sound barrier will break windows, crack buildings and I think we will waste our money in doing it. But you are the only one who can stop it.

Yours truly,

(P.S.—You can help the world. I believe we should keep up with other nations but not this way.)

BEDFORD, IND.

DEAR SIR: I am 12 years old and quite concerned about the problems in the world. One bad problem is the building of the S.S.T. airplanes and the pollution.

Why do you want to build a new airplane when with that money you could control air pollution, poorness and the troubles in the States.

With all the sonic booms that will be going on while the planes are flying you will have to pay more money repairing the damage.

I feel that we shouldn't build the news planes.

Sincerely yours,

JULIE OTT.

MITCHELL, IND.,

May 25, 1970.

DEAR SIR: If you want to know what I think about the SST plane it isn't very good. We really don't need that plane we have too many planes in the air as it already is. Besides it's going to cause more pollution. The men in outer space say we have a beautiful blue planet, the next thing you know they

will say we have a beautiful black planet because of the pollution. We don't really need that plane! Just because America has been first in everything else. We think we have to stay that way and it doesn't make any difference if it ruins our planet.

ference what measures we have to take, even

Sincerely,

FRANK HODGES.

BEDFORD, IND.,

May 25, 1970.

DEAR SIR: My name is Belinda Lea Deckard. I am 12 years old. I think that the SST should not be built. With all that money we could stop pollution or help the starving people in other lands. I mean if we're trying to stop pollution let's not build the SST. If it is built it would be a wonder why people would stay on the earth. I know you'll throw the letter away and say well she should keep out of this. But I'm not. But that's why I think the SST shouldn't be built. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

BELINDA LEA DECKARD.

ROCHESTER, N.Y., LEAGUE JOINS NATIONAL BABE RUTH BASEBALL PROGRAM

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined with many of my colleagues to pay tribute to the greatest baseball player of all time, George Herman "Babe" Ruth, and the Babe Ruth Baseball league, a 19-year-old program dedicated to building character and moral fiber in our young people.

In my 36th Congressional District, a new Babe Ruth League has been formed. This four-team league will open its season July 5. I would like to give credit to the members of this league and ask my colleagues to join with me to wish them the best of luck.

The president of this new league, Northeast Division I, is Howard Ostroff. Other adults participating include Mrs. Mary M. Harold, Robert A. Harold, Sr., Mrs. Norna J. DelVecchio, Frank D. Acquisto, Michael DelVecchio, Gordon Day, and Jesse C. Eplin.

The members of the Cubs team consist of Manager John Shipley, Coach Fred Scott and the players as follows: John Johnson, Robert Sloane, Joseph Jedrzek, Renard Droegmoller, Aurelio Perez, Jr., Jeffrey Vander Els, Paul Specksgoor, Luke Sementino, Edward Frances, Nestor Bernier, Kenneth Lelek, Kenneth Lichwiarz, Daniel Little, and Norman Tisdell.

The Indians include: Manager Mike DelVecchio, Coach Donald Kinney, and players Thomas Drake, Donald Lipka, Henry Soublet, George Moore, Michael DelVecchio, Jr., Arthur Marrapese, Jr., Donald Kinney, Juan Rivera, Neal Polakakis, Mark Harold, Arthur Plewa, Algie VanHoose, Richard Barham, Frank Schoeneman, and Armon Santiago.

The Cardinals team is made up of Manager Frank D'Aquisto, Coach Bob Haus, and players Frank D'Aquisto, Jr., David Cashion, James Mitchell, Meno Droemoeller, Nelson Rivera, James

Holmes, Curt Colombo, Robert Asel, Daniel A. Fallon, Doug Benoit, Stephen Kilbourne, Harold Moore, Herbert Schamberger, Roman Moszkowicz, Steve Fellow.

And the final team, the Tigers, consists of Manager Gordon Day, Coach Floyd Cashion, and players as follows: Joseph LoTurco, Ronald Schoepfel, John Cornelius, Marion Malec, Jeffery Ostroff, Ronald Spaulding, Rodger Zaso, John Smigelskis, Wayne James, Gordon Day, Roger Ornt, Adelmo Miguez, Curtis Battle, Marcus Ingram.

This international program, designed to meet the ideals of Babe Ruth, who himself had a great love and understanding for young people, could not have been made possible without the many able volunteers within our community.

I am sure you will join with me in thanking these citizens for dedicating themselves to a program so essential to the young people today.

CONSUMERS SCORE TWICE

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a great day for the consumer.

First, the Product Safety Commission issued its final report. In it, they told it to the country like it is. What is more, they told us what to do about it.

We all get excited over the huge injury rate on our highways. It took the Product Safety Commission to tell us that the rate of injury is four times higher in our homes.

We all go shopping confident that the products offered for sale are safe. Well, they are not necessarily safe, and it took the Product Safety Commission to tell us so.

The Commission has unanimously recommended a new agency which will administer a new law giving the Federal Government power to set safety standards for consumer products, and tough enforcement powers to make sure the standards are lived up to.

The Nixon administration has done a lot of talking about their concern for the consumer. They now have an opportunity to show whether or not they really mean it. If they do, they will endorse the Product Safety Commission's recommendations.

Second, I was pleased to see that the House Government Operations Committee reported out a strong bill to establish a consumer protection agency.

For the first time, a House committee has reported out a bill that gives the consumer a strong, powerful agency with the responsibility and the power to protect consumer rights. The bill allows the agency to intervene in any and all actions of the Federal agencies and Federal courts where the issue being considered affects the American consumer.

Information and education are important, but by themselves are insuffi-

cient to really give the consumer the protection that is his right. Again, we have heard a lot from the administration about their concern, but when the crunch comes, somehow they are on the wrong side of all important issues—like class action suits and this Consumer Representation Act.

The bill has my full support as do the recommendations of the Product Safety Commission. I hope that the Congress will work immediately to implement these recommendations and pass the consumer affairs bill that will come before us in the near future. I also hope the administration will face up to its responsibilities and aid the Congress in protecting the American consumer.

SPACE NUCLEAR POWER PROGRAMS—PROPULSION AND ELECTRIC POWER

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission's—AEC—space nuclear programs are designed to provide the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's space vehicles, space stations, and space bases with electric power and propulsion. The nuclear rocket program—Rover—is on schedule. The NERVA nuclear engine technology effort has been successfully concluded with the final tests of the ground experimental engine. The goals for the nuclear rocket engine now being designed for space and manned-flight certification are that it have a lifetime of 10 hours and the capability for 60 starts. This craft is expected to be a reusable nuclear shuttle for transporting men, spacecraft, and supplies between earth orbit and lunar orbit, between earth orbit and geosynchronous orbit, and for possible deep space activities.

Satellite, space vehicle, and space station internal power, as well as some thruster applications, must depend upon nuclear-generated electrical power as the only cost-effective and technically feasible power sources.

I would like to report on a significant milestone in the history of this very modern field of science and technology. The first space nuclear battery for producing electricity is heading into its 10th year in orbit. The grapefruit-size battery, more formally known as a radioisotope thermoelectric generator, was launched June 29, 1961, from Cape Kennedy on a navigational satellite. The generator has already operated four years beyond its 5-year design life.

As designed by the AEC, the generator supplemented the power from solar cells on the U.S. Navy's oldest navigational satellite. The generator, designated SNAP-3A, where SNAP is the acronym for systems for nuclear auxiliary power, was about 5 inches in diameter, about 5½ inches tall, and converted the heat given off by the plutonium-238 fuel directly into 2.7 watts of electricity.

I can recall the trouble that was encountered in getting Presidential approval for that launch and the flight of the satellite. The State Department did not want the United States to launch it because they were afraid it might fall on Cuba and cause an international incident.

In all, seven SNAP nuclear generators using radioisotopes as fuel have been successfully launched, and a compact reactor power system has been demonstrated in space.

The first anniversary of the first civilian use of atomic energy in space occurred in April. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Nimbus-3 weather satellite, launched April 14, 1969, from Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, carried two AEC SNAP-19 nuclear generators which again supplemented solar cell power. The 40 watts of nuclear power permit the satellite's experiments to function on a full-time basis, particularly since unexpected damage to the solar cells has placed almost complete reliance for power on the nuclear systems. The nuclear generator placed on the moon by the Apollo 12 astronauts continues to operate as planned. The SNAP-27 system is producing over 70 watts of electricity and is successfully powering the five experiments and instruments deployed on the moon's surface. The unfortunate experience with Apollo 13 had one bright side. It was proved that a SNAP-27 generator would, as planned and designed, reenter the earth's atmosphere intact and would not disperse any plutonium fuel microspheres. It should be noted that all the plutonium fuel used in the thermoelectric SNAP generators is fabricated at the AEC's Savannah River Plant near Aiken, S.C., and is prepared and encapsulated at the AEC's Mound Laboratory at Miamisburg, Ohio.

Three new SNAP generators are now under development. There is Pioneer for a Jupiter fly-by in 1972, the Viking for a Mars landing in 1975, and the new Navy satellite for navigational purposes called Transit. The space stations and space bases which are scheduled for use in the mid-1970's will probably require more electric power than can be provided by thermoelectric generators. It is for this reason that the AEC has its comprehensive program on nuclear reactor electric power sources.

If the U.S. space program is to progress beyond the Apollo moon landings, it can only be done with nuclear electric power and nuclear propulsion. These programs merit strong support.

A DIGNIFIED FLAG BURNING

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my colleagues of a flag burning held recently by some young people in my 20th congressional district.

It was not a ritual staged to display contempt for our country and its flag. No; Mr. Speaker, it was a ceremony which any American would have been proud to see, conducted in accordance with Federal regulations but with a dignity and sincerity that reflected the deep love these young people have for America and her flag.

Held under a moonlit sky beneath towering pine trees, the flag burning was conducted by approximately 75 cadette and senior Girl Scouts attending Camp Yough in Elizabeth Township. They watched as the flag was placed into the fire and burst, almost instantly, into flames. As the glare died, an emotion filled stillness settled over the girls. Then, softly but clearly, they sang the words to "Taps" and listened to the haunting echo which came back from some of their companions gathered under some nearby pines.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of these girls for their demonstration of patriotism. I regret I cannot personally commend each of them, but I can congratulate them through their leaders who arranged the ceremony: Mrs. Robert Ramer and Mrs. Lawrence Broskovic of Liberty, and Mrs. W. D. Mansfield, Jr. of Elizabeth Township.

These scouts and their leaders have shown themselves to be the kind of Americans we can all look to with pride. I salute them.

**CUBAN EXILE COMMUNITY UNITES
BEHIND EFFORT TO PLAN PRO-
GRAM TO RID CUBA OF CASTRO**

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as I have stated publicly many times, it appears to me that some actions being taken against the Cuban exile community by the Department of State are contrary to the stated policies of the Nixon administration and the Guam doctrine of encouraging the people of a subjugated country to win back their own freedom from communism.

Recent intimidating moves against Cuban exiles for attempting to penetrate Cuba and rebuild organized resistance to the Castro regime bear witness to what I have said. Moreover, such moves are contrary to the wishes of many of our friends in Latin America.

A case in point is Costa Rica. On June 6, Costa Rica's Foreign Minister, Gonzalo Facio, attended a dinner in Miami honoring Horacio Aguirre as "Man of the Year." Senor Aguirre is the distinguished editor of Miami's *Diario las Americas* newspaper.

In honoring Senor Aguirre, Foreign Minister Facio pointed out that there are centers of rebellion against Castro inside Castro's Communist Cuba which can, and should, be encouraged and exploited by freedom-loving nations in cooperation with the Cuban exiles. Senor Facio called for some action from out-

side Cuba to act as a "catalyst" for "an internal uprising."

But we find our State Department repressing all resistance to Castro through a thoroughly negative and narrowly interpreted legal position. Under State Department guidance, our Federal authorities have moved, and are still moving, to stifle exile action groups to carry out precisely the strategy suggested by Costa Rica's Foreign Minister.

In his speech, Senor Facio laid both the legal and moral basis for the overthrow of a regime which, backed by Russia and China, is subverting the nations of this hemisphere. I believe that he is correct in his analysis.

And I also commend to you the statement made by a united Cuban exile community. Among those who have signed this statement are two ex-presidents of Cuba, two ex-vice presidents, Castro's own sister Juanita, former speaker of the house and the author of Cuba's great 1940 constitution, Dr. Carlos Marquez Sterling.

The statement follows:

**STATEMENT OF POSITION—CUBAN EXILE
COMMUNITY**

Our fundamental conviction is that Cuba, our country, must be liberated from the Communist regime that represses it. It is no less our conviction that we Cubans have the duty to do so—within the limits of respect which we hold for the laws of the United States.

We therefore declare the following:

We cannot accept the position of the Department of State as transmitted to Cuban exile leaders "to apply certain norms or measures to any person or organization that combats the Cuban regime from this country or a third country (if such person or organization is headquartered in the United States)." Some measures have already been initiated against certain Cubans for combatting the Castro regime.

OUR POSITION

Our declarations are not formulated out of mere ego nor made to promote useless confrontations at the expense of harming the historic ties that have always linked the destiny of our two countries.

Our struggle is deeply rooted in Christian ethic and democratic thought and cannot be analyzed, much less judged, by narrow legal interpretations.

Our right to fight for Cuba also involves the security of a continent now threatened by Communist aggression based in Cuba, and is made in support of the preservation of the democratic institutions of the entire Western Hemisphere.

Our declaration, our position, is stimulated by the announced decision of the Department of State. They have a two-fold purpose. One is to express to the American public our cause; the other represents a respectful appeal to the President of the United States to rectify the errors made by officials of his departments and agencies. In our judgment, actions taken by such officials are wrong and violate the spirit of justice which is the foundation of this great nation.

OUR MUTUAL HISTORY

Joint Resolution of 1898.—The destiny of the Cuban nation was linked to that of the United States through the Joint Resolution of Congress signed by President McKinley on April 20. The resolution recognizes the right of the Cuban people to be free and independent and provided for assistance to the Cuban people to end Spanish domination.

The Bay of Pigs.—Sixty-three years later, the American nation, in just alliance with the Cubans, again linked its destiny with Cuba. On April 17, 1961, Cuban and American blood ran at the Bay of Pigs in order to put an end to the totalitarian regime that today continues to oppress the Cubans.

Neutrality Laws.—On April 20, 1961, only three days following the Bay of Pigs disaster, the then Attorney General of the United States, Robert Kennedy, said of the neutrality laws:

"They are among the oldest laws on our statute books, and not designed for the kind of situation which exists in the world today. They were not designed to prevent individuals from leaving the United States to fight for a cause in which they believed. There is nothing in those laws which prevents refugees from Cuba from returning to that country to engage in fighting for freedom."

Title 18, Section 960 of the U.S. Code (one of the neutrality laws) prohibits certain actions against a nation with which the United States "is at peace"—a "friendly nation." Clearly, Fidel Castro is not "at peace" with the United States and, by breaking diplomatic relations on January 3, 1961, the United States recognizes that Cuba is hardly a "friendly nation." We therefore conclude that this part of the "neutrality laws" cannot be applied against Cubans who are "fighting for freedom."

Joint Resolution of 1962—Public Law 87-733.—"The purpose of the resolution is to provide a means of expressing national unity regarding U.S. policies toward Cuba. To this end, the resolution declares the determination of the United States—

"(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;

"(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and

"(c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination."

This resolution, signed by President John F. Kennedy on October 3, 1961 is known as Public Law 87-733. As such, it has the force of law and represents the latest and strongest national position on Cuba.

We consider it to be against this law when members of the Executive branch of government applies measures and dispositions intended to prevent the Cubans from regaining their country.

We would also point out that a number of international agreements have been signed by the United States which uphold the right of "freedom-loving Cubans" to fight for their country. One of these came out of the VIII Meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the OAS in July, 1964.

In its Declaration to the Cuban People the Council expressed: "Its deepest hope that the Cuban people, strengthened by confidence in the solidarity with them of the other American peoples and governments, will be able, by their own endeavor, very soon to liberate themselves from the tyranny of the communist regime that oppresses them and to establish in that country a government freely elected by the will of the people that will assure respect for fundamental human rights."

It is the solidarity and spirit of the Joint Resolution of 1962 and the Declaration to the Cuban People that guide us in our efforts against the Communist regime in Cuba.

THE NIXON DOCTRINE

Though we fight to put an end to Communist slavery in our country and to a regime that threatens freedom in the Americas,

we have not solicited the armed support of other nations nor endangered their security. Our principles are, in fact, strengthened by the Nixon Doctrine which recognizes "the right to assistance and help by any people who, through their own efforts and dedication, fight against the oppressive forces of international Communism."

Vietnam, Cambodia, Cuba.—The spirit of universal justice contained in previous declarations, and the Nixon Doctrine, is apparent in interpretations surrounding the war in Southeast Asia. It is not evident in the prevention of Cubans from liberating their country only 90 miles away.

Cuban boys are fighting and dying in Vietnam and Cambodia for the same ideals that Cubans declare their right to fight for their own country. It is inexplicable to us that similar cases provoke entirely different interpretations and response from the same government.

CONGRESS HAS SPOKEN, STILL SPEAKS

It is clear from the record of Congressional action taken in the United States that the will of the people has been measured. It is no less clear that an increasing number of Congressmen today recognize the danger and support our cause.

Our cause is mutual. The United States and Cuba are two peoples formed from the same crucible of revolution against outside force. One of us has lost our country; but we have not lost our cause.

For these reasons we not only direct our appeal to the people of the United States but to their President, confident that the actions taken by members of the Government will be corrected. We recall with pride and emotion the words spoken by President Nixon on October 12, 1968:

"There is also on record a commitment which a new administration will reaffirm to the Cuban people. We do not accept as permanent the existence of Cuba as a Caribbean colony of the Soviet empire."

SIGNATURES

- Dr. Carlos Prio Socarras;
- Consejo Nacional de Veteranos de la Guerra de Independencia de Cuba;
- Luis Varona;
- Andres Rivero Aguero;
- Alpha-66;
- Juanita Castro;
- Dr. Carlos Marquez Sterling;
- Accion Revolucionaria Democratica;
- Dr. Gustavo Cuervo Rubio;
- Representacion Cubana del Exilio (RECE);
- Dr. Rafael Guas Inclan;
- Movimiento Revolucionaria (MIRR);
- Dr. Eduardo Suarez Rivas;
- Comite La Verdad Sobre Cuba, Luis Manrara;
- Dr. Lincoln Rodon;
- Municipios de Cuba en el Exilio, Carlos Jones;
- Antonio Maceo;
- Alianza Revolucionaria Democratica;
- Ejercito de Liberacion Nacional;
- Agrupacion Montecristi;
- Asociacion Nacionalista Cubana;
- Movimiento Nacionalista Montecristi;
- Movimiento Democratico Martiano;
- Movimiento Anticomunista Feminino;
- Municipios Independientes de Cuba;
- Marina de Guerra;
- Comando del MRRS;
- Comandos Revolucionaries "Los Pinos Nuevos";
- Comite de Lucha Pro-Libertad Presos Politicos de Cuba;
- Organization Revolucionaria Anti-Comunista;
- Accion Democratic Cubana;
- Union de Liberacion Nacional;
- Movimiento Anti-comunista;
- Ejercito en Armas Unidos;
- Agrupacion Patriotica Insurreccional de Cuba;
- Movimiento Democratico Revolucionario;

- Comite Pro-Unidad Cubana en el Exilio;
- Judicatura Cubana Democratica, Mr. Manuel Navas;
- Asociacion Medicos Veterinarios;
- Colegio de Abogados de La Habana, Dr. Pedro G. Mendive;
- Colegio Medico de Cuba en el Exilio, Dr. Enrique Huertas;
- Colegio de Pedagogos;
- Colegio de Enfermeros y Enfermeras;
- Colegio de Dentistas;
- Colegio de Doctores de Filosofia y Letras;
- Colegio Nacional de Abogados en el Exilio, William Hodge Morales;
- Federacion de Educadores;
- Colegio de Arquitectos;
- Colegio Nacional de Abogados, Dr. Humberto Quinones de Sol;
- Asociacion de Contadores Publicos y Privados de Cuba;
- Corporaciones Economicas de Cuba en el Exilio, Virgilio Perez Lopez;
- Federacion de Trabajadores Telefonicos de Cuba;
- Accion Sindical Independiente;
- Federacion Nacional Obrera del Transporte;
- Federacion de Trabajadores de Plantas Electricas, Angel Coño;
- Movimiento Obrero Nacional Anti-Comunista;
- Accion Juvenil Obrera;
- Frente Obrero Anti-Comunista;
- Union de Dependientes y Cigarreros del Ramo del Tabaco; and
- Colegio de Procuradores.

INDUSTRIAL PARK NEEDS PUSH

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Butte industrial park project was awarded a grant from the Economic Development Administration. These Federal funds will allow the industrial park to become a reality and the project will be of inestimable value to Butte and the surrounding areas. Many firms are already committed to developing the park and the expected business response to the project will result in the diversification of Butte's economy and the building of a more solid economic base.

The grant for the park was not easily come by. It took a concerted effort by community, organizational, and industrial leaders, along with an all-out drive by the Montana congressional delegation and the administrative agencies to obtain the necessary funds. The Montana delegation worked very closely on this project under the expert leadership of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, just one example of what can be gained by having a delegation in Congress that works as a team. Senator MANSFIELD is to be complimented and congratulated for the role he played in leading the delegation.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, at this point I would like to insert two articles from recent editions of the Montana Standard:

[From the Montana Standard-Butte Daily Post, June 7, 1970]

INDUSTRIAL PARK NEEDS PUSH

Butte's proposed industrial park could be in serious trouble, and the reason could be that the Republican administration in Wash-

ington doesn't care for Silver Bow County's Democratic voting habit.

This is an election year, with the House and part of the Senate up for grabs. Montana's all-Democratic congressional delegation and Silver Bow County's Democratic history may work against us in getting the final okay on federal funds for the park.

The situation is this. Ground was to have been broken about June 1 for the park south of Butte. The application for federal funds, prepared by the Butte Model City Agency, received approval at the regional office in Seattle.

The hangup is in Washington, where the Economic Development Administration says the park is a good idea, but that funds for this fiscal year ending June 30 already are committed.

This is the first that local officials heard about all EDA funds for this fiscal year being committed. There had been every indication that funds for the park were available.

What is needed now is a concerted effort by community, organizational and industrial leaders to help spring the money loose. At the close of the fiscal year a number of applicants for EDA funds back out, for one reason or another. Some of these funds could be made available for the Butte industrial park.

Some Butte industries or businesses have executives who supported or directly aided the Nixon presidential campaign. Now is an excellent time for these executives to impress upon the administration the urgency for park financing.

And other persons and groups—labor unions, service clubs, the chamber of commerce—should contact Sen. Mike Mansfield and Rep. Arnold Olsen so they can not only work for a freeing of funds, but also can show real back-home support for the park.

If funds are not released prior to June 30, and are delayed until the next fiscal year beginning July 1, Butte could lose the two industries pledged to the park.

They are Computer Consultants Inc., which expects to ultimately hire as many as 750 persons if the park goes through, and a mineral research center which will be set up in the park through a grant to the Montana Tech Foundation.

Both want into the park, but neither is likely to wait if the park is delayed another year. And if funds are put off to the next fiscal year, it could mean a delay of some six months, pushing park construction off until the spring of 1971.

If this happens, Computer Consultants likely will go elsewhere, and the research center may go to another Butte site. The center is needed in the industrial park to help boost further park development by encouraging other industries to join a going operation.

The industrial park is one necessary ingredient for the economic turn-around Butte needs so badly. It and the industries ready to build in it are vital not only for their real contributions to the economy, but also the psychological life that the whole operation will provide.

The community and its leadership must move now to do all possible to assure that the Butte industrial park gets the needed financing to get under way this summer.

[From the Butte-Anaconda (Mont.) Montana Standard-Post, June 17, 1970]

OPINION AND COMMENT—A RED LETTER DAY FOR BUTTE AREA

The announcement in Butte of a grant for the development of an industrial park constitutes a red letter day for Butte and the surrounding area.

A lead-pipe cinch for the park is a mineral research center to be constructed by the Montana Tech Foundation. That operation will employ 25 to 50 people with strong potential for expansion.

Next in line is Computer Consultants Inc., which plans a computer components assembly plant employing 150 to 200 people, also with strong potentiality for expansion. This is a young firm, headed by a former Butte man, and offers much promise.

Other firms also have expressed interest, including General Electric which would build a service shop in the park.

The important thing is that the park is assured. It will offer prime industrial land at a nominal price. Initially some land in the park may be sold to industry, but the aim is to rent the sites so the Butte Local Development Corp. has a continuous source of funds with which to help finance and assist new developments in the park.

Many persons and groups were involved in securing final authorization and financing for the park, including Sen. Mike Mansfield, Rep. Arnold Olsen and Sen. Lee Metcalf who worked to spring the grant loose this fiscal year. When it appeared that funds may not have been made available now, many community leaders, including prominent Republicans who had assisted the Nixon campaign in 1968, contacted friends in Washington.

Most credit for the park, however, must go to James Murphy, Butte Model City director, who presented the park idea at a November 1969 meeting, showed how it could be done, rammed ahead with the necessary paper work and applications, and pushed the program through a tangle of federal red tape. Only seven months elapsed from idea to approve federal funds, and that's some kind of record.

And without the Anaconda Co., which donated the 125-acre park site to the local development corporation, the park would not have gotten past the idea stage.

Others playing significant roles in getting the park were Tom Perrick, rookie industrial development specialist on the Model City staff, and the development corporation itself which is the sponsoring agency.

It took lots of hard work, lots of long hours, lots of persuasion and some temporary frustration, but the park now is assured. And with it Butte has a good chance to diversify its economy, to build a more solid economic base, and to continue to move ahead, thanks to the cooperation and work of many. It was a red letter day.

A POSITION ON OPERATIONS INTO CAMBODIA AND THE EFFECTS THEY WILL HAVE

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, as U.S. troops are withdrawing from Cambodia, it is necessary to reexamine the premature criticism leveled against President Nixon's decision to seek and destroy the enemy sanctuaries there.

It appears certain that all U.S. troops will have been withdrawn by the end of June. The results of the incursion operations have been impressive. Our troops have seized enough individual weapons to equip over 50 enemy battalions including: 20,400 individual weapons, 2,400 crew-served weapons, 42,400 rocket rounds, 64,600 mortar rounds, and 5,400 landmines. Enough rice to feed over 12,000 enemy soldiers for 1 year was captured while 10,900 storage bunkers and barrack bunkers were destroyed. These

figures roughly approximate 50 to 60 percent of the total supplies stored in Cambodia by the enemy. According to Defense Department figures of June 23, 1970, over 11,000 of the enemy had been killed.

Obviously, most of the supplies can be eventually replaced, but there are other less apparent results of the Cambodian action which may have profound effects upon the enemy. Morale among the South Vietnamese Army regulars was boosted to its highest point of the war, while enemy troops appear scattered and less likely to attack. Monsoon rains will soon make the replacement of large amounts of fresh supplies difficult if not impossible. Large cities in both Vietnam and Cambodia seem less vulnerable to large-scale attack from enemy staging grounds in Cambodia.

U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, Ellsworth Bunker said that because of the Cambodian operation, it would take the enemy 10 months before it will function in the "same magnitude" as before the allied attack. Former Under Secretary of State, Elliot Richardson stated on May 10 that the allies had discovered more ammunition than the Communists normally use over a 10-month period.

It is still possible that the militarily weak anti-Communist government in Cambodia will collapse under the force of Communist maneuvering in Southeast Asia. The President's decision on Cambodia was designed only to protect the more than 400,000 American troops in South Vietnam and hasten U.S. withdrawal. The President is basically involved in a policy aimed at limiting or ending the use of U.S. combat troops on the Southeast Asia mainland, especially on a unilateral basis. Movement into Cambodia meant to aid in ending the war rather than increasing it.

The President seeks to avoid another Vietnam-type war which will use American manpower. His plans call for the unification of the countries of Southeast Asia so that they can provide their own men to fight Communist guerrilla insurgencies. It is probable that the United States could still aid in such conflicts by providing arms, supplies, and advice.

The President believed that his Cambodian decision would not escalate the war and he made this crystal clear during his nationwide television address on the eve of the military action. In fact, the President has stated on a number of occasions that the U.S. policy in East Asia will have as one of its major goals the inducement of the nations of that area to move toward collective self-defense.

Both President Nixon and his Assistant for National Security Affairs, Dr. Henry Kissinger, have expressed the belief that America's allies have become lax under U.S. defense guarantees and that they have no incentive to work toward a collective defense effort.

In an article for the Brookings Institution's "Agenda for the Nation," Dr. Kissinger listed as one of the four conditions for an effective alliance "a penalty for noncooperation—that is, the possibility of being refused assistance must exist otherwise protection will be taken for granted and the mutuality of obligation will break down."

President Nixon was faced with a difficult decision in April when the Cambodian Government submitted an urgent request for military assistance. His decision to send troops for limited action was only a compromise. Apparently, the risks involved were much less than the American public was led to believe by critics of the war. The advantages gained have been truly remarkable.

On June 3, President Nixon said the Cambodian action was the most successful operation of this long and difficult war—all our major military objectives have been achieved. He added that the arms, equipment, ammunition, and food captured were nearly equal to those captured in all of Vietnam last year. The President said that one of the most "dramatic" developments had been "the splendid performance of the South Vietnamese Army in the field."

In an interview with U.S. News & World Report—May 11—Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird said:

Cambodia presents an opportunity for application of the "Nixon doctrine" for Asia, which would mean a reduction not only in American involvement in Asian combat but an increase in military assistance to our Asian friends unlikely to launch a major military assistance program in Cambodia.

During a news conference on May 8, President Nixon asserted that if future attacks into Cambodia became necessary, South Vietnamese forces would handle the assignment alone.

One of the most pressing issues facing the administration at the present time is whether U.S. military commitments to other countries should be reduced in light of what has occurred in Vietnam. In many cases a commitment to give military or economic aid does not imply that the United States will intervene in the defense of a country.

The methods and concepts of war have changed greatly in the past 10 years. Five nations now hold nuclear capabilities and the world has recognized that they are too dangerous for any nation to employ. Mass armies no longer march across borders to meet opposing massed armies. Wars have become political subversions and tend to last longer and seemingly test the endurance of those engaged.

With limitations of Presidential powers becoming an issue of the day, perhaps it is time to begin reevaluating all U.S. treaty commitments and decide exactly what they entail. Certainly many of our treaties and especially our United Nations involvement have proved ineffective and have fallen short of those objectives for which they were designed.

Critics of the President's actions in Cambodia should reexamine not merely the issue of Cambodian involvement but the broader issues of treaty commitments across the world and the ineffectiveness of the United Nations to solve problems in Vietnam.

Legislation which seeks to limit Presidential power by limiting funds is merely the wrong approach to solving problems posed by our present commitments in Vietnam.

I feel that the Tonkin Gulf Resolution of 1964 should be repealed. Concurrently the United States should start a careful

review of all military commitments and decide how effective they are in light of what has happened in Vietnam, I believe that the President has been within his limits of power in protecting our troops during the withdrawal period. I also believe that the present program of Vietnamization will continue to be effective.

At the same time, I do not feel that Presidential power should be limited by legislation calling for the elimination of funds to support our present effort. I am sincerely in favor of ending the war at the first opportunity, but I cannot believe that this will be done by setting a date to cut off funds.

The McGovern-Hatfield "end the war" amendment is merely a camouflaged attempt to limit the President's power and may only serve to limit his effectiveness in bringing about Vietnamization and an end to our troop commitments. I refuse to believe that such proposals are dealing with the real issues at stake.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AID SMALL BUSINESS IN MEETING FEDERAL OR STATE POLLUTION CONTROL STANDARDS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, for appropriate reference, a bill similar to S. 3528, introduced by Senator McINTYRE, designed to assist small business concerns in conforming with new pollution standards. The bill would also aid in encouraging small businessmen in the development and utilization of new and improved methods of waste disposal and pollution control. It authorizes the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, after consultation with appropriate governmental agencies, to include in the Administration's regular loans programs equipment, facilities, or machinery so designed as to prevent, control, or minimize environmental pollution.

Increasing awareness of the dangers inherent in the deterioration of our environment has prompted Congress and various State legislatures to enact legislation to cope with this problem. Undoubtedly, interest in these problems will be greatly expanded during this decade.

An increased emphasis will be placed on enforcement by requiring firms contributing to pollution to make necessary changes in plant and equipment. Requirements and new standards must, out of necessity, be drawn in such a way that compliance will be assured.

Many small business concerns will be hard pressed for available funds to meet requirements as new enforcement programs are established, and the very existence of large numbers of small businesses will be threatened if they cannot meet the statutory requirements. This bill would assure that small business loans would be available to help meet this need. The bill is also designed to

make loans to encourage the small business sector of our economy to develop and utilize new and improved methods of waste disposal and pollution control.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that it is not the purpose of this bill to in any way remove or exempt small business from meeting standards or requirements under any environmental bill presently enacted or proposed in the future. It is my hope that this bill will constitute a vehicle by which small businesses can be encouraged to comply with and develop new methods whereby early eradication of environmental pollution can be accomplished, and I ask my colleagues to join me in this endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the bill to be printed at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 18191

A bill to amend the Small Business Act to encourage the development and utilization of new and improved methods of waste disposal and pollution control; to assist small business concerns to effect conversions required to meet Federal or State pollution control standards; and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7(a) of the Small Business Act is amended—

(1) by striking "paragraph (5)" in paragraph (4) and inserting "paragraphs (5) and (8)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(8) The Administrator shall require that any equipment, facilities, or machinery to be acquired with assistance under this subsection be so designed as to prevent, control, or minimize environmental pollution which might otherwise result therefrom in accordance with such standards as the Administrator shall prescribe after consultation with the appropriate governmental agencies. In the processing of applications for financial assistance under this subsection the Administrator shall give priority to those applications which he determines will further the development or utilization of new and improved methods of waste disposal or pollution control. The rate of interest for the Administration's share of any loan with respect to which such determination has been made shall not exceed the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date of the loan and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum, plus one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 7(b) of the Small Business Act is amended—

(1) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting "; and"; and

(2) by adding after paragraph (5) a new paragraph as follows:

"(6) to make such loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis) as the Administration determines to be necessary or appropriate to assist any small business concern in effecting additions to or alterations in its plant, facilities, or methods of operation to meet requirements for the prevention or control of environmental pollution imposed by Federal or State law, if the Administration determines that such concern is likely to suffer substantial economic injury without assistance under this paragraph."

(b) The third sentence of section 7(b) of such Act is amended by striking "or (5)" and inserting "; (5), or (6)".

(c) Section 4(c) (1) of such Act is amended by inserting "7(b) (6)", after "7(b) (5)".

AGRICULTURE AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, recently—and unfortunately it has only been recently—our national concern has focused on the environment and man's pollution of his planet; but I believe that we often forget that agriculture is, as much as any livelihood, tied very closely with ecology and continued ecological balance. If our manipulations of the environment upset our agricultural capabilities, then our peoples might well face shortages of sufficient foodstuffs for our continued survival.

I include in the RECORD an article entitled "Human Needs and Environmental Quality," written by Dr. N. C. Brady, the director of research and director of the Cornell University agricultural experiment station—a man eminently qualified to speak on the question of agriculture and the environment. His article which appeared in New York's Food and Life Sciences Quarterly follows:

HUMAN NEEDS AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

(By N. C. Brady)

Agriculture's reason for being is to meet basic human needs. Supplying healthful nutritious food is our first objective. We provide other essential products used for clothing, shelter, and industrial raw materials. Furthermore, the natural resources of our great outdoors provide not only material wealth but aesthetic satisfaction so essential to our well-being. And in our immediate surroundings plants and animals, mostly products of agriculture's efforts, provide us with enjoyment we can obtain in no other way.

Agriculture has succeeded in varying degrees in meeting these human needs. Our highly efficient production and marketing systems have been most successful in providing us with food and fiber at low relative costs. Unfortunately, this efficiency has required production systems and new chemical inputs which in some cases threaten to reduce our ability to meet another of our basic human needs—a clean wholesome environment. This dual responsibility—meeting the needs for food, fiber, and aesthetic satisfaction, and maintaining environmental quality (EQ)—is truly agriculture's major challenge of the decades ahead.

There are some who contend that agriculture has no concern for the environment. They couldn't be farther from the truth. Agriculture's very existence is dependent upon a favorable environment, not only for man, but for plants and animals as well. Regardless of the region, or the state of technology, agriculture's use of the soil, water, and air resources continually reminds the industry of its dependence upon a favorable environment.

The relationship between agriculture and its environment has not always been compatible nor mutually beneficial, however. Agriculture has suffered from an unfavorable environment, especially as evidenced by in-

adequate moisture. Also from the earliest days of settlement, there have been abuses and excesses in agriculture's manipulation of nature. The best example is that of soil erosion. In colonial times when soils were depleted, new land was acquired or cleared, but as prime agricultural lands became fully occupied and centers of civilization moved closer to the areas of production, agriculture realized that it could no longer permit its soils to wash away. The Dust Bowl Era and the soil conservation movement were indeed the turning points in American agriculture.

The concept of soil conservation was initially difficult to put across, but when the benefits were demonstrated, cultural methods to keep valuable top soil in place eventually became basic, accepted practices of intensive crop production. Farm ponds, terraced slopes, and grassed waterways likewise proved their worth in the scheme to preserve water and soil resources for agricultural uses. These practices have had tremendous social benefits too, in terms of preventing accumulation of silt in great reservoirs, lakes, and streams, and providing abundant water supplies for aesthetic, recreational and other practical uses for all of society.

The intense competition, advanced technology, and highly commercial aspects of modern farming have brought new problems to agriculture's environment. The use of chemicals to control devastating insects and diseases, and to supplement soil nutrients for high-yielding crops have come into common practice. Animal production is being confined to huge feed lots to enhance management efficiency and to reduce the labor and equipment costs of unit production. Where these practices have been carried to excess or where poor judgment was exercised, agriculture has found them to be self-defeating.

Concern for the effects of agriculture on the environment is not new to science. For many years, agricultural researchers have worked to develop fertilizer, feeds, crops, and animals that were optimally suited to their purposes and surroundings, that would resist or tolerate pests, or that would be more fully utilized and reduce the problems of contamination and waste. This search is still going on and almost daily new knowledge is being reported. Biological controls, quickly degradable compounds, and resistant varieties are among the developments that reduce the need for pesticides. Chemicals specific in their effect on target organisms have been developed as have those which chemically attract or sterilize the unwanted pests with a minimum of damage to non-target organisms. New designs and techniques that conserve soil and water, processing technology that re-uses water or passes it along unimpaired for other uses, and new and useful products from former wastes are some of the exciting examples of agricultural research accomplishment. Likewise, the many ornamental plants developed and utilized by agricultural scientists are major contributions to improved environmental quality.

Despite the progress already made, it is obvious that we are just getting started in a problem area where much remains to be done. Biological controls, acceptable disposal of animal wastes, and ways to delay eutrophication of our lakes, for example, are barely underway in terms of the knowledge required to make sound judgments and implement effective practices.

Agriculture joins with the rest of society in expressing its concern with the seeming deterioration of some aspects of our environment. At the same time, it recognizes that all human needs must be considered as we seek to improve environmental quality. Furthermore, emphasis must be given to science and education if we are to develop the new and improved systems which minimize pollution while continuing to satisfy man's need for food, fiber, and aesthetic enjoyment.

Adequately supported, agricultural scientists can contribute much to all of society and many industries outside of agriculture in the crucial years ahead. Their professional skills and ability to work with nature's dynamic environment can be of great value in reconciling human needs with the preservation of a wholesome, natural environment.

AMBASSADOR KNOWS RUSS AIM

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Ray McHugh is chief of the Washington bureau of Copley News Service. He is a distinguished correspondent who shows with each piece he writes a keen analytical approach to news reporting. Moreover, as an interpreter of current international developments, he brings insight and understanding to complex issues.

Mr. McHugh has just written a series of articles on the Middle East. In these, he points to the basic friendliness many Arabs have for America and their unwillingness to see their nations fall under Soviet domination. He notes the forward strides being made by Iran, the precarious position of Lebanon, and the critical problems of Egypt.

As one who shares his basic respect for the Arab peoples, and who hopes that America will not write off this vast section of the world, I want each of my colleagues to have an opportunity to read Mr. McHugh's works:

[From the Aurora (Ill.) Beacon-News,
May 13, 1970]

AMBASSADOR KNOWS RUSS AIM

(By Ray McHugh)

TEHRAN, IRAN.—It is one of those curious quirks of history that finds Douglas MacArthur III stationed as U.S. ambassador to Iran at a time when the Soviet Union has mounted its most determined bid for domination of the Middle East and access to the warm waters of the Persian Gulf and the oceans beyond.

It was August, 1939, when a young MacArthur, working his way up the state department ladder, was ordered to Moscow with a personal message for Soviet Premier Joseph Stalin from President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

American diplomats in Europe had learned that a Soviet-German pact was imminent. Roosevelt's letter was an appeal to Stalin not to enter into any agreement with Adolf Hitler.

"I traveled by train from Paris to Berlin to Warsaw and finally to Moscow," MacArthur recalls. "When I finally arrived, I learned that the agreement had been signed the night before.

"It was probably too late to change any decisions, but one will always wonder."

Little more than a week later Hitler invaded Poland and World War II was under way.

While in Moscow, MacArthur and other U.S. diplomats learned from anti-Hitler Germans one of the secret clauses of that agreement—a clause that was not made public until after the war.

"The two governments agree," it said, "that the area in the general direction of the Persian Gulf is recognized as the center of the aspirations of the Soviet Union."

The clause was remembered in the wartime big three conferences, including the 1949

meeting of Roosevelt, Stalin and Winston Churchill here in Tehran, and in the immediate postwar period.

Roosevelt and Churchill rejected in sequence Stalin's demand for control over the Dardanelles that lead from the Black Sea into the Mediterranean, his demand that Libya in North Africa and Eritrea on the east coast of Africa be made Soviet mandates, his bid for creation of a Kurdish state that would have been carved out of lands belonging to Iran, Turkey and Iraq.

After the war, when the Soviet army broke its pledge to withdraw from Iran within six months after the end of hostilities—a deadline that the United States and Britain both beat—and Soviet agents set up a puppet regime in the Caspian Sea province of Azerbaijan, it was only vigorous pressure by the Truman administration within the security council of the United Nations and courageous direct military action by the Iranian Army and the Shah that toppled the would-be Soviet puppets and returned the province to Tehran's control.

Those lessons were too soon forgotten. Attention shifted to Berlin, to eastern Europe and the Balkans, to the vast mainland of China. But Russian ambitions, spelled out in the 1939 pact and directly linked to a policy laid down at the 1815 Congress of Vienna by Czar Alexander I, continued to burn in the Kremlin.

"The history of this situation must not be overlooked in any assessment of Soviet ambitions," said one high U.S. official.

"What we are seeing in the Middle East and South Asia today is not a natural spread of Communist or socialist ideology, but rather a continuation of age-old Russian ambitions, aided and abetted by radical nationalism that Moscow encourages at the expense of feudal, almost medieval conditions in many countries.

"Iran, thanks to the forward-looking policies of the Shah, has become a bastion against the Russians, but consider what has happened in other parts of the Moslem world in recent years:

"For 60 years after the defeat of the Russian navy by the Japanese in the war of 1905-1906, no Russian warship ventured into the Persian Gulf. Last year there were three 'courtesy visits.'

"Iraq and Syria are totally dominated by Moscow.

"Egypt has become dependent on Soviet arms.

"Sudan, Libya and Algeria have radical leftist governments. Eritrea is a hotbed of subversion.

"The Russians have established a strong naval force in the Mediterranean.

"South Yemen has become one of the most radical of states with the Russians and Chinese Reds vying for influence.

"And now Britain is scheduled to leave the Persian Gulf in 1971, leaving to an uncertain future its whole network of sheikhdoms and protectorates that have been guarded for 150 years by the 'plate glass' of British military presence."

[From Copley News Service]

IRAN PUSHES VILLAGE EDUCATION PLAN

(By Ray McHugh)

TEHRAN, IRAN.—In what it calls a holy war against ignorance, Iran is taking boys and girls on graduation from high school and sending them to remote villages to live in one-room mud huts and help less fortunate countrymen bridge a chasm of centuries.

In this nation of 30 million people, only 30 to 40 per cent can read and write. More than half have no knowledge of modern medical treatment. In hidden mountain villages meager crops are coaxed from the soil with methods that were old at the time of Christ.

The shah of Iran who is driving his na-

tion into the 20th Century in an aggressive "white revolution," has now turned his well-developed army into what promises to be a huge domestic "peace corps."

The program may become a model for developing countries throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America. It also may be a crucial element in the shah's determined drive to establish Iranian leadership in the Persian Gulf region before the area falls to radical elements allied with Russia.

American officials, concerned with reform of U.S. draft laws and the ambitions of many young people to perform national service outside the military area, also are studying the program. Some of its features are not unlike the "national service corps" idea put forward in 1966 by former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

"There is no other way that we could attack our problem," says Dr. Hussein Banai, director of Iran's education corps and also leader of the country's Boy Scout movement.

"If we spent 10 times as much—money we don't have—we could not expect the same results."

In an interview, Banai said Iran has 55,000 villages. Ten thousand, he said, are virtually untouched by any kind of government program.

"About 19,000 now have some kind of school," he said. "We hope that within two to three years all villages with a population of 200 or more will have classrooms; within 10 to 12 years we hope to put a school into every village in Iran that will offer at least the minimum fourth-grade education for children and adults."

Banai calls the program the "gate" to Iran's future.

"We must open this gate to education. We must teach our people to read and write before we can begin to school them in the whole complex social and technical changes that are necessary. Literacy is not the end of this program. It is only the beginning."

Each male high school graduate in Iran is drafted for two years of military service at the age of 18. A series of tests selects who will work in the educational and agricultural corps. All medical students are automatically assigned to the health corps for two years upon graduation.

Each corpsman receives 200 hours of military basic training, and 350 hours of instruction in teaching, public hygiene, sanitation, basic agriculture, etc.

About 50 per cent of the male high school graduates are now being taken into the corps. The pay scale is identical to military grades and ranges from \$45-\$70 a month. The army provides transport and logistical support for the program.

In eight years, the education corps has sent 60,000 boys into the village.

It is now handling 5,000 newcomers every six months and Banai says 33,000 who have finished their service have voluntarily gone back to villages as teachers. They must agree to serve a minimum of three years. If they serve five years, they receive certificates entitling them to teach in Iran's larger cities which boast regular public school systems.

The activities of each soldier-teacher are checked about 30 times a year, Banai says. Youths who are anxious for a college education are allowed to work on correspondence courses that are augmented by two months' attendance at a college or teachers' institute each summer.

So far, Banai says, about 1.5 million illiterates have been taught to read and write.

Girls were allowed to volunteer for the program two years ago. They, too, undergo six months of military and corps training.

"The girls really are doing a better job than the men," says Banai. "We now have 3,500 in the villages and we hope to send

4,000 a year into the program. They are changing the face of whole villages. Adult classes are growing. The women are less timid about girl teachers.

"In one village in a northerly forest region, one girl actually convinced the people that they needed a farm-to-market road and then she helped lay out a 12-kilometer road."

The Iranians are getting some unexpected benefits from the program. It is minimizing the complaints of some youths about forced service, it is giving the army a new image among the peasant population—boys and girls in the corps all wear military-type uniforms—and it is bringing various isolated sections of the country's society into contact with other regions, stirring a new national pride.

Iran is a country as large as that section of the United States east of the Mississippi River, but for centuries it has lacked the roads and communications that bind nations together.

"In a real sense," Banai claims, "we are introducing our universities to our villages and, in turn, we have already gathered more information about our villages than has been available at any time in the last 25 centuries."

A fledgling computer center in Tehran is attempting to program this information with other demographic data collected in national censuses in 1955 and 1965. The 1955 census was the first in the history of the country.

In addition to their teaching duties, each boy and girl soldier must organize the villagers to build classrooms as a community project.

"I expect to build 2,500 schools this year," Banai says. "They may be primitive by U.S. standards, but it would cost the government at least \$10 million to accomplish this—and I don't think we could do it."

The government is spending about \$10 million on the male portion of the program and has earmarked \$4.5 million to train the girls. The funds have been drawn from the defense budget. The Education Ministry furnishes the new classrooms.

The greatest change may be in the outlook of Iran's women. In traditional Moslem fashion, most women remain in their father's house until they are married. Except in a few large cities where Western ways have penetrated, women in Iran have followed age-old patterns.

"Now for the first time," Banai said, "we are giving our women a true role in a major national program. We are opening a 'gate' for them, too."

[From the Joliet (Ill.) Herald-News, May 28, 1970]

EGYPTIAN INFERIORITY COMPLEX

(By Ray McHugh)

CAIRO.—Official Egypt wears a brave face but when the mask slips a visitor sees a fear much deeper than concern over Israel.

A few days in hot and dusty Cairo, in the teeming streets of Alexandria and along the people-packed banks of the Nile leave one wondering if President Gamal Abdel Nasser could afford peace. Some say peace could open the way for unparalleled development. But it also could open unparalleled problems to public debate.

Without the trumpeting claims of often imaginary victories over the Israelis, without the constant appeals for Arab unity, without the heavy contributions from oil-rich Arab neighbors, what would happen to Egypt? Can it overcome a kind of national inferiority complex?

Cairo gives a visitor the impression of a not-too-well made clock that is slowly running down, despite some obviously dedicated efforts to speed its movements.

Cars still crowd streets and the big squares along the Nile; shops still offer a reasonable selection of goods, though the quality is generally poor and one is assured that "anything" is available on the black market.

Factories spew clouds of smoke, but production is admittedly slipping behind schedule and behind a remorseless population growth, despite the recent injection of Soviet industrial equipment and personnel.

Universities opened to the rank-and-file Egyptian youngster in 1954 by Nasser now boast more than 80,000 students in Cairo alone. The top 10 per cent of this student body is called "excellent" by qualified judges, but the general level of education seems to range from poor to mediocre.

Nevertheless, even this introduction to higher learning has kindled aspirations and ambitions that Egypt's military-socialist society finds hard to meet.

Agriculture programs keyed to the Aswan Dam project are behind schedule, though the approaches to Alexandria attest that Egyptians, too, can make the desert bloom; it produces perhaps the best cement in the world, but struggles to find markets.

The families who live in 700-year-old hovels along the walls of Old Cairo, near the "city of the Dead" are silent testimony to the housing shortage, though new subdivisions and utilitarian if unattractive blocks of flats dot Giza and Heliopolis.

Corn fields are green with hybrid strains developed on advice of men from the American midwest and vegetable gardens prosper, but so far a deaf ear has been turned to suggestions that the Nile Valley can become a five-crop-a-year vegetable larder for most of Europe—even for Egypt.

The Suez Canal remains closed with its \$200 million annual revenue diverted to the building of huge oil tankers that will never be able to use the waterway.

A \$3 million annual tourist industry has dried to a trickle so thin that a new Sheraton Hotel in Cairo opened in May and found only 10 paying guests for its 20 floors.

An Egyptian pound pegged at \$2.40 is ridiculed by Egyptians who pursue visiting Americans with "pound for a dollar" offers. Government restrictions that allow an Egyptian to convert only \$20 to hard currency when he goes abroad adds to the money pressure.

Where is it all leading?

"I don't know," confesses a former cabinet officer. "We have accomplished a great deal in improved health services, social planning, food distribution, even housing."

"But sometimes I am a pessimist. We seem to be fighting an impossible battle. The odds are so great."

"I suppose we are a nation of 'pyramid builders.' We reach out for dramatic, instant solutions to our problems. The Aswan Dam is the latest example, but I am not at all sure the dam can accomplish all that is expected of it."

What if the war with Israel goes badly, or what if the Aswan Dam fails to fulfill expectations?

"Then," said the former cabinet minister, "I am afraid we would lose faith in ourselves. It has happened before. We would retreat into our own kind of mysticism—a kind that has evolved over a thousand years, fed by the monotony and the inevitability of nature in this part of the world."

"If we fail, we will say, 'This is something Allah did not want.'"

"To a westerner, such an answer may seem like a weak excuse. It is. But it's been used before. It allows us to live with ourselves."

The well-educated former minister's words struck a sharp contrast to the confident carefully chosen phrases an American newsman hears in Egypt's government offices.

A spokesman for President Nasser exudes

confidence. He urges understanding and cooperation with the United States, but he sets a high price.

He demands an end to all military sales to Israel and U.S. support for the immediate, unqualified withdrawal of Israeli forces from territories occupied in 1967.

"The day an American spokesman indorses withdrawal," he said, "we will resume diplomatic relations.

"If the United States thinks—as President Nixon has said—that there is now an equilibrium between Arab and Israeli forces, it is wrong. This we cannot accept."

But behind the brave words, there also is a plea.

"The United States is not only a great country, it is a great power," he said. "It has great responsibilities in this part of the world.

"Right and justice are on our side. We look to you for help because America has had nothing to do with colonialism and Israel today is practicing a new kind of 'Nazi' colonialism.

"We do not believe there is any limit to the influence you can exert on Israel. If you command, it must agree. The pro-Israel elements in America must understand that Israel has achieved no peace, no security. Her military victories have brought her nothing."

Despite the long lines of Russian ships that can be seen in Alexandria Harbor, despite the occasional MIG21 that flashes over the Nile, despite the convoys of Russian katushka rockets and cannon that roll through Cairo streets under carelessly tended canvas covers, Egyptian spokesmen try to minimize Soviet influence.

"If there is a settlement with Israel, if there is no threat of aggression, we will expect the Russians to leave," said Dr. Essmat Abdel Maquid, newly appointed ambassador to France.

"Russia poses no military threat to the Arab world. But where the West has refused to help us in our revolution, the Soviet Union has cooperated. It has its own experience in trying to change an archaic class society and it has shown that it sympathizes with our desire to do the same.

"We are not concerned with big power politics, but if the U.S. Sixth Fleet has a right in the Mediterranean, so does the Russian fleet.

"To us this is not a struggle of Communism vs. Capitalism. This is a case of Russia supporting a right and just cause."

Other Egyptians, however, do not appear so confident about Russian intentions. Egypt is essentially run by its army and it is the army with whom Moscow has made its compact.

An international industrial fair in Cairo in May was dominated by Soviet exhibits and a huge "USSR" banner dwarfs even the red, white and green flag of the United Arab Republic.

Soviet "advisers" are reported to have moved into most of the government ministries, particularly the information, industrial and communications sectors. They have avoided social planning fields thus far.

"The MIGs were one thing this is something else," warned a British businessman who lives in Cairo. "This is serious. The Egyptians have their backs to the wall. They must produce something to match their words. They are in a mood to make a deal with the devil, and they may have done just that."

With the man in the street, the Russians have less impact. Few Soviets are seen and to many Egyptians the actual war with Israel is a bore, though in true Arab style, they enjoy Nasser's saber-rattling speeches.

They applaud the rhetoric, but show little taste for the battle. They weep for the Palestinians, but quietly refer to them as "foreigners . . . those Asians."

Prodded by a friend, I offered a Cairo banker two Russian rubles in exchange for an Egyptian pound.

The banker laughed.

"No, thank you," he said. "Our pound may not be worth much, but your rubles are worth nothing."

Perhaps that is what really troubles Egyptians. Are they selling their future for rubles? They still are praying for an alternative.

[From the Elgin (Ill.) Daily Courier-News, June 4, 1970]

IN THE MIDDLE IN MIDEAST
(By Ray McHugh)

BEIRUT, LEBANON.—More than 3,000 years ago Phoenician traders sailed from Beirut to open trade routes to the far corners of the Mediterranean.

Their descendants today fact equally hazardous voyages through storm-tossed Middle East politics.

It is probably still true that Christian-Moslem Lebanon would be the "second" of Israel's neighbors to sign any peace agreement, but what was once an almost neutral stance in the Arab-Israeli controversy is rapidly giving way to outright hostility toward Tel Aviv. In a country balanced so delicately on economic, ethnic, religious and political tightropes, passion is a vice it can ill-afford.

Three years after the six-day war, Lebanon finds itself squeezed harder and harder by events over which she has little control.

She is menaced by a quarrelsome Syria which is dominated by Russia and a radical socialist band of ex-army corporals and sergeants.

She is menaced by upwards of 200,000 Palestinian refugees, some of whom have lived in pathetic mud and tin camp cities since 1948 and whose hatred for Israel spills over into violence with increasing regularity.

And she is menaced by Israel which has struck punishing blows against Lebanon's impoverished southern regions in attempts to discourage Palestinian commando raids on Jewish territory.

Lebanon's little 12,000-man army is no match for any of its potential adversaries, the Syrians, the Israelis or the well-armed Palestinian commandos. Its tanks and guns are positioned in the streets of Beirut, Tripoli and Tyre to bolster local police in an increasingly tense internal climate.

"The Syrians send the commandos truckloads of arms and our soldiers and customs people dare not stop them," complained a worried Beirut businessman. "Syria would like any kind of excuse to march in."

The situation, ironically, is driving Lebanon closer to Egypt and to Russia for protection. And each step is painful for a country that does not disguise its friendship and admiration for the United States.

Former President Camille Chamoun, the strongman of Lebanese politics and a bitter foe of Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser, has just done an about-face. In a speech outlining the qualifications of Lebanon's next president who will be elected this summer, Chamoun said:

"The hard circumstances . . . necessitate that the next president of Lebanon be the best aide to President Nasser in his battle against the common enemy (Israel)."

Lebanon, he added, now is in a state of "complete deterioration."

Sheikh Michel El-Khouri, one of the men frequently mentioned as a strong presidential contender, touched another corner of Lebanon's dilemma.

"Unfortunately, the only way to prove one's nationalism to many people, is to be anti-American," he said in an interview.

The bald, 42-year-old president of the National Tourist Council is the son of Lebanon's first president. The nation gained its independence from France in 1943.

Nasserism and anti-Americanism could both cost Lebanon a high price. Sheikh El-Khouri and tourism minister Khataik Babikian acknowledge that declining American trade is having an impact.

The loss is particularly noticeable here because Beirut is home to so many U.S. firms that operate in the Middle East.

One of those businessmen, Frank Russell, a former vice president of RCA and the Hilton Hotel Corp., has taken the lead in a vigorous effort to defend not only U.S. interests in the region, but also to encourage what he calls greater understanding of the Arab side in the confrontation with Israel.

Russell has founded "Americans for justice in the Middle East." Sparked by members of the American community here and with contributions from more than 3,000 members and several firms, the AJME has launched a worldwide mailing program to present what it calls the "facts" about the Arab side, which it complains are inadequately reported.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, 1965, I first introduced legislation to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide equality of treatment with respect to widows and widowers of certain employees who die in service. On June 12, the U.S. Civil Service Commission submitted their views to Representative DULSKI, chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, expressing support for my bill in this Congress, H.R. 468. I wish to extend congratulations to the Civil Service Commission and I think it is great that the Commission has finally awakened to the discrimination against women and their husbands. At this time, I insert in the RECORD the text of that letter for everyone to read:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 12, 1970.

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request for the Commission's views on H.R. 468, a bill "To amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide equality of treatment with respect to widows and widowers of certain employees who die in service."

The bill would revise the civil service retirement system to provide automatic survivor annuities for widowers of employees who die in service on the same basis as for widows.

Section 8341 of title 5, United States Code, provides for automatic survivor annuities for widows and "dependent" widowers of civil service employees who die after 18 months of service.

To qualify as a "dependent widower" of an employee who dies in service for purposes of a survivor annuity under the civil service retirement system, the widower, among other things, must (a) be incapable of self-support because of mental or physical disability, and (b) have received more than half of his support from the employee. This bill would revise section 8341 of title 5 to remove the requirement that the widower of an employee who dies in service must have been a "dependent widower" in order to qualify for a survivor annuity.

In fiscal year 1969, 5933 widows and 17 dependent widowers of deceased employees were added to the benefit roll. If the amendment proposed by this bill had been in effect, an estimated additional 900 nondependent widowers would have been added to the roll. The Commission estimates that enactment of this bill would increase the normal cost of the retirement system by .04% of payroll. It would add \$196.1 million to the unfunded liability, to be amortized in equal installments of \$10.3 million a year for the next 30 years.

The Commission favors the enactment of H.R. 468 for the following reasons:

1. The present provision for automatic survivor annuities reflects discrimination between the sexes. The nondependent husband does not have equal protection against economic hazard; he has no entitlement to a

survivor annuity whereas the non-dependent wife is awarded a survivor benefit.

2. The present provision runs counter to the facts of current day living. By and large, women work because the family needs the money, and the income earned by women is significant in the support of the family. On the principle that one purpose of a retirement system is to cushion family living standards against loss of income caused by death, it is appropriate to drop the dependency requirement for husbands of working wives.

3. The provisions for annuities to surviving spouses of deceased annuitants do not include a dependency test. It is inconsistent to apply such a test in the provisions for annuities to surviving spouses of deceased employees.

4. From a practical viewpoint, the proposed provision would be easier to administer because the dependency determinations are usually time consuming and frequently difficult to resolve satisfactorily.

This bill does not take into account the enactment of Public Law 89-554, approved September 6, 1966. In addition there are a few technical changes which should be made in the bill. Accordingly, if this bill is to be given further consideration, we suggest amending H.R. 468 as follows:

(A bill to provide equality of treatment with respect to widows and widowers of certain employees who die in service)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8341 (a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "and" after paragraph (2);
(2) by striking out paragraph (3); and
(3) by renumbering paragraph "(4)" as paragraph "(3)".

Sec. 2. Section 8341(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "dependent widower" wherever it appears and inserting "widower" in place thereof;

(2) by striking out paragraph (2); and
(3) by renumbering paragraphs "(3)" and "(4)" as paragraphs "(2)" and "(3)".

Sec. 3. Section 8341(c)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "subsection (a)(4)" and inserting "subsection (a)(3)" in place thereof.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the Administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. HAMPTON,
Chairman.

SENATE—Thursday, June 25, 1970

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou in whose boundless being reposes all treasures of wisdom and truth and holiness, grant that as we draw near to Thee there may be imparted to us a measure of that wisdom, truth, and holiness which transcends our human powers. Lift all our endeavors this day above our own strength and wisdom. Mediate to us Thy energy of mind and spirit and judgment.

Grant us, O Lord, the grace of a thankful and uncomplaining heart, the grace of courage to speak boldly for what is right, the grace of patience when others speak in disagreement, the grace of silence when it is wiser than hasty speech, the grace of forgiveness toward any who wrong us, and the grace of steadfastness in desiring to know and do Thy will.

O God, may the Congress, the executive and judicial branches of the Government, and the people concert their energies for the achievement of justice at home and peace among the nations.

In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore of the Senate (Mr. RUSSELL).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HOLLINGS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 24, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA TODAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the completion of the remarks of the able Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) today the able Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD) be recognized for not to exceed 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the dis-

tinguished Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE) is now recognized for a period not to exceed 1 hour.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me for a unanimous-consent request without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. MCINTYRE. I yield.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERLY TRADE IN TEXTILE ARTICLES AND ARTICLES OF LEATHER FOOTWEAR

NOW IS THE TIME FOR SHOES AND TEXTILES

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, on April 16, of this year, I introduced S. 3723, to provide for orderly trade in the importation of textile articles and articles of leather footwear. The bill is identical to H.R. 16920, introduced in the House by Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

The Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), my senior colleague from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Penn-