

The latest incident adds yet more imperative reasons for approval of a preventive detention provision included in the D.C. Crime Bill, under which Federal District judges would be permitted more discretion in setting bail. The Tydings Advisory Panel Against Armed Violence recently endorsed preventive detention as "an immediate response to armed violence." The panel found, in its investigation, that one out of every 11 suspects released on bond is charged with subsequent offenses before reaching trial on the first charges. The panel also reported that offenders charged with certain crimes, such as burglary, robbery, and narcotics offenses, are much more likely to be charged with subsequent offenses while free on bond.

The preventive detention proposal has sincere opposition from those who believe that it infringes on the constitutional rights of criminal suspects. After all, they say, the suspect has not yet faced trial on his charges, and therefore he must be presumed innocent and set free until proved guilty. Opponents further contend that only a small percentage of those released actually commit new crimes before their trials, and preventive detention would punish both the innocent and the guilty.

These arguments fail to persuade. In recent testimony before a Senate subcommittee, U.S. District Judge George Hart recounted 14 cases in Washington in which preventive detention would have prevented commission of new crimes by the suspects, all of whom had been charged with crimes of violence. The subsequent crimes included rape, attempted murder, and armed robbery. In Judge Hart's view, the right of society to be protected from crimes of violence justifies approval of preventive detention.

Those who oppose preventive detention somehow view judges as ogres who would welcome an opportunity to put every criminal suspect behind bars. The record suggests otherwise. Judges who deal daily with violent criminals soon learn to recognize a hardened criminal when he appears in their courtrooms. These judges also recognize their responsibility to uphold the law acting as instruments of that law. Arguments against preventive detention suggests that most judges are corrupt and that they have no ability to distinguish a hardened criminal from a first offender, an unjustified insult to the Federal judiciary.

The arguments continue, pro and con, and a great deal of misinformation results. Mean-

while, the crime rate in Washington rose 21 per cent during the first three months of this year over the same period in 1969; the national crime rate rose by 13 per cent. Even the liberal *Washington Post* has recognized that the lack of preventive detention has contributed to Washington's crime problems. With support from both conservative and liberal elements, preventive detention in conjunction with a speedier trial system, may yet prove a highly effective weapon against those who repeatedly threaten the lives and safety of citizens in the nation's capital.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 23, 1970, at 11 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ONE MAN'S PERSEVERANCE

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in Sunday's Boston Globe that describes the splendid work of Mr. Hugh Tuttle, former mayor of Dover, N.H., in keeping his family's three-century-old farm a prosperous and going concern in the fact of growing urbanization.

Hugh Tuttle's energy, industry, and dedication to his home and his fellow citizens are well known in Dover, N.H., and throughout New Hampshire's First Congressional District. In these rapidly changing, and often confusing times, Hugh's accomplishment serves as an inspiration to us all.

The article follows:

IN AGE OF DISAPPEARING FARMS: HUGH TUTTLE LOVES THE LAND TOO MUCH TO GIVE UP
(By Nathan Cobb)

DOVER, N.H.—It is this simple: Hugh Tuttle loves the land.

For 325 years, the Tuttle have been farming the rich soil of Dover Point, three miles southeast of the center of this milltown of 20,000. The developments that chewed up the other farms along the Point and spit out the box-like houses that replaced them now squat at the borders of Hugh Tuttle's land, and he realizes they will someday invade his own fields.

But he also knows it has been his own ingenuity and foresight that has sustained the Tuttle farm for at least one more generation, thus assuring him he will always be a farmer. And that's all he ever wanted, really.

The success of Hugh Tuttle is ironic. His property has been worked by 10 generations of Tuttle and is the oldest farm in America that has continually passed from father to son. But Hugh's refusal to cling to the past has been its salvation.

Educated in botany at both Harvard and the University of New Hampshire, Tuttle has an advantage over most of his fellow farmers. He not only knows how something grows, he knows why.

As he drives you through his 40-plus acres of salad crops, he is likely to tell you about one of his latest experiments, perhaps the black sheets of polyethylene he is using to warm the topsoil. He has been active in the Soil Conservation Service for nearly 25 years, and he is constantly talking about "a better way."

But the main reason the Tuttle land has not yet gone for housing sits conspicuously beside Dover Point Road at the northwest corner of the farm. It is formally designated "Tuttle's Red Barn," but people hereabouts—who know Hugh as a former city councillor, mayor, acting city manager and state legislator—call it simply "Tuttles." It is the store where Tuttle sells the vegetables they grow, as fast as they can grow them.

"My father always sold to the independent stores," recalls Tuttle, who is 50 but whose bone-thin features, mahogany-colored skin and closely-cropped hair skim a decade off his age. "But then the chain supermarkets came in. They weren't interested in quality, just in buying cheap and selling high. We struggled along for several years and just weren't making enough income. I could see we had to do something."

Tired of paying 40 cents or more on the dollar to a middleman, the Tuttle warily opened their 125-year-old barn as a roadside store in 1956. They were immediately inundated by a quality-starved market that has been growing ever since. The daily appearance of 800-1000 customers who spend around \$1200 is not uncommon, a volume of business that is a far cry from the two truckfuls of preordered groceries Tuttle was laboriously delivering to local stores every day 15 years ago.

The unchallenged manager of the store is Hugh's wife, Joan. She defies the stereotype image of a farmer's wife as she rushes about in fashionable bellbottoms and sandals, anxiously checking the loading platform in back for more vegetables or happily discussing four types of strawberries with a customer out front.

All three Tuttle children passed their growing-up summers in the store. But Rebecca, a long-legged blonde who is 17 and will start college in the Fall, may well be spending her last season on Dover Point. And Lucy, 25, lives in Paris, while 23-year-old William Penn Tuttle 3d is working in Boston.

The barn opens for the season with the green lettuce and spinach of late May, runs through the yellow corn of hot summer, and

closes with the orange pumpkins of Halloween. Cars fill the parking lot long before the 10 a.m. opening, and many daily pickings are gone by noon. There is no such thing as "day-old," and smart shoppers telephone ahead to reserve certain vegetables.

The atmosphere around the store is chaotic crackerbarrel. The hectic filling of orders is likely to be salted with numerous questions about children, introductions of grandchildren and exchanges of news.

Not only are customers called by name. So are their dogs.

While all this controlled mayhem is taking place at the barn, Hugh Tuttle usually can be found quietly managing his fields. "It's better that way," he smiles. "Sometimes if a customer complains, I take it personally."

The farm now produces some 60 vegetables, everything from Swiss chard to Chinese peas. "We decided we were going to make these meat and potato Yankees like salads, and we've done it," Hugh laughs. His land covers 245 acres (the average U.S. farm being 250), but some 200 of this pasture, hayland, wasteland and the woodland that produces the fireplace logs he sells during Fall and Winter.

He keeps precise records of when, where and what he grows, as well as shortage and excess records. These details will make up his "bible" for subsequent years.

Complicated? "It's either do it this way or mechanize and grow only two or three crops, ship them to Boston, pay off the top, and let everyone make more money than you do," he says flatly.

Hugh Tuttle's day begins at 5:30 a.m., and by 7:30 he is joined by his pickers. Unlike many New England farmers, he has a built-in labor market. Dover is filled with low-income families who are anxious to have their teenagers work in the fields, and the University of New Hampshire is only four miles away. The farm receives some 200-300 work applications every year.

Picking goes on all day, with Tuttle acting as a liaison between the store and fields. When his wife tells him customers are waiting for peas, he hurriedly moves pickers to that area of the farm. Or beans. Or corn. And on it goes.

It was one John Tuttle—"Immigrant John", the family calls him—who first made his way to Dover Point from Bristol, England, in 1632, having been shipwrecked off the coast of Maine along the way. The land

was used only to keep the family alive for seven generations, but the industrial revolution eventually brought cotton mills to Dover and in 1909 Hugh's father began growing vegetables and taking them around to local grocery stores.

"It used to be that the dumbest kid in the family took over the farm," Hugh explains. "But times have changed. There's a revolution in agriculture now. I'll try anything new at least once, and if it doesn't work, well . . ."

A little later he calls out to his 22 black angus beef cattle, the ones he keeps mostly because the local kids like them and because he loves "the look of black cows against the green grass." They come slowly across the pasture, bellowing.

"I'm the only one left along here," he says, squinting up Dover Point rd. "The taxes have tripled during the past 10 years, and I'm paying houselot taxes on much of my land.

"But, of course, all types of American farms are going out of existence at a rapid rate," he goes on, "particularly around the population centers of the East and Far West. And with no population control and no preservation of land for agricultural purposes, I can foresee the day when this country won't be able to grow its own food."

Is time running out on the Tuttle farm? Certainly the family knows that half of America's farm population has disappeared since 1950 and that creeping urbanization has helped swallow up over one-third of the country's farms during the past two decades.

"There's a possibility it may go on another generation," Hugh theorizes, stooping to cut a row of lettuce. "My son has allergies which make living here almost impossible, but I have two daughters, and who knows? They might marry farmers.

"But the only way to survive another generation is via the retail route. The farm just couldn't go on if we were still wholesaling. You see, land values are so high they've made farming almost impossible this close to megalopolis. Frankly, I'm not encouraging anybody to carry on here another generation.

"But this land!" Hugh Tuttle says, setting a box of fresh lettuce in the back of his pickup truck. "This land has a dependability you don't find in people, and that's what I love. I wouldn't have lived my life in the city for anything."

TREATMENT OF PRISONERS ACCORDING TO THE GENEVA CONVENTION

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, today over 1,400 American servicemen are held as prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese. We have used every available diplomatic channel to persuade that government to provide a list of such prisoners, to indicate their condition, and to permit regular communication between them and their families in accordance with the rules of the Geneva convention.

Whether the requests have come from the United States, from neutral countries, or from international organizations, they have been ignored or rejected by the North Vietnamese Government.

Yet that government is a signatory to the Geneva prisoner of war convention which requires that captor nations, as a minimum, must treat prisoners in the

manner we have requested of North Vietnam.

Once again, I urge we renew our efforts to press for minimum justice for American prisoners of war held by the North Vietnamese.

BITTER HARVEST

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include an article by Father Daniel Lyons, S.J., which appeared in the July 12th issue of Twin Circle magazine. Father Lyons points out the fallacies and bitter harvest of the so-called grape strike.

The article follows:

CHAVEZ REAPS BITTER HARVEST

(By Father Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

I went to the Coachella Valley with Father Cletus Healy late in June to find out the latest developments regarding the table-grape situation. The valley is in the vicinity of Palm Springs, 100 miles east of Los Angeles. We also went to the Bakersfield and Delano area to talk with workers, growers, pastors and other knowledgeable persons to find out all we could. Father Healy will be writing a more detailed account of our latest investigations for our readers, but I am anxious to tell you my conclusions.

First of all, do not think of grape-pickers as an oppressed people. They are the highest paid agricultural workers in the nation. A long-time pastor in Delano told us he had often said to concerned outsiders: "Go out and find a family that is underfed and come back and tell me, so I can feed them." They have apparently never found any. Secondly, do not think the workers are clamoring to join the union. As a union organizer, Cesar Chavez has failed miserably to get workers behind him. Thirdly, do not labor under the illusion there has been a workers' strike against the growers.

Chavez called for a strike against the growers, but he could never get more than a handful of workers to go out on strike. So he hired pickets who were non-workers, and induced hippies, members of the SDS and other characters from the Berkeley campus and elsewhere to picket various ranches. Newspapers and TV crews then interviewed the picket as though they were workers out on strike.

"POISONED" GRAPES

Since a strike is supposed to be a withholding of labor by workers on the job, the effort failed miserably. Chavez then launched a nationwide boycott, but this too failed until recently. Having failed to get the workers behind him, having failed with his strike tactics, having failed with his boycott, he launched a fourth weapon: pesticides. He claimed the growers were using poisonous pesticides, so no one should eat grapes. Then he cynically agreed to waive the poison issue if the majority of growers would sign contracts with him. But he was beaten on the pesticide issue when the State of California Department of Agriculture proved that his charges were untrue.

But Chavez is not a failure. He has succeeded in getting hundreds of thousands of dollars from the AFL-CIO. He has gotten millions of dollars worth of publicity. He has successfully formed committees in nearly 100 cities to pressure the chain stores into boycotting table grapes. In Chicago alone he has 40 full-time representatives

working on the boycott. He has gotten mayors in such big cities as New York, Boston and Detroit to support his boycott. He has organized pickets all over the country to man the entrances to chain stores with their placards.

Whether Chavez is behind it or not, he has also profited from fires that have been set in scores of sheds, owned by growers in strategic areas, and from hundreds of tires that have been slashed on the cars of grape pickers who have not succumbed to his tactics. He has gotten hundreds of clergymen, and particularly priests, to picket stores and call on store managers to persuade them to boycott grapes. He has also managed to get all the Catholic bishops in the United States behind him officially. Only a few Catholic bishops are actively behind him, but the good name of them all is being used because a bishops' committee was set up and is acting in their name.

COMMITTEE USURPED POWER

As the spokesmen for the bishops' committee, Auxiliary Bishop Joseph Donnelly of Hartford and Monsignor George Higgins of Washington, D.C., said they would do everything they could to organize the table-grape industry. And that is only the beginning, they pointed out. The committee intends to dedicate its efforts to organizing all of the farm workers in America. There is no indication the rest of the bishops had this in mind when they supported the committee on table grapes. As far as we can determine, it is a power the committee simply usurped.

That the name of the U.S. bishops is being used in the campaign to organize the table-grape industry is unprecedented. We have also found it bitterly resented. In the Coachella Valley, for example, 70 percent of the growers are not Catholic. Among them is the head of their association, who is facing bankruptcy because he will not force his workers to join Chavez's union. He met twice with the bishops' committee, but said it refuses to meet with him any further because a bishop on the panel thought he had not been sufficiently respectful. Of course, in the eyes of the grower the bishop was just another pleader for Chavez.

Shortly before he died in Illinois this past May, Father John Coogan, S.J., wrote to Twin Circle that Monsignor George Higgins, who is the dynamo behind the bishops' committee, has spent his life crusading for compulsory unionism. "As far as grapes are concerned, Higgins can take them or leave them," he said. Father Coogan, who taught social science at the University of Detroit for many years, and who preceded this writer as current affairs columnist for Our Sunday Visitor, knew whereof he spoke.

By right, Cesar Chavez should have had to convince the workers they should join his union. He never did. He is about as popular with most of the workers as the seven-day itch. If they oppose his union he sometimes threatens to have the Internal Revenue Service harass them. The union contracts he has signed have forced the workers to pay so many fees, dues and assessments they are all receiving less take-home pay than they were before. And they are forced to pay these sums by having the money taken out of their checks by the employer, under pressure from the union. Furthermore, Chavez is bringing in thousands of workers from Mexico to take the jobs of residents, since so many refuse to join his union even under pain of losing their job. He is constantly advertising for workers on the radio in Mexico, and the workers in California know it. Only ten percent of grape pickers were migrant workers before Chavez came in, and he condemned the importation of workers from Mexico in the past.

MANY WORKERS FIRED

Just as Chavez has never succeeded in getting the worker behind him, so he never

succeeded in getting enough people to stop buying grapes. Where he did succeed is in getting so much pressure on chain store managers that they were afraid to handle his grapes. He succeeded so well with this that he has finally forced many employers to sign a union contract with him. In doing this he never consults with the workers. He merely forces the employer to discharge all those who will not sign up with his union.

From all we could find out by talking with workers and employers, the so-called union elections are a farce. Employers who have signed a union contract have usually done so because the boycott has made it impossible for them to sell their product, so they face financial ruin. The union promises to sell their grapes for them, and it does so by forcing stores to buy grapes with the union label on the box. It then acts as the broker.

The union makes no attempt to contact the workers before it forces an employer to sign a contract. Numerous employers quote Monsignor Higgins as saying: "Either you sign a union contract or we have no recourse but to have the bishops across the country enforce the boycott and make you sign." When employers ask him why the workers are not consulted by the union, the Monsignor declares: "That is not necessary. They can ratify the contract later."

What is so shocking is to have the workers and employers tell you what "ratification" means. It means telling the workers they will be fired that day, or at least within three days, if they do not sign a union card. Those workers unwilling to join the union then leave. That is why you hear that "the workers voted to join the union 70-0." Sometimes the figure is given as "70 to 2," as in a Russian election.

As Father Coogan pointed out, compulsory unionism is what Monsignor Higgins is totally committed to pushing. That is why he and his committee of one or two active bishops talk with the union as though it represents the workers, instead of trying to understand the thinking of the workers themselves. They have determined that compulsory unionism is what should be imposed on the workers, whether the workers like it or not, and whether the workers want this particular union or not. When the bishops' committee talks about "negotiations" they mean compulsory unionism and nothing else.

WORKING CONDITIONS UNCHANGED

No working conditions are changed by the union contract. All they get is \$1.75 per hour, plus commission, instead of \$1.65 per hour, plus the same commission. If the workers were being underpaid, how has the union helped them? They are getting considerably less money now, after they pay their initiation fees, union dues and assessments. And what is the justice of forcing workers to join a union unless they want it?

The bishops' committee is not listening to the pastors involved or to their parishioners. Large numbers of Catholics have already been alienated from the Church, and thousands of non-Catholics have been embittered by the arbitrary, high-handed actions of the bishops' committee.

A "FIGHT TO THE DEATH"

Chavez describes his movement as a "fight to the death. They destroy our union or we conquer them." He is now moving his hired pickets against the \$11 million melon crop in the Imperial Valley. Melons are vulnerable because they begin rotting within three days after ripening. A spokesman for the union said pickets will move from field to field, picketing crops as they ripen. Reports the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner: "Chavez' tactics of intimidation and threats have closed three fields comprising 300 acres of one grower's total of 1,200. The cost to the grower is estimated at \$30,000 a day." As usual, none of

the workers belong to his union, but he hopes to force the employer to compel them to join.

We expect that of Chavez, but we cannot believe that most of America's bishops would approve of what is being done in their name if they were fully aware of the facts. Coercion of both the workers and employers ill becomes the Church Christ founded.

PROPER NEWS REPORTING AND USE OF MASS MEDIA BY EXECUTIVE BRANCH

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on July 10, the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) addressed the National Broadcast Editorial Conference in Park City, Utah. His speech dealt with the important question of proper news reporting and the use of the mass media by the executive branch. Because of the importance of this matter and the excellent manner in which Senator CRANSTON addressed the problem, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SPEECH BY SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON

Last month, the Senate repealed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. In the six years the Resolution existed, more than 50,000 Americans died in Southeast Asia. In those six years, our involvement grew from a few advisors in one country to thousands of troops in three. In those six years, the cost of the war kept us from meeting our urgent domestic needs, and controversy over the war kept our people divided.

The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was adopted in August, 1964, after President Johnson had appeared on national television requesting what amounted to a blank check to wage war in Vietnam. The request stirred little debate in the press, among the public or in the Senate. CBS News, for example, devoted only two minutes of air time for commentary after the President had completed his remarks. Fred Friendly, who was then president of CBS, later wrote: "I shall always believe that, if journalism had done its job properly that night and in the days following, America might have been spared some of the agony that followed the Tonkin Resolution."

But the press didn't do the job.

The Congress didn't either, and we've gone through six years of agony.

The war drags on.

And a new President goes on television to seek public support as he sinks deeper and deeper into the morass in Indochina.

We dare not repeat the mistakes of 1964. Our nation can't survive another six years like the ones we've just gone through.

Congress must never again turn over its power to the President—it must never again allow the United States to become locked in an undeclared war in a distant corner of the globe.

And the press must never again fail to give the American public the vital information and interpretation it so desperately needs in these complex and troubled times. The press—especially television—must never

again let major Presidential announcements go unexplained.

The primary burden of explanation falls on television for two reasons:

First, television is the medium the President uses to take his messages to the people, and it should be, therefore, the chief medium of interpretation of that message.

And, second, television is the largest—and in many cases the only—source of news for the American people.

The importance of television as the country's news source can't be over emphasized. On an average evening, 20.6 million American households—one of every three households in the United States—watch TV network news. The news programs reach more than 40 million viewers a night and there is good reason to believe that many of these men and women only occasionally read a newspaper or news magazine, and never read a journal of opinion.

A study recently published at Harvard revealed that half of this country's adults apparently lack the literacy required to read a newspaper. And a survey by Roper Research Associates a year and a half ago indicated that 59 per cent of our citizens rely on television as their main source of news; 29 per cent said television was their only source of news.

These are sad and disturbing observations. Not because they indicate that television has a large audience, but because they reveal that many Americans are getting all or almost all of their news from a medium that isn't structured to give important events the necessary depth of coverage on a day to day basis.

As Walter Cronkite noted recently, there isn't time in a single news show to develop even basic arguments on all sides of an important issue. The viewer needs a fair background going into the broadcast to get an accurate impression of the day's news. And, unfortunately, most viewers don't have that background.

Because of this situation, television newsmen have struggled for longer news programs, fewer commercials, more investigative reporting, more analysis and interpretation. To a small degree they have been successful. But, in many important ways, they haven't been. And television news has a long way to go before it meets the needs of a public that reads very little.

You and the other journalists in the industry will be partially responsible for how well television develops in the next few years. But, as you well know, not all of the decisions are yours; your best efforts can be thwarted; your best plans reversed.

Television—especially television news—has incredible potential. It could make possible the sort of extended dialogue—that is so extremely necessary today. It could, with a few alterations, provide many sides to many issues. It could allow complete discussion of complex matters. It could be an expanded and essential ingredient in the continued success of the largest and most complicated democracy the world has ever known.

Television could.

I'm not sure that it will.

I'm not sure because I believe there are men in government and in television itself who want less dialogue, not more. Men who want cleverly packaged Presidential announcements with no interpretation. Men who want to hear simple solutions to complicated problems. Men who fear controversy, don't trust debate, and want the open forum open only as long as it is the platform for ideas they feel comfortable with. If these men prevail, I fear that dialogue—at least dialogue on television—will die in our times.

Our job—mine in Congress, yours in the industry—is to see that they do not prevail.

Our job is to work for more dialogue, more discussion, a greater exchange of ideas and

a broader airing of divergent views on television. It won't be easy. The forces on the other side are powerful. And, I fear, public opinion is with them, not us.

The evidence at hand convinces me and, I know, many others that the Administration has launched a coordinated attack on the press—especially on television. One ultimate goal of the attack is to eliminate dialogue—complete discussion of Presidential announcements—and one tactic it has used is to play on the public's distrust of the media.

The Vice President had led the attack. He has spoken, obviously, for the entire Administration. And he has been aided by a number of Administration officials—from the White House aide who wrote the Vice President's speech attacking television news, to the Nixon-appointed chairman of the FCC who announced he agreed with what the Vice President had said.

In addition, the law and order zealots in the Nixon Administration have—either by design or accident—damaged the news media's ability to gather information. The Justice Department has issued subpoenas to newsmen, and sources have started to clam up. The officials in government who would play fast and loose with some rather basic freedoms—including freedom of the press—have been given new license by the Nixon Administration. And the result, as far as the media's ability to gather information is concerned, has been unfortunate indeed.

One of the main reasons for the Administration's attack on the media is, I think, the Administration's overwhelming desire to circumvent the press—to take its already-prepared message directly to the people.

We shouldn't be too surprised. This is, after all, how the President was elected. He didn't debate. He didn't subject himself to hard, live, on the air questioning by newsmen. He didn't take any chances. Instead, he was "sold" to the American people. His television appearances were carefully conceived—worked out well in advance to give the impression of dialogue while permitting none of the dangers that are presented by a real, unrehearsed exchange of ideas. Even his election eve telethon was written in advance.

Once in office, Mr. Nixon continued to make good use of television. He allowed ten televised press conferences, and, last week, even conducted a question and answer session with three network newsmen.

Televised press conferences are a well-established aspect of the presidency, and I think Mr. Nixon has had little choice but to conduct them. The press conferences have been infrequent and I believe it is clear they are only a secondary and unavoidable factor in the President's approach to television. The backbone of Mr. Nixon's television operation is the speeches—the safe, sure presentations the President has used 12 times in his first 18 months in office.

He has gone directly to the people—unencumbered by questioners—with slick, carefully prepared reports complete, in recent months, with charts, maps and film footage.

The President has had free television time to make his case in the most effective way he and his advisors could devise. But that, apparently, wasn't good enough. Not only did Mr. Nixon seek to have large chunks of prime television time to give his views, his way, with no questions. He apparently wanted television to carry his speeches with no follow-up, no balance, no interpretation, no analysis of his remarks. Because, when television executives exercised proper journalistic judgment and provided some analysis after the November 3 speech on Vietnam, the Vice President began his rampage.

I think the Vice President's outbursts have been disturbing—particularly since they came from an Administration that pledged to lower its voice and bring us together. But even more disturbing is that

the intimidation in the Administration's attacks on the press has been successful in some instances. An editorial in the January 3 *TV Guide* pointed up the situation very well:

Vice President Spiro T. Agnew's scolding of the networks apparently has had the desired result: After President Nixon's Dec. 8 press conference, there was no criticism whatever from commentators who followed him.

I haven't watched every commentary following every Presidential appearance on television. I've seen some criticism in the broadcasts since December. But I've also seen too many instances when post-speech coverage was very brief, and really presented only a skimpy rehash of what the President had said.

The success of the Administration anti-press campaign can be attributed to careful study of where the press is vulnerable. The Vice President found a place when he suggested, in the Des Moines speech, that "perhaps it is time the networks were made more responsive to the views of the nation and more responsible to the people they serve." This hit a sensitive spot, for there is fear among a good many of the people television serves that the network news programs aren't telling it like it is. Indeed, we'd be fooling ourselves if we didn't believe that the Vice President reflects the concern of many, many men and women in this country.

A New York Times sampling last fall showed people who called or wrote to television stations supported the Vice President's views by a two to one margin. A Gallup poll conducted early this year revealed that only 40 per cent of the American public believes television fairly reports social and political issues.

Certainly the press—especially television—can present more sides to controversial issues. It can present more discussion and a greater exchange of ideas—and this will do much to restore the public's confidence. But I doubt that these steps would satisfy the Vice President. He's not concerned with a free press. He's concerned with an acquiescent one.

In his attack on television news, the Vice President quoted this passage from the Supreme Court's landmark *Red Lion* decision: "It is the right of the viewers and listeners, not the right of the broadcasters, which is paramount."

He left out what I believe is a much more meaningful passage from the same decision: "It is the purpose of the First Amendment to preserve an uninhibited market place in which truth will ultimately prevail, rather than to countenance monopolization of that market, whether it be by the government itself or a private licensee."

We've seen how committed the Nixon Administration is to creating an uninhibited market of ideas.

We've seen an Administration that wants a monopoly on the market place.

We've seen an Administration that wants its ideas accepted without discussion or interpretation.

We've seen an Administration that views television as a tool to be used only to advance Administration policy.

I believe we've seen an Administration that has no intention of helping to preserve an uninhibited market place of ideas.

But television's record in this area is not all that it might be. In the last year, television networks have been unduly active with the censoring scissors. Joan Baez mentioned why her husband was in jail. The statement was censored. Carol Burnett appealed for letters of peace to be sent to Mrs. Martin Luther King. The appeal was censored. Judy Collins criticized Judge Julius Hoffman. The criticism was censored.

This is an uninhibited market place of ideas? I think not.

I think the censors have been working too

hard. I think they have trimmed—too much and too often. I think ideas—especially unpopular ideas—deserve to be heard. And it is a serious matter when controversy is snipped out of network television.

It is also serious when network television avoids controversial subjects or waters down their presentation on the air. Early this year, *Variety* reported a long list of television documentaries had been severely trimmed or discarded altogether. The documentaries covered touchy subjects—homosexuals, corruption in Saigon, the military-industrial complex—subjects television news should be looking into. It is sad indeed that network executives decided these controversial subjects could not be presented, or presented fully, on the air.

As I'm sure you know, television policy is a delicate matter in the Senate right now. And, in fairness, I should tell you I am one of a group of Senators who, this week, filed a complaint with the FCC seeking a ruling that network television will provide time for us to respond to the President's television speeches on the war.

The group, consisting of Senators of both parties, is seeking to improve the balance between the executive and legislative branches of government. As you well know, the branches are supposed to be co-equal—but that is obviously not possible when one branch has unlimited access to the Nation's most powerful communication medium, and the other branch has practically no access at all. We were willing to purchase television time to provide a Congressional balance to the President's presentations, but—since NBC initially did sell us a half hour for one show—the three networks have told us they will sell us none. And so, as a last resort, we have turned to the FCC. Without arguing the case, let me only say that I believe a response by us, or by some other informed group, would add substantially to the exchange of ideas about the war. And that sort of exchange is what we should be striving for—on many issues.

I realize the networks face serious financial and programming difficulties in cases like these. Your realization of that fact must be greater than mine. But I also realize that there is a need for more than one voice to be heard on the question of the war in Indochina. I think your voices—the voices of the industry's editorialists—should be heard. And I think the voices of those opposed to the President's policies who are not in the press should be heard also. We need to work harder to establish that uninhibited market place of ideas in which the truth will ultimately prevail.

Here are some things that can be done: Every instance of interference with the press by the Administration should be well publicized. The first few subpoenas to newsmen when unnoticed for several weeks last year because each publication and television network thought that it was alone and said nothing. This shouldn't happen again.

There should be a national privilege law for newsmen. Subpoenas damage a newsmen's ability to gather news and should be issued only under carefully predetermined circumstances.

The proceedings of the House and the Senate should be open, within reasonable limits, to radio and television. And the House should follow the Senate's lead and open committee sessions. It is absurd to argue that the electronic media should cover government and then make it impossible for the media to use its primary tools.

There should be more commentary on television—especially commentary at the local level. It's one thing for a network commentator to appear on national television and discuss how an event affects the Nation. It is something quite separate, and equally important, for a local commentator to appear on local television and discuss the local effects of the same event.

News programs should be enlarged and there should be more time for explanation and background during the show. Several educational television stations are experimenting with an hour-long format that resembles a news meeting between an editor and a group of reporters. The results of the experiments have been very encouraging. I should think that a similar format might well be adapted to commercial television.

All newsmen should stay skeptical of politicians and government. Thousands of public relations men in Washington are cranking out press releases, manufacturing "news" and creating snazzy images for their bosses and agencies. As a result, the need for a skeptical, objective and thorough press corps is greater than ever.

In all of these—and like changes that have been suggested elsewhere—there is one common thread. It is this: We need more controversy on television—not less. We need more commentary on television—not less. More Americans should have access to the airways. More ideas should be expressed. More opinions given. More sides presented. And more feathers ruffled.

We desperately need to expand our market place of ideas.

Because if we don't expand it, I fear our children may one day come to the market place—and find it closed.

KNBR LOOKS AT THE PERIPHERAL CANAL

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, a recent report by the U.S. Geological Survey and linking the water quality of San Francisco Bay with the amount of fresh water outflows from the Sacramento River has caused an enormous amount of concern to be focused on the California State water project.

As proposed, Mr. Speaker, this project would divert up to 80 percent of the normal fresh water outflows that enter the bay to points to the south.

If the contentions of the U.S. Geological Survey report are correct, and there is no real reason to doubt them, then the perils posed to the San Francisco Bay area are quite clear—it will face tremendous problems because of the massive diminution of fresh water outflows.

A recent editorial on San Francisco radio station KNBR contained some insightful and highly pertinent conclusions and, I think, should be of interest to the Members.

The editorial follows:

PERIPHERAL CANAL

The giant California water plan to deliver northern California water to the south has been a multi-billion dollar fiasco from the beginning. The long delays in construction may, however, prove a blessing in disguise. The U.S. Geological Survey has just issued a report on the effect of building the peripheral canal to divert Sacramento River water away from San Francisco Bay. Their findings indicate that without the flushing action of the Sacramento River waters, the Bay would quickly become a stagnant dead sea, similar to Lake Erie. We at KNBR would have to wonder why the original planners did not discover this same information. It would seem that they overlooked or merely closed their eyes to anything that did not further

their purpose. In any event, it is clear that the proponents of the water plan must either, one, prove the U.S. Geological Survey wrong, or two, abandon the idea of building the peripheral canal. We realize that this plan is of great importance to southern California, but the destruction of San Francisco Bay is a price which the people of northern California can not and will not pay.

SCOTT TESTIMONY ON CAMPUS UNREST

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, last week, the distinguished minority leader (Mr. SCOTT), appeared before the President's Commission on Campus Unrest, headed by another distinguished Pennsylvanian, former Gov. William W. Scranton.

Senator SCOTT spoke eloquently on the need for reasonableness and moderation in an area where too often rhetoric and emotion dominate our attention. Senator SCOTT has shown an understanding of many of the legitimate concerns of young people and has made some excellent suggestions for conduct by young and old alike.

I commend Senator SCOTT's remarks and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE HUGH SCOTT, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Senator SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am very honored and pleased to have a chance to testify here before this distinguished Commission, and of course with special reference to the Chairman, whose services to his Commonwealth and the Nation are so well known and so greatly appreciated.

I am glad to make a brief opening statement on an issue which is of primary concern, as you have stated, to this very distinguished Commission. A Commission which is marked by its credentials, its background of civic and academic aplomb, and the very high level of the membership, would guarantee I should think, that it would well and truly satisfy its mandate and provide most useful information and recommendations.

The distinguished Majority Leader, Mr. Mansfield, and I last May after the Kent State tragedy urged the President to establish a high level commission fully to investigate and report on that incident, and on the general situation of unrest and turmoil which exists on some campuses today.

We said at that time that "We believe sincerely that the Nation would welcome recommendations as to how the present unfortunate situation can be alleviated."

Mr. Chairman, my purpose this morning is simply to express a view as to what is happening, not only on campuses, but to all our people. There has been an intolerable level of intemperance and misunderstanding on all sides which has created an atmosphere of distrust among Americans who find themselves in dissent with each other.

And this rhetoric has built up a heavy turbulence of highly emotional disagreement.

And so we need to retreat from demagoguery with all of its aspects of oratorical fulmination. And I think that it is time

that we learn to show each other our humanity and our basic human goodness. And we are going through a time when the diatribes of the left and the polemics of the right are obscuring the broad swath of the middle wave. And the dissenters are to be heard above the tumult.

And yet it is moderation that produces action, wise and reasoned, forward-moving action. The time has come strongly to reassert our broad generosity and spirit of accommodation, and to reassert the strength of that moderate spirit, then, which has been our heritage.

Last November prior to the coming of hundreds of thousands of students from hundreds of campuses to Washington, I suggested then that the solution could include better listening, more compassion, and a willingness to respond and show a sensitivity and an awareness to the problems of the other side, and that the Government should inject some youthful idealism, and that we should not resign Government to the apathetic or the cynical or the coldly mathematical, that we should listen to the young voices of idealism, of hopes for better ways. And I would say now that we ought to have a synergetic system to harness this great potential.

The concern of the student activists is expressed in the search for means to influence the decisions which most directly affect their lives—the war, the draft, the rights of people, the conditions of living.

And student awareness does this generation credit, as does their idealism. Their anger at the system, the Establishment, and often for society, is evidence of this awareness.

At the same time one feels that students generally are more aroused than informed, and often more frustrated than constructively involved. And this Commission will serve to increase the body of information available to us as to where there may be some better ways to establish more acceptable communication between students and the rest of the community.

And perhaps too the Commission may come up with some helpful suggestions as to areas where the Establishment and the alienated students may reach some common ground once certain essential premises are established.

Let us hope that the Commission's efforts will lead to more accommodation, and less confrontation, to more open minds and fewer closed schools. And all of us will wish the Commission well, and I do thank the Commission for its kindness in inviting me to appear before you.

Chairman SCRANTON. We appreciate very much your comments, and also your wishes of good health and wealth to us in what we are attempting to do.

As you know, one of the most difficult things at the moment is the first item that the President enunciated when he established the Commission, which was to identify the causes themselves of the campus unrest.

What is your thinking about what these causes may be, Senator?

Senator SCOTT. I have a feeling that each generation comes into the universities under different conditions of life from any preceding generation. And unbulwarked as yet by experience, desirous, quite naturally, through idealism, for sudden and in fact at times almost instant gratification, they naturally react against the conditions in which they find themselves.

This particular generation, born in a time of what seems to be never-ending war, continuous social conflict, an era where a government of laws appears to have failed to provide a good condition for men, and in the concatenation of the Cambodian expedition, which came undoubtedly with enormously heavy impact, the very sad events at Kent State and Jackson State—I think all of these

things combine to create a mood in the universities unlike anything that has happened before in its intensity.

I have lived and seen all kinds of student unrest. I remember in 1967 at Temple University the excitement developed over the increase in the price of coffee in the cafeteria from 10 cents to 12 cents. There was a brown bag revolt, as it was called, and the students raised their voices in economic consumer protest.

When I attended the University of Virginia the high cost of clothing created a spontaneous reaction across the United States. Most of this Commission is old enough to remember it. But in every campus in America there was a run on overall factories, and students appeared by the scores of thousands in blue denim overalls—and promptly brought the price of clothing down by a good 20 or 25 per cent.

It would be natural, then, for students to feel at this time that their impact can immediately affect the operations of government. And of course their frustration increases when they find that government, the system, representative government in America does not operate with celerity which they demand.

And I think that they threaten to lose confidence in the system because it does not immediately respond to what to them is so crystal clear, the need for change. And they are not yet sufficiently experienced to realize that the previous generations have already recognized that need for change, have done something about it, have made their slow and painful progress forward, have done what they honestly believed was their best, which this generation feels was very poor indeed.

So I think all those things are involved. If I may name-drop for a minute, concluding the answer, I had a recent talk, just before the general elections in Great Britain, with the Queen. And she asked about student unrest in America. And I discussed it with her in much this vein. And I spoke of instant gratification.

And her comment was, "How odd, and how very much like the emerging nations, to want it all at once."

Chairman SCRANTON. I hope you do not mind if we ask you a series of questions, sir.

Senator SCOTT. Not a bit.

Chairman SCRANTON. But all the members of the Commission wish to do so.

One more question on this line. Do you see this unrest as stemming—being primarily caused by, characterized as political or economic or cultural, or how do you see it in terms of trying to pinpoint it into a field of endeavor or field of philosophy or field of interest?

Senator SCOTT. I simply do not think it is economic. To distinguish it from other occasions, it arises in many cases among the affluent. It does not seem to have goals of economic alteration. It seems to me to be more of a cultural malaise. As they begin to realize what is going on, they also begin to dislike intensely the way it is happening. And when they say, tell it like it is, they do not like the way it is.

And so obviously it is the best educated generation, and healthiest and strongest generation. They have an advantage over their elders even in height. And they certainly do in education and training. And therefore they see themselves as equipped to handle the world's problems, which is in the nature of youth, before they have grown memories, and of course thereby grown experience.

To characterize it oversimplly, I would say cultural.

Chairman SCRANTON. Mr. Ortigue has a question.

Mr. ORTIGUE. Senator, we have heard a great deal from the students indicating that they wish to have the means to be heard, but that frequently they are not heard. Do you have any suggestions to the Commission in

terms of the mechanism by which young people who, as you have indicated, have not had the experience, can be heard?

I am specifically concerned that after the tragedies this spring many of the Senators and many of the members of Congress were available to the students. And it is fashionable now to be available. I would like to know, what are your reactions in terms of suggestions for young people to make certain that their concerns are heard?

Senator SCOTT. I think there was some release of tension, when students were heard by members of Congress and by their staffs. And in my case they were heard by myself and my staff literally by the thousands during this period. They demand—and it would be well if we could find means to accord it to them—better ways of being heard within the college system, a greater participation in the planning phase without the semidictatorial powers that at times they demand.

And I am coming to why I think they do it that way.

I have said to groups that we have for years been saying, get involved. And now we have said, do it. And sometimes we then are appalled when they do it to us collectively. And of course that is an ideal way for them to become involved in the political system, to pursue their choice of candidates, their choice of issues.

In the educational system they do need more participation. The sad fact is that if you create a new form of student senate or student faculty cooperation, after they get it there is less tendency to use some of these means of cooperation.

A student at Temple, speaking of that university again, said recently that students do not like to work within the committee system, because when they go to the committees, unless they are angry and arrogant and contentious, they are going to be out-talked. This is a fear that their elders are not going to listen to them.

It also appears that they are not yet quite competent enough to engage in the reasoning process with their elders. They fear that they will be overcome by sophisticated subtleties of logic.

Of course, we need more logic and philosophy in the colleges, perhaps. But I do think all the doors should be open to them where they can participate before they are really ready to control.

Chairman SCRANTON. Commissioner?

Mr. RHODES. I have two questions, Senator.

First, in fact what we have been seen happening on the campuses in the last year, the gradual growth of a massive student revolt, indicates that a radical outspoken majority of the students are opposed to the administration's policy, do you think, given the Cambodian invasion and the President's war policies, that any activities in Indo-China are worth the disillusion of our society, as indicated by the events of the spring, which all of our knowledge indicates will continue to the fall?

Senator SCOTT. Mr. Rhodes, I would have to respectfully challenge the premises there. Because I do not believe that the values in our society are vitally damaged or inherently defeated by the war in Indo-China.

I do think the war in Indo-China is immoral, but in the same sense that virtually all wars are immoral, that it is unpopular, that it should be terminated as fast as possible. But I think it is more fashionable than reasonable to argue that the cause of this summer of our discontent is directed solely to the war.

I think it was one of the springs that set it up. One wonders why it was not set off sooner at a time when the war was growing rather than at a time when the war was lessening. And it might have been good for this country had this happened about two to four years ago. But obviously it disorders the priorities. Obviously it deters and detains the

things that need to be done in this country. But I do not believe that we can ascribe all of our ills to this particular unfortunate situation.

Mr. RHODES. My second question is, we often hear descriptions of the political dissent coming from students. And this Commission is charged with investigating the process of campus unrest, which to some extent begs the question already, I would suggest, and in fact we are almost really more concerned about political dissent, which has more of its sources on the campuses. But why do you think—or do you think dissent in this country against the Administration's policies goes beyond the campuses; and in fact is something which is suggested by simply focusing on the campuses in terms of unrest?

Senator SCOTT. Well, dissent is the history of America. And it is not confined to the young. And when it is not violent, it should be honored. And there is a Jeffersonian precept to go on there. I do not believe that—the dissent today, I will put it this way, is more outspoken, or evident, more voluble. But we have had many periods of dissent in this country where the whole Nation reacted quite suddenly, with dissent against policies, economic or political. This is simply one of those periods in my life.

Mr. RHODES. Thank you, sir.

Chairman SCRANTON. Mr. Ahern?

Mr. AHERN. Senator, what contribution do you think the national Administration can make toward alleviating some of the concerns that students have today?

Senator SCOTT. The contribution of our concern, attention, listening, and invitation for wider participation. As you may know, this is not universally popularly said, but at the White House today there are probably more members of the Ripon Society than of any other organization.

And while I am concerned myself, I refer them to the intolerable excesses of the far right, for example. The White House, in other words, if you go down there, is really peppered with attractive thinking young men and women. We could have more of that in all the government. And those who are their elders would do well to listen to them.

I think the President's action in naming this Commission and recognizing people of different background and different ages is indicative of their concern. You can never really listen enough. But certainly there ought to be more of it.

And then like all administrations, there is the lack of follow-through. Every President has commented at one time or another, I give an order, and then nothing happens. So this Administration is nothing unusual, it gives orders too, and very frequently nothing happens.

Sometimes that is true of their leaders, they give orders to us in Congress, and nothing happens. It is the difficulty of the system.

Mr. CANHAM. Senator, could we get a little specific about the relationship of legislation to this problem. Would you tell us your views about pending legislation and other legislative proposals, what you think the Congress could do to help relieve the situation?

Senator SCOTT. Well, obviously, no repressive legislation—obviously no legislation designed to control people's behavior should be considered. Beyond that I think we in this country expect too much of our laws, and sometimes too little of the people who are responsible for administering it at all levels.

I would not have specific legislative suggestions to make. I would think that we ought to leave the solution of these problems as far as we can to the colleges, referring now to the students, to the colleges, to the faculties, to intercommunity relations.

I think that the Administration can help by supporting continued research into im-

balances in education, to discrimination in education, to the support of the educative process as we are doing in the education bill, where both House and Senate have added funds above and beyond the Administration's request.

But I believe we may be in a period where I would doubt that legislation per se touching on student unrest would be of very much use. The Commission may come forward with a suggestion, but nothing occurs to me.

Mr. CANHAM. As you well know, we have had for some time a system by which a considerable number of student interns come to Washington to work in the summertime and sometimes other times. How would you feel about a really massive enlargement of this participation of students in government, both in the legislative branch and in the executive branch, by which a contact, a first-hand personal relationship could be set up on a really substantial scale between students and the governmental process nationally, and of course State and local as well?

Senator SCOTT. Well, I would welcome it. I have had quite a bit of personal experience with this. I think it would be an excellent thing to do if college credits were to be allowed for this kind of internship, if it were a regular part of the curriculum where those who wished to do it could. I have a dozen interns in my office this year.

Normally we have six to seven. We have had some requests. And we try to divide them among small colleges and large.

We are aware of the women's liberation movement. And we have usually about the same number of ladies and gentlemen. They are fascinated by the entire process. It does the public officials good, because it convinces them as observers that we really work very much harder than the general public would understand or accept. They themselves ultimately become involved in the political process. I have never known a college intern who worked for me who did not later maintain some interest in political life and affairs. And some of them became candidates for public office.

I will give you a very amusing incident. Janet Bond discovered that the old common law position of coroner in the county of Mercer, New Jersey, was elective. So she set up a write-in petition, and got herself elected as coroner of Princeton University. And she found that the only duties she had were the care of shipwrecked sailors. And you would be amazed at the naval change in Princeton after Janet became coroner.

Mr. CANHAM. Could you explore a little further your views about the relationship of students to this fall campaign. Do you think the colleges and universities should suspend for a while so the students can take an active part in the campaign in October? Or what do you think should be the attitude as to this 1970 campaign?

Senator SCOTT. Well, one wonders whether it will become a regular process or not, whether it will continue for all Novembers. I would see no special objection to it. I would prefer that instead of the universities closing down—which I think is a mistake, I think it is a mistake to close the universities for an election, it makes more of an elite of students. They are already elitists. It gives them special privileges not available to the worker in a plant, or to the professional man, to the woman in secretarial work. So that they give a certain advantage which will be resented in other parts of the community.

But if the individual student, if the colleges could arrange for the individual student to take a couple of weeks off to engage in political activity on condition that he makes up the time, that seems to me to be a desirable objective. It has been done to some degree in other countries. It is not unusual in England to go to the dean and ex-

plain that you want to be away for a week or so, and you have time to make it up. If the colleges can be sufficiently flexible to accommodate that I would see no objection.

But I do not think you ought to close the whole university because allegedly a majority of the students want to engage in the political process. I know students pretty well. I have taught twice in my lifetime. Five to 10 per cent of them will engage in the political processes, and rest will go off on a lark somewhere.

Chairman SCRANTON. Dr. Derthick?

Dr. DERTHICK. Would you guess that giving the vote to persons of eighteen will in any significant way alleviate the discontent among young people?

Senator SCOTT. Yes. If I can come at this sideways, I think the reform in the draft has already taken some of the pressure off the valve. And students become aware that the draft is a one-year thing, and ultimately it will be succeeded by a voluntary army. It is a release of pressure. The right to vote is a release of pressure.

I have supported the 18-year-old vote reluctantly, because I think 19 is a better age. We have not been given our choice in Congress here, it is either 18 or 21. I think 19 is better.

In a rather extensive survey, I think, in the State of Washington a few years ago, all of the 18-year-olds voted for the 18-year-old vote. But when they reached 19, and 19 to 21, they were overwhelmingly of the opinion that 19 was a better age.

That says something to me. In England in the last generation there were 2.8 million men between the ages of 18 and 21 who might have voted, and only 1 per cent voted.

And therefore two things emerge, I believe, one, that the young people do not exercise the franchise in the proportion their elders do when given it, and, two, they divide about as diversely in this disparate fashion as their elders did.

Mr. ORTIGUE. I want to follow through with reference to the matter of students being heard, because the question of the draft is so important to them and their concerns. Do you foresee relief for students in the immediate future, future relief in terms of the draft?

Senator SCOTT. Yes, in several directions. First, I think the number of draft calls will steadily decrease, for example, for the rest of this year. And this Administration would be very wise not to have heavy draft calls in September and October, both for their purposes and that of the students.

We have a voluntary army pending which may yet be adopted, perhaps not in its present form, but with a provision for ultimately putting the draft on a standby and moving into a volunteer army. And that has a really good chance of being accepted in the Congress.

Moreover, the combat troops will or should be out of Vietnam by next spring or summer. And that would perhaps permit sending only volunteers to combat areas. So that I think all of these will ease the student concern.

And I have noticed among adults that the greatest and most violent rhetoric usually comes from parents of 15-, 16-, and 17-year-olds, those who are about to be eligible for the draft.

Mr. RHODES. Senator, you have said that you are opposed to the legislation to repress the acts of students. Some students have charged that the Industrial Security Act which is now in the Judiciary Committee, and the D.C. Crime Bill which would permit no knock, and legislation with respect to drugs would be used oppressively against them. Students at the University of South Carolina have petitioned me to that extent. How do you feel about those acts?

Senator SCOTT. IST, the Internal Security Act in the Internal Security Subcommittee?

Mr. RHODES. No, there is one about the industrial security in the Judiciary.

Senator SCOTT. I do not know of a bill that touches on industrial security. But if it is the broad overall of the internal security, which is a low number, S. 1, or S. 8, which has been considered off and on this year and last, I have very serious reservations on it, and probably could not support it. I am on that subcommittee. And I have already indicated that I do not like what is going on in that bill.

I think it does have within it the seeds of oppression.

Now, on no-knock, which the House of Representatives considers today and the Senate tomorrow, and the D.C. Crime Bill, both no-knock and preventive detention have become liberal code words. They are knee-jerk words nowadays. And they will not stand up to the assault upon them in my opinion. And I will tell you why.

In the first place, a no-knock is already the law in approximately three-fourths of the States. It is the common law of England. And it certainly means that if you are—if the arresting officer is of the conviction that his life is endangered, or that the evidence is about to be destroyed instantly and on the spot, he may enter without a warrant.

Now, what this bill does, wrought by lawyers and wrought by men who are extremely concerned about the rights of individuals is interpose the judgment of a judge or a magistrate, whichever way it will come out of the Congress, in lieu of the judgment of the policeman.

As it is now, the common law, and in most states the policeman, can knock on the door. Now, if behind that door there is a dealer in heroin, and he has in a little box anywhere from \$10,000 to \$100,000 worth of this white powder, if there is a knock, the powder goes down the drain in about five seconds. And therefore it is essential to preserve the evidence.

But this new bill, Federal bill, will go much further than most of the States. It would require the policeman not to use his own judgment, but to go to the judge and give the fact as to the reasonableness of the existence of the evidence, and the right to protect society, which in my view overwhelms the rights of the individual.

Under those circumstances, therefore, you have someone responsible above and beyond the policeman, who does not necessarily have the same legal training, the judge.

Now, as to preventive detention, I am not quite as positive on that. It is again an effort to determine whether the rights of society rank higher collectively than the rights of the individual. There a judge could detain a person accused of a crime, and would not normally under the law as written detain a first offender. If there is evidence that that person's previous record of conduct, or conviction of crime, is such that it would be dangerous to the entire community to have him released, and there is a special provision in this bill providing for a special calendar so that these people shall be detained properly and may not be detained beyond this period in jail—there is a constitutional question.

Most of the lawyers in the Congress seem to think it is constitutional, that it does not violate the prohibition against excessive bill.

I have a reservation on it until I have heard all the evidence. But it may be that this is another case where we decide for society rather than for the individual. And when you stop to think of it, that is the case in almost every criminal statute.

Chairman SCRANTON. Have the members of the staff any questions?

Mr. BYRNE. No.

Chairman SCRANTON. Senator, you referred

in your statement to a synergistic system to harness some of this violence that is going on. And yet you do not think that we should involve ourselves in any way in repression. How are we going to get such a synergistic system of harnessing, and why do you think we ought to have it?

And secondly, if we do have it, how can we avoid repression?

Senator SCOTT. Well, your system has in the process of formulation, as I see it, through public opinion already, if one can rely on the survey, some 80-odd per cent of the people have reacted quite violently against violence. I would think that one of the functions of this Commission is to help to establish public opinion and to advance it.

And there are some guidelines—I hate to use this cliché—but some guidelines. And rules of behavior and conduct will emerge and be accepted by society generally, and be recommended to faculty administrators and college presidents. I have in mind, when you speak of the control of violence, that these colleges who resorted to civil relief were often more successful than those who called on the police force, the writ of injunction.

The University of Virginia has adopted, for example, in the midst of violent controversy between the alumni, the student body and the faculty, certain rules of behavior. In other words, if you want to protest, you give a notice in advance, and you do it on certain days and in certain areas of the university, and you are protected, the university is on your side.

If you violate the rules which you have agreed upon in advance—all students are asked to agree in advance—to fail to agree has already outlawed a dozen or two dozen people, perhaps, I do not know what you do with them except to keep an eye on them. But at this university the student body agreed. And they also agreed that they would accept the penalties which came from violating the rules which they were jointly making.

And I think this is one area that you are aware of, that you already know about.

Chairman SCRANTON. If we do come up with some formulas or guidelines, have we got some instances of universities where this has worked? Perfectly frankly, we are looking forward to any instances or cases anywhere in the country where protests and dissents have been handled, and handled well, and at the same time people given an opportunity to vent their spleen on whatever they care to do.

Senator SCOTT. I have only experience with two schools, both of which I once attended. And there they were handled well, and were handled reasonably, and again within the Jeffersonian area of the principle, the University of Virginia and Randolph Macon.

Chairman SCRANTON. Isn't it impossible to make a formula and say, use this over all the country? Aren't there differences?

Senator SCOTT. Oh, yes. There is the widest kind of differences, obviously. And one which would go in an urban environment, a community college, might not go in a sectarian small-town institution. So that I doubt if we could establish with too much specificity a guideline that would apply to everybody. And I think there are some broad rules of behavior which society has long recognized.

And I think the key to it is asking people to abide by it in the first place. Because that is where you identify the outlaws, who certainly regard themselves as Robin Hoods, but you identify them.

Chairman SCRANTON. Secondly, one other question. You say that you do not think that there is basic legislation that could be passed that would be helpful in this field, because if we got into too much of that it would really end up in repression. And yet at the same time it is generally conceded, as we referred to it, that students, at least a lot of them, seemed to be very frustrated by

our present political action or lack of political action.

And the political system does not seem to move as rapidly forward in the way they think it ought. Are there any reforms, political reforms that you would advocate, or any suggestions that you would make to us to advocate that would help in this political system to answer some of their questions, if they should be answered?

Senator SCOTT. Well, they have indicated when they come down here that they dislike the unwillingness of Congress to reform itself. They feel that there should be a much better system for avoidance of conflict of interest, for disclosure of holdings, for some change in the seniority system. The problem in Congress is, the longer you stay here the more you tend to like the system.

But it has been recommended in both the House and the Senate that the choice of the committee chairman ought to be made perhaps by the committee itself from among the three or five more senior members, which avoids the brashness of the total newcomer, creating a revolution the first week he is in the Congress, but at the same time gives a width of choice and breadth to selection of committee chairmen, and probably would make them less cocksure of themselves.

A committee chairman in Congress has enormous powers, much more than the chairman of an average committee elsewhere. So they would like to see this system reformed.

They would like to see reforms in the State Legislature, where to the student they seem to be doing little more than voting an increase in salaries or expense accounts.

They would like to see, I am sure, more democracy, as they put it, in the university itself, and in the way in which the university runs.

They would like to have more say about the curriculum. And now I think you are in a highly controversial area in which I am not competent to speak. As I say, I would like to see more logic and more philosophy taught. I would like to see some of the old basically virtuous subjects renovated and restored.

I believe that there is a likelihood that students will better understand the system if we can engage their attention as to what it is we are trying to do with a little more plausibility.

You are not going to engage it by calling them rough names. You are not going to engage it by refusing to talk to them. You may ultimately cause them to listen if you sound more reasonable than their elders have been sounding to them. And then of course the on-rush of time will take care of this college generation, which will become quite logical in about eight to ten years.

Chairman SCRANTON. Mr. Ortigue has one last question, which he says you can answer with a yes or no.

Mr. ORTIGUE. Senator, do you have any indication that there are forces outside of this country that are pushing students within this country, or assisting them in carrying on campus unrest?

Senator SCOTT. I have no evidence whatever. The Communist Party would be missing a big bet if it were not frantically running around the fringe trying to penetrate. But I see no evidence of it.

Mr. ORTIGUE. Thank you.

Chairman SCRANTON. We thank you very much, Senator. We appreciate the time you have given us, and particularly your courtesy in allowing us to have this room. And we welcome anything that you would like to send us at any time, sir, during the course of the deliberations of the Commission.

Senator SCOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman SCRANTON. Is Senator Kennedy here?

We are very grateful to have Senator Kennedy before us. I do not think anybody in America is more interested in the problems of youth in America than Senator Ken-

nedy. I do not think I need to introduce him to any of you, or to the City of Washington.

You may proceed as you wish, sir. You may read your statement or comment on it or do anything you wish to and then we would like to ask you some questions.

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you very much, Chairman Scranton.

THE BLOODBATH IS NOW

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, now that it has become apparent that our Vietnam adventure has helped rather than hindered the fall of the dominoes, and that it has wrecked our economy and destroyed our domestic tranquility, the arguments that the war serves our national interest have gone out of style. The principal argument against accelerated withdrawal has become the danger of the bloodbath might ensue among those adherents of the Thieu-Ky regime who are unable to escape to the Riviera.

The possibility of a bloodbath concerns me deeply. I do not like it all. But as a reason for staying in Vietnam it leaves me absolutely unmoved.

To begin with, there is no evidence that an American withdrawal would produce a greater bloodbath than would a Thieu-Ky victory. Bloodbaths are not a peculiarly Communist phenomenon; the greatest slaughter of recent times was that which followed an anti-Communist victory in Indonesia.

Thieu and Ky, and Lon Nol for that matter, have shown themselves as capable of atrocity as has the other side. And our own effectiveness at ameliorating their savagery has not been impressive.

But more importantly, the bloodbath that is going on right now is far greater than that which could reasonably be expected to be committed by either side after the end of the war. For Vietnam as well as for the United States, the greatest evil is the war itself.

Using figures supplied by the Agency for International Development, columnists Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden have put together an interesting analysis in their Washington Post column of July 21, 1970, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

THE NONCOMBATANT TOLL ALREADY EXCEEDS PREDICTIONS OF VIETNAM "BLOODBATH"

(By Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden)

We have the capability to count every last bullet we capture, every grain of rice scooped from the Cambodian sanctuaries, and every week we solemnly list the "body count" of enemy dead, but we publish no figures on the number of noncombatant civilians we kill. There is a good reason—conservative estimates from the field are that we kill more civilians in a year in Vietnam than the Vietcong have since the war began.

For those who like to talk about the "bloodbath" that will ensue if we leave Vietnam, the figures are instructive. Most official spokesmen put at 29,000 the number of innocent civilians killed by the Vietcong since the war began. President Nixon—presumably with better information—put

that figure at 40,000 in his conversation on network TV last week.

But U.S. and South Vietnamese government figures show that there were at least 200,000 civilian casualties in South Vietnam in the past twelve months, including between 50,000 and 60,000 dead. Those figures do not include any civilian deaths in Laos, where our saturation bombing is at a higher level than it ever was against Japan, or in Cambodia, whose civilian population we have only this year begun to expose to our bombing and artillery.

One starts this gloomy study of civilian casualties with official figures of the Agency for International Development (AID). AID finances 43 civilian hospitals in Vietnam, and keeps records of their admissions, as well as those to the military hospitals of civilian casualties. It is only since late 1967 that we have begun to treat Vietnamese civilian casualties at all, although we have been causing them, on a major scale, ever since our bombing and "search and destroy" missions began in 1965.

In the base year of 1967, there were nearly 50,000 civilian casualties admitted for treatment in these AID-supported and U.S. hospitals. On-the-spot investigation by the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees yielded the conservative conclusion that the admission figures were understated by from 10 to 20 per cent.

Testimony by senior AID health officials from Vietnam revealed further that for each casualty admitted to a provincial hospital, there was at least another civilian wounded but not admitted. That is to say, roughly the same number were treated in village or hamlet clinics, at home, or not at all. In addition, there was a conservative estimate that approximately 50,000 Vietnamese civilians died of war injuries before they ever reached a hospital.

All of that adds up to between 150,000 and 200,000 civilian casualties in 1967, of whom between 50,000 and 60,000 died. Those are the figures for 1967, and the comparable figures are higher for each subsequent year, including the current one. In 1967, by the official Pentagon count, there were 3,706 civilians killed by the Vietcong. Since the enemy has no air force at all with which to bomb villages, since it has no navy to shell from off-shore, and since enemy rocket attacks on the cities are infrequent and cause relatively few casualties, the conclusions to be drawn are inescapable and melancholy.

Finally, it must be added in all candor that even this doesn't tell the whole story. Our "body count" of enemy dead in the past twelve months (pre-Cambodia) stands at 138,982. Concealed in that figure, we know at least since My Lai, is a large number of innocent civilians, including women and children.

In support of the argument that a bloodbath would ensue if we left Vietnam precipitously, the Pentagon has now produced a study estimating that some 100,000 South Vietnamese would be killed by the enemy. But even that number is carefully hedged, and assumes the unthinkable possibility that we would make no effort to protect them. But the casualty figures tell another story; the South Vietnamese have had that kind of a bloodbath every year since we made them a part of the Free World.

ON LEGISLATION FOR VETERANS

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, as the junior Senator from Pennsylvania and as ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, I have

long admired the outstanding record of my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. Scott) in the field of veterans' legislation.

Senator Scott, himself a war veteran, is currently backing a number of important bills to assist veterans with their education and medical needs and to provide additional benefits and recognition to the families of deceased veterans.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of Senator Scott's accomplishments in veterans' legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR HUGH SCOTT'S RECORD ON VETERANS' LEGISLATION

One debt this Nation owes that can never be fully repaid is the debt to our veterans. Senator Hugh Scott, a veteran himself, having seen active service in the North Atlantic and the South Pacific, knows that veterans deserve to receive additional benefits.

Senator Scott has always worked for legislation to aid veterans. He has introduced bills calling for additional national cemetery space in Pennsylvania and has called for a rehabilitation allowance for paralyzed veterans. During the 1968 Republican National Convention, Senator Scott was Chairman of the Platform Subcommittee on Human Needs, which dealt with veterans affairs. He wrote the plank which promised aid to returning Vietnam veterans, further assistance to cold war veterans and increased benefits to veterans of previous wars.

The following summary outlines how Senator Scott has worked to assist veterans:

91ST CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 338—To increase the rates of educational assistance allowance paid to veterans.

S. 1205—To provide for a Supreme Sacrifice Medal for widow or kin of deceased.

S. 2800—To provide paraplegia rehabilitation allowance of \$100 a month for veterans of World War I, World War II and Korea.

S. 2813—To increase amount payable on burial and funeral expenses for veterans from \$250 to \$400.

S. 2890—To define "active duty" so as to allow reservist or member of National Guard or Air National Guard of any state to enjoy education benefits.

Votes

Voted to provide additional veterans' education and training assistance.

89TH CONGRESS

Votes

Voted for the Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967.

89TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 969—To provide for at least one veterans' service center in each state.

S. 3580—To provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served during the Vietnam era.

Votes

Voted to provide education and readjustment benefits to those who served in the southeast Asia theater of operations as determined by the President.

Voted to provide that benefits of the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act be through grants rather than loans.

Voted for the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act.

88TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. Res. 48—Creating a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the United States Senate.

87TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 3289—To grant national service life insurance to veterans heretofore ineligible.

Votes

Voted against reducing by \$10 million funds for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses of the Veterans' Administration.

86TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 688—To provide for establishment of national cemeteries in Pennsylvania.

S. 269—To equalize pay of retired members of uniformed services.

Votes

Voted for the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959.

Voted to offer to veterans of World War II and to veterans of the Korean War an opportunity for one year to take out national service life insurance at their attained age.

Pennsylvania's veterans are receiving greater benefits and more assistance than ever before because of Senate Republican Leader Hugh Scott's efforts over the years. Senator Scott has pledged his continued efforts for the future.

MEET THE CHALLENGE

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, we are constantly hearing complaints about our system of Government, our universities, our churches, and our environment.

But while we are hearing all that is wrong, the complainants rarely offer solutions to correct the shortcomings.

This was pointed out in a well-written editorial by Ellis Bloomfield in the Hecor Mirror in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, and for the edification of my colleagues, I insert Mr. Bloomfield's editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MEET THE CHALLENGE

We spend an awfully lot of time complaining about our system, our government, our universities, our churches and about how loused up our whole world is. Of course many things really do need changing. We have made and will continue to make many mistakes as long as we are doing things.

It is easy to view our mistake in getting involved in the Viet Nam War, our failure to keep our environment clean, our raising too large families, our not curbing inflation, our spoiled children and a host of other problems. Most of these problems have been protested by mass demonstrations and other means.

There is a real challenge, now that we are so aware of the problems, and perhaps it can be met in part by some of those graduating this week. That challenge is in finding the solutions.

Demonstrations and protests in the past have certainly brought the problems to our attention, but now we need something more. It takes no guts or brains to join a mass movement and make a protest demonstration. It takes a lot more to work out and propose solutions. We recently heard a speaker who said that we should follow each protest with a proposal.

We do not like pollution but we cannot destroy all automobiles and shut down all of our factories, instead we have to come up with pollution eliminating devices. We must come up with a new powerplant for our cars or clean up the old one. We must devise ways to produce our manufacturing materials without cluttering up the air. There is more of a challenge in this than marching down the street and making demands that factories be closed, which is obviously no solution.

Almost everyone in the country would like to get out of Viet Nam, but not too many workable solutions have been proposed. The logistics of the situation alone prohibit us from simply raising our hands and immediately pulling out. We do not want to commit to slaughter the last 50 or 60 thousand boys over there, especially if we know a few of them personally. Yet there has to be a workable solution for a fast pullout. It would be a challenge for some group to come up with a well worked out plan better than that now being followed. It would probably be adopted and welcomed.

You can go right down the list of things being complained about and ask yourself if you have any solutions. If you do, make them known, if you do not, then think about them. Your voice will be heard far louder than if you "give up" and join the masses who can only take the negative approach and knock the system, without trying to better it.

The world is desperately in need of deep thinking young people who can set their sights on improving their world and do something about it.

KIDNEY FOUNDATION OF CALIFORNIA

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding example of volunteer public welfare effort that is taking place in southern California.

The Kidney Foundation of Southern California, headquartered in Los Angeles, an affiliate of the National Kidney Foundation, has just completed a most successful fiscal year—1969-70—in its continuing battle against the Nation's No. 4 killer—kidney disease.

The foundation is a nonprofit, nonsectarian organization supported by public contributions, with volunteers devoting their time and money in a three-prong attack against this often insidious threat to our health. The group sponsors service to aid kidney disease patients with "Project Life Preserver" a program of securing home artificial kidney machines. It supports research to discover causes and seek means of control of kidney disease. Through an educational program the foundation keeps the public informed of ways of early diagnosis of kidney disease and keeps physicians continually alerted to new discoveries by means of literature and an annual medical symposium.

In the last fiscal year the organization funded nine new home artificial kidney machines, making a total of 12 that have

now been made available at no cost to needy patients by the foundation. It also earmarked \$25,000 for research fellowship grants and established three new volunteer chapters in the western Los Angeles area, the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area, and in San Diego County. Also launched were an at-cost drug bank, transplant donor program, and a pilot kidney disease detection project.

I would like to publicly express appreciation for a job well done by the hundreds of dedicated members, contributors, physicians, and to the 1969-70 board of directors led by Mr. Orville John Hoag, Jr., its president, Dr. Harvey C. Conick, M.D., chairman of the foundation's voluntary scientific advisory council, and to Mr. Leonard Gottlieb, the Kidney Foundation of Southern California's executive director.

MEDICAL CARE AND POCKETBOOKS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in this year of recession every American has been hard hit by the dual tragedies of inflation and unemployment. Perhaps hardest hit of all are those who have had the misfortune of being hospitalized.

Hospitalization has always been a hardship; illness is never easy, but it is especially trying at the present time. Today, with the usual hardships of illness, comes the added problem of paying the astronomical costs of medical care.

Recently, an editorial appeared in the Los Angeles Times commenting on this problem. The editorial states:

There is a growing consensus that something must be done—because for millions of Americans, going to the hospital means going broke or close to it. For many more, good medical care is next to nonexistent.

It goes on to offer some succinct comments on the options before Congress and on the difficult choices which Congress will have to make in order to balance the public's demand for more health protection and the public's predictable reluctance to pay the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this editorial presents a view which the entire Congress should take into consideration. I insert it in the RECORD:

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 13, 1970]

MEDICAL CARE AND POCKETBOOKS

ISSUE: With medical costs soaring, what role should the federal government play in providing adequate health insurance?

Although Americans spend over \$60 billion a year for health care, far more than any other nation in the world, it is almost literally true that a lot of people would as soon die as get seriously ill.

For millions of Americans, going to the hospital means going broke or close to it. For many more, good medical care is next to non-existent.

There is a growing consensus that something must be done—even if that something has to be a national health insurance system going far beyond the existing Medicare and Medicaid programs for the elderly and indigent.

Several bills already have been introduced, ranging from a modest "medicredit" approach backed by the American Medical Assn., to a sweeping proposal that cradle-to-the-grave medical services, financed through the federal government, be made available to every man, woman and child in the United States.

The Nixon Administration is expected to come up with some specific proposals of its own for the next session of Congress.

Despite the growing pressure for action, however, the question is so enormously complex that it may take several years to work out an approach which will alleviate rather than exacerbate the problem.

As anyone knows who has been to a hospital lately, medical costs have been soaring out of sight—partly because the 1966 enactment of Medicare and Medicaid created massively greater demands for health services, and partly because of the pressures for higher pay by nurses and medical technicians.

Even people who have relatively generous medical insurance coverage can be wiped out by a catastrophic illness in the family. The situation is even more tragic for the 24 million Americans under 65 who have no health insurance at all.

It is widely recognized, however, that a comprehensive national health system will produce nothing but still higher medical costs unless it is accompanied by measures to increase the supply and quality of medical services.

This involves the training of more doctors, of course.

In view of many experts, it also involves the large-scale use of so-called paraprofessionals—medical technicians who can take over some of the less complicated functions now performed by physicians.

Finally, it is expected to involve steps to encourage a more effective utilization of equipment by hospitals, and an acceleration of the trend toward group medical practice.

Just how to go about achieving these fundamental reforms is going to require some very close congressional study. The lawmakers need to do considerable head-scratching, too, over the extent to which an expanded federal health insurance plan will supplant private industry's own medical insurance programs.

Last but not least, there is the politically important question of balancing off the public's demand for more health protection and the public's predictable reluctance to pay the bill—a bill which, under the more ambitious schemes, could run up to \$40 billion a year.

Since the money can come only out of our own pockets, either in the form of higher income taxes or social security deductions from our paychecks, that is a very large question indeed.

KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Franklin J. Krantz, Jr., a courageous young man from Maryland, was killed

recently in Vietnam. I should like to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD.

Pfc. FRANKLIN KRANTZ, JR., KILLED AT 19 IN VIETNAM

Pfc. Franklin J. Krantz, Jr., of Route 3, Frederick, died in Vietnam June 13 after being wounded in an enemy ambush a week before, the Department of Defense announced yesterday.

Private Krantz, 19, died at the 12th Evacuation Hospital in Cu Chi, Tay Ninh province. He was wounded by enemy small-arms fire while on patrol somewhere in South Vietnam on June 4, the Defense Department said.

A member of Company A, 1st Battalion, 5th Infantry Regiment, 25th Infantry Division, he had been on duty in Cambodia prior to his being shot, his father said.

Private Krantz had enlisted for three years in the Army in July, 1969, after his graduation from Governor Thomas Johnson High School in Frederick.

He completed his basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C. and had advanced training at Fort Polk, La. He was sent to Vietnam in December, 1969.

In high school, he was a member of the glee club. "His only ambition was to be a radio announcer," his father said.

Private Krantz, who was born in Frederick, is survived by his father, Franklin J. Krantz, Sr., of Frederick; his mother, Mrs. Ronald Garling, of Bel Air; three sisters, Mrs. Susan Shafer and Mrs. Sandra Leigh, both of Frederick; and Candace C. Krantz, of Bel Air; and both grandmothers, Mrs. Henry Krantz, of Frederick, and Mrs. Carl Brinkman, of Orlando, Fla.

VA HOSPITALS SHORT OF FUNDS AND PERSONNEL FOR 1971

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a result of a recent survey made last week of the 166 VA hospitals by the Veterans' Affairs Committee, it appears that the budget requests made to the Congress for the Veterans' Administration for 1971 fall over \$180 million short of what is needed to meet the medical needs for America's sick and disabled veterans. H.R. 17548, which is the Appropriations bill to fund this program, is presently awaiting action by the House and Senate conferees. As the bill stands in conference, the Congress has added a total of \$125 million to the requests made by the administration. One hundred million dollars was added by the Senate and I have written to each of my colleagues endorsing the action taken by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the wisdom of the House and Senate action is borne out by the survey which the Veterans' Affairs Committee has just completed. I have communicated these results to each one of the House conferees so that they will have the most up-to-date information available as they contemplate accepting

the additional \$100 million voted by the Senate. It is abundantly clear to me that the House conferees should accept the additional funding voted by the Senate as it appears that dental care for returning Vietnam veterans has been underfunded by over \$20 million; hospital equipment budgets have been short-changed by over \$26 million; and VA hospital directors throughout the Nation say they are over \$83 million short of funds to hire needed recruitable medical personnel.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a breakdown of the 1971 nationwide deficiencies just compiled by the Veterans' Affairs Committee:

Dental Care for returning Vietnam Veterans.....	\$20,409,707
Community Nursing Care program	7,524,798
Purchase of New Equipment.....	11,644,159
Purchase of Replacement Equipment	14,667,774
Non-recurring Maintenance & Repair	35,526,747
Recurring Maintenance & Repair	1,982,412
Recruitable Medical Personnel.....	83,495,450
Other categories (i.e. fees for medical consultants, contract hospitalization, outpatient fee medical, state home program grants, etc.).....	5,259,253

Total 1971 VA hospital deficiencies

180,510,300

Mr. Speaker, the following is a State by State breakdown of these figures:

States reporting	Dental care for returning Vietnam veterans	Community nursing care program	Purchase of new equipment	Purchase of replacement equipment	Nonrecurring maintenance and repair	Recurring maintenance and repair	Recruitable medical personnel	Other	Total
Alabama.....	\$728,877	\$275,094	\$160,116	\$404,436	\$253,330	0	\$1,819,609	\$46,016	\$3,687,478
Arizona.....	213,515	33,544	242,430	227,328	386,943	\$24,875	794,535	35,527	1,958,697
Arkansas.....	93,924	22,101	259,186	212,963	522,202	0	587,156	0	1,697,537
California.....	3,514,650	216,140	1,564,084	2,220,662	5,331,457	310,853	6,965,680	239,573	20,363,099
Colorado.....	523,340	86,930	155,560	258,670	643,761	92,000	1,688,183	9,500	1,937,944
Connecticut.....	692,340	18,003	121,255	96,080	456,704	11,150	1,625,626	0	3,021,158
Delaware.....	40	189,964	96,610	41,200	101,730	0	651,907	0	1,081,371
District of Columbia.....	152,372	98,096	247,350	163,800	374,125	0	2,843,300	27,000	4,005,043
Florida.....	729,352	306,053	520,933	101,000	43,476	0	3,448,555	40,275	5,189,644
Georgia.....	695,054	245,544	160,375	3,298	134,760	0	1,830,230	312,749	3,382,010
Idaho.....	75,728	6,621	0	102,613	0	0	139,967	(-12,004)	9,378,111
Illinois.....	643,493	631,007	363,246	623,790	826,029	67,000	4,809,871	183,798	9,378,111
Indiana.....	177,169	44,712	85,573	78,750	119,313	40,000	908,758	38,034	1,318,785
Iowa.....	231,000	290,879	367,812	173,564	232,575	25,000	2,403,426	535,800	4,260,056
Kansas.....	111,353	84,263	135,400	118,900	2,180,148	95,600	1,114,078	80,695	3,920,437
Kentucky.....	64,500	36,044	0	0	151,278	0	1,036,422	0	1,288,244
Louisiana.....	185,999	55,099	515,454	365,470	1,105,978	94,300	1,771,935	100,259	4,194,494
Maine.....	96,645	0	0	0	0	0	158,235	24,000	278,880
Maryland.....	98,936	132,740	91,595	18,000	284,450	50,000	608,464	33,600	1,318,785
Massachusetts.....	554,800	257,814	385,348	328,240	944,274	60,000	2,041,246	20,000	4,591,722
Michigan.....	1,657,333	231,756	267,291	320,853	5,420,028	123,000	1,538,163	136,338	9,794,762
Minnesota.....	965,067	217,979	13,000	426,630	320,805	0	630,410	6,400	2,580,291
Mississippi.....	52,550	135,046	0	0	0	0	724,189	30,963	942,748
Missouri.....	382,848	68,880	595,073	894,722	1,157,023	123,558	2,024,526	27,100	5,273,730
Montana.....	171,102	14,421	13,505	28,314	55,210	0	272,820	33,786	589,158
Nebraska.....	330,408	51,423	75,612	152,914	1,377,685	6,000	865,323	41,825	2,901,190
Nevada.....	35,678	12,775	11,631	146,552	371,135	0	243,910	2,412	824,093
New Hampshire.....	71,950	0	40,100	33,475	88,772	0	172,268	25,560	432,125
New Jersey.....	95,760	235,411	484,010	576,616	790,652	62,595	1,782,106	0	4,027,150
New Mexico.....	29,322	57,648	96,213	71,302	107,551	0	230,474	150,284	742,749
New York.....	1,025,718	798,162	2,327,382	3,882,583	6,084,860	292,844	9,963,018	1,112,595	25,397,162
North Carolina.....	233,456	108,822	261,333	127,944	220,982	0	3,616,200	0	4,568,737
North Dakota.....	146,095	15,330	0	0	0	0	200,580	10,950	372,955
Ohio.....	848,446	304,256	222,495	365,828	357,232	155,338	2,133,093	59,640	4,446,328
Oklahoma.....	317,199	38,520	49,592	241,953	362,841	11,700	965,241	79,346	2,066,312
Oregon.....	677,400	99,596	383,456	397,934	927,131	51,190	1,455,648	98,520	4,090,875
Pennsylvania.....	1,025,024	332,371	423,042	608,692	711,169	54,000	5,645,889	82,907	8,883,094
Puerto Rico.....	50,000	48,000	56,311	0	0	0	1,682,481	121,000	1,957,792
Rhode Island.....	170,600	0	0	0	0	0	394,070	62,050	626,720
South Carolina.....	162,608	127,000	99,107	126,616	303,531	0	204,049	111,450	1,134,361
South Dakota.....	38,400	8,915	28,111	45,470	0	0	178,282	7,602	306,780
Tennessee.....	247,544	372,261	0	0	144,129	91,470	1,160,236	0	1,986,938
Texas.....	1,015,352	324,386	303,885	508,923	530,624	60,500	4,724,009	16,700	7,504,379
Utah.....	83,000	0	75,841	62,125	233,849	40,950	191,090	0	686,855
Vermont.....	21,475	0	0	0	0	0	293,622	0	315,097
Virginia.....	151,250	210,824	53,516	134,808	705,377	25,000	753,180	41,860	2,075,815
Washington.....	312,774	308,302	171,441	104,279	185,578	13,489	1,386,108	703,866	3,186,837
West Virginia.....	95,000	20,383	99,214	65,456	39,428	0	978,232	0	1,297,713
Wisconsin.....	840,000	234,451	90,150	369,968	368,491	0	2,310,647	305,357	4,519,064
Wyoming.....	57,916	25,550	20,221	193,761	466,518	0	367,579	377,920	1,509,465
Total.....	20,409,707	7,524,798	11,644,159	14,667,774	35,526,747	1,982,412	83,495,450	5,259,253	180,510,300

A METHOD OF DECISIONMAKING
AMONG ALTERNATIVES

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have become increasingly concerned over the way decisions are being made with regard to the use of our resources. Often these decisions are made without a systematic evaluation of any kind. I submit that decisions affecting the allocation of our resources are generally very complex, and require a systematic reconciliation of conflicting goals to arrive at an optimum selection. The weakness of the prevalent decisionmaking approaches is that they have failed to recognize two basic principles of decisionmaking, reported Dr. A. Bruce Bishop in his study on "Socio-Economic and Community Factors in Planning Urban Freeways." These are:

(1) That decisions must be based on the differences among alternatives; (2) That money consequences must be separated from the consequences that are not reducible to money terms; then these irreducibles must be weighed against the money consequences as a part of the decisionmaking process.

Dr. Bishop's study deals with the choices in planning urban freeways; however, his method for comparing and evaluating user and community consequences for decisionmaking among alternatives is useful in all areas of public program decisions. I commend to the attention of my colleagues chapter VI of his study outlining his method as the second in a series of articles dealing with the critical matter of making choices in the allocation of our resources.

The study follows:

A METHOD FOR DECISIONS AMONG FREEWAY
LOCATION ALTERNATIVES BASED ON USER AND
COMMUNITY CONSEQUENCES

(By Bruce Bishop)

INTRODUCTION

Consequences to users and impacts on affected communities are both recognized as important parts of decisions about urban freeway locations. Often, of course, these decisions are made primarily in response to political pressures without a systematic evaluation of any kind. At the same time, highway planners and analysts have proposed various methods for evaluating these factors in order to provide a basis for improving and expediting the decision-making process. To date, these techniques have generally fallen into one of two groups. The first of these is to apply economic measures such as the benefit-cost ratio. It is primarily based on agency costs and motor vehicle operating and (possibly) time costs. The other technique is some form of point weighting scheme similar to the sufficiency rating. Seldom does either of these methods include more than a few of the many variables relevant to the decision.

A general criticism of either of these approaches is that they have failed to recognize two basic principles of decision making. These are:

1. That decisions must be based on the differences among alternatives.
2. That money consequences must be separated from the consequences that are not reducible to money terms; then these irre-

ducibles must be weighed against the money consequences as a part of the decisionmaking process.

One of several statements which applies these principles to highways and freeways is:

"In many cases, some consequences of decisions among highway alternatives cannot be expressed in terms of money. Furthermore, these 'irreducibles,' to whomsoever they may accrue, are relevant to the decision. In these situations, the 'dollar' answers from the economy study do not dictate the final choice; on the other hand they provide a money figure against which the irreducibles can be weighed and thereby narrow the area of uncertainty with which the decision maker is faced."¹

This paper proposes and discusses a procedure that is intended to fit these rather simple statements of principle to the complex problem of decision making among proposed freeway locations in urban areas. It offers a structure and analytical tools by which valid comparisons among alternatives, based on these principles of decision making, can be made.

It must be recognized at the outset that decisions about urban freeway locations usually involve a variety of effects that these are viewed and weighted differently by the affected interest groups. At the same time the human mind can at one time encompass and analyze the effects of only a limited number of such relationships. Thus a primary aim of any decisionmaking scheme must be to eliminate as many irrelevant factors as possible, and to provide a means for clearly focusing on and thinking straight about the remaining areas of agreement as well as on the points of disagreement.

REVIEW AND CRITIQUE OF PRESENT METHODS
OF ANALYSIS

The present methods for making decisions among alternative freeway locations generally fall into two groups. These are benefit-cost or other economy studies and point weighting schemes. A brief review and critique of each of these approaches follows.

Benefit-cost studies

Engineering economy provides the basis for comparing the direct economic consequences of alternate route locations with each other or with the "do nothing" alternative, which, in this instance, is to continue to use existing facilities. Engineering economic analysis has taken the following forms:

1. Benefit-cost ratios—including incremental benefit-cost ratios.
2. Present worth of benefits minus present worth of costs.
3. Equivalent uniform annual cost.
4. Rate of return—including incremental rates of return.

These methods are presented and discussed by various writers⁴ and¹⁴ and others. All of the methods, when correctly applied, will give equivalent answers. To date these techniques have been little used, except on the Interstate System, where they were required by the Bureau of Public Roads. Even these studies often left much to be desired.⁵

The principal difficulties in benefit-cost studies for alternative highway locations in rural areas relate to such factors as estimating future traffic volumes, choosing a proper time period for the analysis, determining appropriate unit values for such items as time, and for methods 1, 2, and 3 (above) specifying the minimum attractive rate of return. Each of these problems has received attention in the literature (see Reference 14 for a summary). In the urban environment, freeways have additional consequences referred to in the literature as community impacts or effects. These often involve values which cannot be quantified in money terms. To date, neither suitable techniques nor adequate data have been developed for appraising the economic effects of these factors; furthermore, it may be inap-

propriate to quantify some of them. It follows that, in the urban context, economic analysis may give only a partial appraisal of the problem.

Factor weighting methods

Systems of point weightings and numerical ratings also have been proposed as a method of evaluating community impacts. The approach of Jessiman and Brand, et al.⁶ is to itemize the objectives to be considered in the selection of the location and, where possible, to define a measure for the objective. Each objective is given a weight which reflects its importance relative to the other objectives. A total of 100 percent is assigned to all the objectives. Points under each objective are given to each proposal according to how well it satisfies the objective; the one best satisfying each objective receives the maximum points allowed; the worst receives none, and the remainder are assigned values between zero and the maximum. Points allotted to each objective are totaled for each proposal; and the one achieving the most points is considered the best alternative.

Hill⁷ proposes a similar method of evaluating which he calls a goal achievement matrix. This provides for separate weightings by individual segments of the community; in turn, these opinions are weighted to reflect the relative importance of each group. Other methods of analysis have been suggested by Roberts⁸, Shimpel and Grecco¹¹ and Schlager¹⁰.

All of these weighting methods violate in some basic ways the two principles of decision making stated earlier. Some of the reasons for this deficiency and some of the difficulties encountered in attempting to consolidate community effects into a single number are as follows:

1. *Finding Common Units of Measure.* The first difficulty is in finding a common unit for constructing a utility scale which can measure all the diverse impacts of a freeway in such a way that they can be combined into a single number.

2. *Assigning the Values.* Any procedure which requires the assigning of subjective numerical values leads to the question of who is to assign them. Clearly, where conflicting interests are involved, the viewpoint taken will affect the values assigned. It is also evident from careful observation of planning studies that values change during the planning process. This is to be expected as the natural result of information developed by the study itself and by the planners' reactions to this information. It follows that the rating scheme itself becomes another variable in the planning process.

3. *Weighting the Interest Groups.* Even if adequate evaluations by various groups can be obtained, the problem of comparing the evaluations or utilities assigned by one individual or group with those of others and deciding how much weight should be given to each still exists. Different members of society have different interests. Inevitably they will value the various objectives at widely varying rates. While the theoretical concept of utility is important, it is severely limited by the fact that to date no way has been demonstrated to measure the utilities of all individuals on some absolute scale. Until such interpersonal comparisons of utility are possible, the aggregation of the preferences of all individuals and groups in society into a single measure cannot be taken to be an objective measuring device.

4. *Complex Decisions Need More, Not less, Information.* In any situation where large amounts of information must be encompassed in a decision, the tendency of decision makers is to aggregate all information relevant to the decision into a single number. While too much information is confusing, too little information or an over-aggregation of information can also lead to incorrect decisions. Too much aggregation sub-

Footnotes at end of article.

merges pertinent information. It masks and covers the true differences among alternatives and leaves no way to identify and contrast these differences in decisionmaking. A middle ground is needed where the number of factors in the decision is manageable, and yet all the differences among the alternatives which are pertinent to the decision are shown.

USER AND COMMUNITY FACTORS IN EVALUATING ROUTE LOCATION ALTERNATIVES

To carry out an engineering, economic, social analysis of the effects of freeway location, a basis must be established for evaluating both user and community consequences in making comprehensive comparisons of the differences among alternatives. To accomplish this, three important aspects of the problem must be considered. These are (1) quantification and separation of user and community factors, (2) viewpoint of decision makers, and (3) time period of analysis. Decision makers should include all of these in their analyses if optimal decisions are to be made.

Quantification

Comparisons of the differences among alternatives depends on defining the factors which measure the relative merits of the alternatives. Identification and quantification of these factors are difficult problems. Tables 1 and 2 represent the effort of the authors to develop a list of factors that describe the cost of the freeway and its impact on users and the community. These tables separate the consequences into direct and indirect effects in a manner which, in the authors' opinions, is in best keeping with the second principle of decision making, and with the best current practice in highway economy studies. Table 1 contains the direct effects which are specifically associated with highway construction and use, and Table 2 the indirect effects which fall upon the non-user and the community. The "measures or suggested measures" indicate whether these consequences are presently quantifiable in money terms, or, in other instances, those factors for which there seems to be a good possibility to measure them in some other units. Factors which are seemingly non-quantifiable also are noted. The word "non-quantifiable" is used advisedly since the effects described by the item are real. In time they might be quantified, though not necessarily in dollar values.

User and direct effects. Table 1 lists the items of direct cost of the highway and costs or benefits to the highway user. Items (1)

and (2) under the heading "quantifiable market values" are those typically used in the calculation of benefits and costs in the economic analysis of highway projects. The variables listed under (1) the cost of the highway and (2a) vehicle operating costs are readily definable and, given reasonably accurate inputs, are quantifiable in money terms. The same is not true, however, for item (3) travel time savings to non-commercial vehicles and item (4), the non-quantifiable non-market items. These are important in the ledger of costs and benefits to the * * *. Considerable research effort has been devoted to arriving at monetary values for some of these factors. There remains, nevertheless, substantial controversy and disagreement as to the methods for imputing values to these factors, the values to be assigned, and whether or not certain portions of them should be considered at all.^{1 2 3 12 13}

In order to avoid confusion, and also to place the analysis on a solid economic basis, the authors recommend that only the "quantifiable market values" (measurable in the market place) be stated in money terms to be included in the economic analysis. This means that travel time savings must be

divided into commercial and non-commercial (as indicated by Table 1) segments, using a monetary value only for commercial travel time. Likewise only the identifiable economic costs of accidents are considered on the monetary side of the ledger, avoiding any attempt to place dollar values on loss of life, pain, or suffering caused by accidents. By the same line of reasoning, the authors recommend that discomfort, inconvenience, strain and aesthetic considerations not be stated in money terms.

Factors in Community Impact. Table 2 contains a list of 18 factors which describe the community or non-user effects of freeway route location. They are grouped into four areas: (1) Local Transportation Effects, (2) Community Planning and Environment, (3) Neighborhood and Social Structure, and (4) Community Economic and Fiscal Structure. As indicated earlier, techniques are not available and may not be appropriate for expressing the community effects of freeways in money terms. Quantification of others may not be possible even in non-monetary terms. Table 2 suggests some possible measures for items that appear to be quantifiable. Some of these have been taken from the highway research literature; others are suggestions of the authors. All are tentative at this point.

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 1.—DIRECT EFFECTS OF FREEWAY CONSTRUCTION AND USE

Factor	Description	Units	Time period (years)
QUANTIFIABLE MARKET VALUES			
1. Cost of highway:			
(a) Planning	Capital cost and annual cost of planning, constructing, maintaining, and operating the freeway.	Dollar	Not available.
(b) Right-of-way		do.	20 to 40.
(c) Construction		do.	20.
(d) Maintenance		do.	Annual.
(e) Operation		do.	Do.
2. Costs (benefits) to highway user:			
(a) Vehicle operating cost (including congestion costs).	Net increase (decrease) in costs of vehicle operation per year.	do.	Do.
(b) Travel time savings (commercial)	Net increase (decrease) in travel time, times dollar value of commercial travel time.	do.	Do.
(c) Motorist safety (economic cost of accidents).	Net change in expected number of accidents times average cost per accident.	do.	Do.
QUANTIFIABLE NONMARKET VALUES			
3. Costs (benefits) to highway user:			
Travel time savings (noncommercial)	Minutes saved per vehicle trip	Minutes or hours.	Do.
NONQUANTIFIABLE NONMARKET VALUES			
4. Costs (benefits) to highway user:			
Motorist safety	Accident-costs of pain, suffering and deprivation	Unknown	Do.
Comfort and convenience	Discomfort, inconvenience, and strain of driving	do.	Do.
Aesthetics from driver viewpoint	Benefit of pleasing views and scenery from the road.	do.	Do.

TABLE 2.—COMMUNITY EFFECTS OF FREEWAY LOCATION AND USE

Factor	Measures and suggested measures (description)	Units	Time period	
			Long run	Short run
Local transportation effects:				
Traffic service to community by freeway—Highway capacity, O-D of trips, major traffic generators.	1. Percent reduction of through traffic on city streets. (Vehicles before, vehicles after)/vehicles before.	Percent	X	
	2. Distance of freeway access from major traffic generators (E. G. academic, business, cultural, administrative centers) or as measured by road user or transportation costs.	Miles	X	
	3. Corridor miles compatible with present or future public transportation development.	do.	X	
Effect on local transportation—city street circulation mass and/or rapid transit.	1. Costs (savings) for improvement to city streets to provide for projected traffic volumes if freeway is not built.	Dollars	X	
	2. Net change in parking space available as result of freeway	Number of spaces	X	
	3. Number of interchanges with the community less streets closed	Number	X	
Access to regional facilities—recreation, education, culture, business, and employment.	1. Travel time savings to regional activity centers (minutes/vehicles) X (vehicles/day) for each facility.	Minutes per day	X	
	2. Number of trips to community generated from outside	Vehicles per day	X	X
Highway design standards—grades, alignment, and interchange location.	1. Miles less than X% grade	Miles	X	
	2. Miles of curvature less than Y radius	do.	X	
	3. Average distance between interchanges	do.	X	
Community planning and environment:				
Land use—Land development, changes in use, multiple use, separation of uses.	1. Land for potential development to which access is created	Acres	X	
	2. Miles of freeway separating incompatible land use minus miles dividing compatible uses.	Miles	X	
	3. Miles adjacent to or through land undergoing change in use	Miles/acre	X	
Ethetic impact of freeway on community—depressed or elevated, landscaping, structures.	1. Miles depressed in residential areas plus miles elevated in commercial areas less miles at grade.	Miles	X	
	2. Additional costs of aesthetic improvement in structures and landscaping.	Amount	X	
Noise	1. Increase in DB level weighted by miles residential, and numbers schools, churches, etc., adjacent to freeway.	DB (weighted)	X	
	2. Additional cost of noise barriers in "noise problem areas"	Dollars	X	
Air pollution	1. Net change in noxious exhaust emissions for projected traffic with and without the freeway.	Percent	X	

Factor	Measures and suggested measures (description)	Units	Time period	
			Long run	Short run
Neighborhood and social structure:				
Property values—Changes in resale values	1. Increase or decrease (net) over normal trend in property value classified by type of use and distance from freeway.	Dollars	X	
Neighborhood impacts—Displacement and relocation of people, environmental qualities, neighborhood cohesiveness and stability.	1. Number of housing units displaced (or) number displaced as percent of community's total stock.	Number		X
	2. Number of people displaced (or) number displaced as percent of community's population.	Dollars		X
	3. Net loss of housing—Units taken (less) vacant replacement housing in same price range with comparable financing (less) new construction planned on vacant land with financing.	Number of units	X	
	4. Cohesive neighborhoods severed by freeway (as determined by mapping neighborhood boundaries and social characteristics).	Number of people	X	X
Parks and recreational facilities	5. Neighborhood stability (mobility index, Hill, S.L., and Frankland, B., HRB record 187, 1967, pp. 33-42).	Index No.	X	X
	1. Acres of parks lost (gained) as percent of total available acres.	Percent	X	
Cultural and religious institutions	2. Cost of park replacement less compensation.	Dollars	X	
	3. Number of parks affected.	Number	X	X
	1. Number of churches taken (or) total attendance affected.	Number of churches		X
Historical sites and unique areas	2. Additional cost of relocation, excess over taking price.	Number of people	X	X
	3. Improved access or location for new church facilities.	Dollars	X	
	1. Number of historical areas lost (total affected less those relocated).	Minutes	X	
School system—Attendance boundaries, school environment	2. Value of monument measured by annual visits per year.	Number	X	
	1. Net loss (gain) in tax base for school system.	Visits per year	X	
	2. Number of schools totally or partially taken (or affected).	Dollars	X	X
	3. Number of school attendance areas with access to school seriously impaired where boundaries cannot be adjusted.	Number of schools	X	X
	4. Increase (decrease) in cost of providing school services due to changes in bussing, etc.	Number of pupils	X	X
Community economic and fiscal structure:	5. Net additional cost to the community of relocating schools affected by freeway (plus) cost of noise reduction in schools adjacent to freeway.	Dollars	X	X
	1. Loss of assessed valuation in right-of-ewy as percent of community total.	Percent		X
	2. Loss of assessed valuation in right-of-way less increase of land values (assessed) due to freeway impact.	Dollars	X	X
	3. Net loss (gain) in tax revenue due to freeway impact.	do	X	X
	1. Net increase (decrease) in costs of providing fire and police protection and water, sewerage, and garbage service.	do	X	
Community services—Police and fire protection, utility services—water, garbage.	2. Net number of businesses located (dislocated) by freeway.	do	X	
	1. Net increase (decrease) over normal trend in gross wholesale and retail sales.	Number	X	
Commercial activity—Wholesale, retail	2. Net number of jobs located (dislocated) as a result of freeway.	Number		X
	1. Net number of jobs located (dislocated) as a result of freeway.	Dollars	X	X
	2. Net gain (loss) in gross earnings from jobs located or dislocated by the freeway.	do	X	X
Employment—Creation of jobs, displacement of jobs	3. Net increase (decrease) in job opportunities due to expanded commuting area less jobs available to outside commuting.	Number	X	X

The factors and suggested measures given in Table 2 can be used as a basis for evaluating differences in community impact of various alternatives. It must be recognized that those measures which are given in dollar values are not compatible with the market cost items in Table 1 and therefore cannot be incorporated into the economic analysis. While the list of factors and measures given in Table 2 provides a reasonable means for identifying and measuring community effects, it is also meant to stimulate thought, research, and improvement in the means of

describing and measuring community impact. Only by collecting data during route location studies and on the effects of existing freeways will it be possible to properly evaluate the community effects of proposed freeway route alternatives.

Viewpoint as a factor in evaluating community effects

Different alternatives affect the various levels of government, communities, and groups in different ways. Much of today's controversy over freeways results from the

failure of one group to appreciate another's values and concerns.

To provide some insight into the principal concerns of the major decision making groups, a research survey was used to evaluate the attitudes of highway planners, community officials, and a sample of citizens in one community, toward the route location factors presented in Tables 1 and 2. A few of the results of the survey are given in Table 3. They show the degree of importance placed on route location factors by these three groups.

TABLE 3.—IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS IN ROUTE LOCATION TO HIGHWAY PLANNERS, LOCAL OFFICIALS, AND CITIZENS

[In percent]

Factor	Division of Highways			Community officials			Citizens		
	Major	Minor	No	Major	Minor	No	Major	Minor	No
Direct costs and benefits of freeway:									
Cost of highway	95	4	1	86	12	1	81	16	1
Motorists safety/comfort	85	13	2	84	12	2	87	8	1
Travel time savings	52	43	5	55	40	2	61	31	7
Vehicle operating cost	41	54	5	29	48	21	19	50	29
Local transportation effects:									
Traffic service to city	96	4	0	89	8	1	77	20	1
Local transportation	74	20	6	91	7	2	63	31	4
Regional access	50	45	5	65	31	2	55	37	7
Highway design standards	93	5	2	87	11	2	81	15	1
Community planning and environment:									
Land use plans	65	32	3	79	17	2	52	37	8
Esthetics of freeway	69	26	5	76	21	1	42	51	2
Noise	24	67	9	67	28	3	51	42	4
Air pollution	13	52	35	58	33	6	72	22	2
Neighborhood and social structure:									
Property values	65	28	7	72	22	2	59	33	6
Neighborhood impact	54	41	5	59	33	5	40	41	17
Parks and recreation	82	18	0	58	34	6	37	51	8
Cultural/religious center	54	43	3	36	57	4	17	61	18
Historical/unique areas	69	30	1	64	32	2	37	48	11
School system	56	37	7	51	43	5	43	42	13
Community economic and fiscal structure:									
Effect on tax base	30	61	9	49	42	7	48	41	7
Community services	32	65	3	71	25	2	61	34	3
Commercial activity	37	50	13	56	39	3	47	43	6
Employment	41	45	14	56	32	8	60	35	2
Number in sample	54			160			123		

Several of the responses of the three groups, as shown in Table 3, deserve comment. First is the attitude toward vehicle operating costs. They are considered to be of importance by the highway planners; on the other hand, community officials or citizens place practically no importance on them. Second, as expected, the highway planners show less concern for local traffic circulation than do city officials. Third, regarding the factors in community environment such as noise and air pollution, there is much more concern by community officials and citizens than by the highway planners. Finally, the factors reflecting neighborhood and social structure were of much less importance to this particular sample of citizens than to either the highway planners or community officials.

These few examples point out the need for considering the various viewpoints in planning studies. Based on the survey, it might be concluded that, from the local viewpoint, highway planners may be putting much more emphasis on parks, the effects on the school system, and cultural and religious institutions than is necessary. On the other hand, they clearly indicate that, at least in this instance, some factors ranked as important by planners are not valued as highly by local officials and citizens. The factors which are most important will, of course, vary with each individual project. Some means, such as Table 3, should be used to evaluate every project at the conceptual stage with each affected group expressing its principal concerns. Besides the groups included in Table 3, other groups such as school districts and commercial and industrial interests should also be considered. By identifying the factors of greatest concern to each community group, the costs and benefits and the points of agreement and disagreement might be identified. It should be emphasized that the purpose of such evaluation is to eliminate confusion and many of the pointless arguments, and not to assign "weights" to the factors for evaluation of alternatives.

Time period

The time period over which the consequences of the various factors are evaluated is also important. Otherwise short run consequences might be given more weight in the decision as compared to the long run effects, or vice versa. An example might be the community concern that elderly people would be displaced from their homes in a given area. At the same time, the community master plan may indicate that the area is suitable for high density apartments and a survey show that the transition is already underway. In this instance, an appreciation of the time factor is extremely important to a rational appraisal of the possible alternatives.

The right hand columns of Tables 1 and 2 provide space in which the time period can be expressed (in some manner) in order to bring each factor into focus. A decision maker may on this basis be able to "discount" the significance of a factor's impact, conceivably in ways similar to the application of compound interest formulas in the economy study.

COMMUNITY FACTOR PROFILES: A DECISION MAKING TOOL

The approach to decision making among alternatives suggested earlier in this paper pointed out that correct decisions among freeway location alternatives must have two parts: (1) an economy study which includes all items that can be reduced to money terms, and (2) an analysis of all items which cannot be stated in terms of money but which must be weighed in the decision. The approach proposed for analyzing the indirect or community effects of (2) has been called a "community factor profile." In the opinion

of the authors, this approach is at least a step toward more rational decision making.

The community factor profile is a graphical description, based on the factors and measures suggested in Table 2, of the effects of each proposed freeway location alternative. Figure 1 is a highly simplified and consolidated version of such a profile for four alternative locations numbered 1, 2, 3 and 4. [Figure 1 not printed in Record.] On this figure, each profile scale is on a percentage base, ranging from a negative to a positive 100 percent. One hundred either negative or positive is the maximum absolute value of the measure that is adopted for each factor. Reduction to the percentage base simplifies scaling and plotting the profiles. The maximum positive or negative value of the measure, the units, and the time span are indicated on the right hand side of the profile for reference. For each alternative, the positive or negative value for any factor is calculated as a percent of the maximum absolute value over all alternatives and is plotted on the appropriate abscissa. A broken line connecting the plotted points for each alternative gives its factor profile. For the profiles, factors and measures should be selected which will adequately describe all important elements of community impact. Care should be used in defining factor measures to assure that they are not measuring the same consequences. Otherwise in effect there would be "double counting" and disproportionate weight would be given to those factors. This may result in incorrect decisions.

In order to reduce the complexity of the diagram and, in turn, of the decision making process, the full set of community factors should be reduced whenever it is possible to do so. Two guidelines are suggested for accomplishing this: (1) eliminating all those factors that are not relevant or important to the particular decision, and (2) eliminating all factors where the values are substantially the same for all alternatives. These tests must be acceptable to all parties involved in the study.

It is expected that the profiles will be prepared for each alternative from the viewpoint of each community interest group and will incorporate the factors that are important to that particular group's viewpoint. A composite profile would also be prepared showing the total community effect for each factor. Separate profiles for each alternative could be made on transparent overlays to facilitate the method of comparison proposed in the following section of this paper. In passing it should be noted that research is well under way to provide such displays on a cathode-ray tube activated by a computer. This would permit almost instant recall of any comparisons that seemed appropriate.

METHOD FOR PLAN EVALUATION

Because of the complexity that "real life" factor profiles would often have, a systematic procedure for evaluating and comparing the relative merits of the several alternatives is essential. The method proposed here is that a series of paired comparisons be made using engineering economic analysis and factor profiles as the decision making tools.

First, alternatives 1 and 2 would be compared; then the better of these is compared with 3, and so on. In comparing two alternatives the incremental cost or benefit from the economic analysis is weighed against the differences in community impact between the alternatives as shown by the factor profiles. The decision maker representing each group would appraise the economic and community factors and determine his preference between the two alternatives. After all the paired comparisons among the various alternatives have been completed, there

would result preference rankings for each viewpoint in the community. These would be used for comparisons among competing viewpoints in reaching a final decision.

A highly simplified example to illustrate the paired comparison approach is given by the question: "Is it preferable to save \$50,000 per year in vehicle operating costs accruing to local residents by adopting a shorter route or to retain a commercial enterprise employing ten people and paying \$20,000 per year in property taxes? It is estimated that a substitute enterprise will develop in five years." It is admitted that this example is far simpler than those of the real world where the factor profile would include several elements. Even so, such such comparisons make clear the actual points at issue and may greatly reduce the number of irrational arguments that accompany most controversial decision.

Technique for comparisons among alternatives

The flow chart of Figure 2 depicts the procedure to be followed in making the paired comparison described above. [Figure 2 not printed in Record.] Failure to follow some such procedure may result in selecting the less than optimum alternative.

Step 1: Perform Engineering Economic Analysis. Rank the alternatives in order of preference as determined by the economic analysis. This may be done on the basis of maximum net benefits over cost or total and incremental benefit cost ratios or rates of return. Tabulate the net benefits over costs for each alternative.

Step 2: Prepare Factor Profiles. Factor profiles are prepared from the viewpoint of each interest group showing the freeway's impact on each relevant factor for that group. A factor profile is also prepared which shows the total or aggregate effect of each alternative over all communities and groups.

Step 3: Economic and Factor Profile Analysis. Compare alternatives on the basis of the economic analysis and the factor profiles. Eliminate from the set of feasible alternatives any alternative which is dominated by another from the standpoint of both the economic analysis and the factor profile. One alternative is strictly dominant over another if all percentage values of the factor profile of the dominant alternative are greater than that of alternative. This implies that there are no crossovers in the lines of the factor profiles for the two.

Step 4: Paired Comparison of Alternatives. Paired comparisons are made for each viewpoint on the basis of the incremental differences in community effects from the factor profiles, and comparing these with the incremental differences in costs from the economic analysis. Any two alternatives can be paired, but a reasonable beginning would be to pair one of the alternatives having a good factor profile with the preferred alternative from the economic analysis.

(a) Determine the differences between the alternatives for the community factors, and compare the increments of values gained with the increments of values lost.

(b) State a preference between the two alternatives based on the importance to the decision makers of the tradeoffs among the factors.

(c) Check the preference statement against the ranking from the economic analysis. This resolves the question, "Is the alternative preferred in (a) also superior from the standpoint of the economic analysis?" If the answer is "yes" then the preferred alternative is paired with the next alternative selected for analysis. If "no," then the analysis proceeds to (d).

(d) Test the differences in community factors against the excess of costs over benefits. The decision-maker is asking the question, "Are the gains in community factors

worth the additional incremental costs of this alternative?" If the answer is "yes" the alternative of higher cost is preferred because of its higher community benefits. Otherwise, the alternative preferred from the economic analysis is selected and paired against the next alternative for analysis.

Step 5: Continue Paired Comparison Procedure. The procedure (a) through (d) is continued until all feasible alternatives have been included in comparisons. The paired comparisons among the feasible alternatives produce a preferred alternative, and also a preference ranking among all alternatives for each viewpoint if this is desired.

The only constraint imposed on the decision makers in the paired comparisons is that preferences among alternatives must be transitive, i.e. if A is preferred to B, and B is preferred to C, then A is preferred to C. This insures that preferences and decisions are consistent with previous ones, and that the final ranking of alternatives reflects the decision makers' true preferences.

In sum, the purpose of the factor profiles and the procedure for analysis is to help the decision maker apply the two basic principles of decision-making: (1) to separate economic effects measurable in dollar values from other consequences, and (2) to compare the differences in alternatives in making decisions. The factor profiles and the method of analysis offer both a visual aid and a systematic procedure for implementing these principles. The construction of the factor profiles does not imply that the area under the curves can be integrated, or the percentage values of factors can be added in order to make a decision. To do so would be to revert to the factor-weighting methods discussed earlier in this paper.

An example application

Consider a freeway route location with four proposed alternatives, with the relevant community impact factors and corresponding factor profiles depicted in Figure 1. The economic analysis in Table 4 provides the following information:

TABLE 4.—ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF LOCATION ALTERNATIVES

Item	Alternative (in thousands)			
	1	2	3	4
Annual cost.....	\$650	\$750	\$850	\$700
Annual road user savings..	1,000	1,200	1,150	1,000
Net benefits.....	350	450	300	300
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.54	1.60	1.35	1.43

Incremental analysis	Incremental		Benefit-cost ratio	Incremental net benefit (cost)
	Cost	Benefit		
4 over 1.....	50	0	0	(50)
2 over 1.....	100	200	+2.0	100
3 over 1.....	200	150	+ .75	(50)
2 over 4.....	50	200	+4.0	150
3 over 4.....	150	150	+1.0	0
3 over 2.....	100	(50)	-.5	(150)

The economic analysis indicates that alternative 2 is preferred, since it shows a benefit-cost ratio greater than 1 on the total investment and on all increments of investment. Alternative 1 ranks next, then 4 and 3 have equal desirability from an economic standpoint.

It must be recognized that the rankings given by this analysis can be changed substantially by changing the interest rate, with lower rates tending to favor higher capital investments. This example is based on an interest rate that reflects the minimum attractive rate of return for a particular highway agency.

In examining the factor profiles, we find that the profile of alternate 4 dominates both

1 and 3. Since 4 is equally attractive as 3 in the economic analysis, alternative 3 can be dropped on the basis of the dominance tests. For the first paired comparison, alternative 2, preferred from the economic analysis, is paired with 4, a dominant alternative from the factor profiles. In comparing the differences between these two alternatives, we find that alternative 2 provides 200 acres of developable land and saves 290 housing units and \$.58 million in assessed valuation. On the other hand, alternative 4 decreases the average daily traffic on major local streets by 5000 vehicles and saves 25 parcels of industrial property and 2 community facilities. Let it then be assumed that the decision makers agree that alternative 4 is the more attractive of the two, based on the factor analysis tradeoffs.

However, in the economic analysis alternative 2 is preferred to 4 by \$150,000 per year, so that additional comparison to the net benefits foregone must also be made. Here it should be noted that alternative 2 costs the agency that will build the freeway \$50,000 more per year; on the other hand, vehicle operating costs are \$200,000 per year less. It could be that the various groups would therefore weigh the economic consequences quite differently. Assuming that, even with the cost differences, alternative 4 is selected over 2, a similar comparison would be made between 4 and 1.

ADVANTAGES OF THE PROPOSED APPROACH

When a composite analysis of the over-all effects of route location alternatives does not produce a final decision among alternatives because of conflicts of interest among decision groups, then an analysis of factor profiles from the viewpoint of each decision making group can be performed. By separating out those factors that are relevant to each decision making group, and following the procedure for analysis from the flow diagram of Figure 2, a preference ranking of alternatives can be derived for each viewpoint. The rankings and profiles can then be used for resolving conflicts among competing interest groups. In addition, where there are areas of disagreement, the factors responsible for such conflicts, and the reasons for them, can be pinpointed explicitly.

The proposed approach can also serve as a basis for negotiation and compensation. In a political setting, arriving at decisions which are as equitable as possible may involve negotiation and compensation of losers by the gainers. One of two approaches can be taken by decision makers in arriving at final decisions:

1. Selecting the alternative that will distribute the impact as equally as possible among the conflicting interest groups.

2. Selecting the alternative which maximizes the net benefits of both economic and community factors along the entire route.

With either approach the factor profiles can be used as a basis for negotiation and bargaining, and for determining and providing for compensations to communities, groups and individuals to achieve equitable solutions. This becomes especially important in the light of new and proposed legislation respecting public hearings, decisions, and compensation for losses. Recently, the courts have altered the concept of compensating property to one of compensating people when freeway rights of way are acquired. It is not a great step to the concept of compensating communities and groups for losses resulting from freeways. At the same time, provisions might be made to allow communities and groups to make certain concessions and side payments, and adjust community and service district boundaries in order to equalize gains and losses. Such steps as these could do much to smooth the present rocky road to agreements on freeway locations.

SUMMARY

To summarize, the advantages of the proposed factor analysis method of evaluation of freeway locations are as follows:

1. It separates the direct money consequences from the community consequences so that they do not become confused in the analysis;

2. In complex decision making where it is important to have more rather than less information on which to base the decisions, it provides a means by which to display the different factors relevant to making choices;

3. It provides a means for comparing the incremental differences in community factors among alternatives, and contrasting them with the differences in economic costs or benefits;

4. The analysis also provides for separation of viewpoints as well as an analysis of the over-all impact. It shows the incidence of community effects upon community groups, brings out the points of agreement or disagreement among those groups, and serves as a mechanism in resolving those conflicts;

5. Finally, factor identification and factor profiles can be a useful tool during the planning process a) in defining the factors which are important to the community and community groups, b) in establishing goals and objectives, c) as a basis for discussion during the development of alternatives, and d) as a means of evaluating and making decisions among alternatives.

REFERENCES

*The survey used to evaluate the attitudes of planning and decision-making groups toward the factors in freeway route locations was conducted in three parts during September, October, and November of 1968, and April, May, and July of 1969. The first sample included 54 highway engineers and planners in the Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Sacramento offices of the California Division of Highways. The second was a sample of 160 community officials and professional staff including mayors, city councilmen, city managers, city engineers and city planners. This sample was drawn from all the communities of the two major urban areas of California, San Francisco-Oakland and Los Angeles-Orange County, where freeway studies were currently being or had been conducted in the three years 1965-1968. The third was a sample of 123 citizens from four communities in an area of Southern California where a freeway study was recently completed and a route selected. The communities were primarily suburban and residential in nature.

FOOTNOTES

- Curry, D. A. *HRB Record* 77, pp. 48-77.
- Fleischer, G. A. *HRB Record* 12, pp. 19-47.
- Grant, E. L., and Ireson, W. G. *Principles of Engineering Economy*. Ronald Press, 4th ed., New York, 1964, pp. 21-23, 436, 445-448, 456.
- Grant, E. L. and Oglesby, C. H. *HRB Bulletin* 306, pp. 23-38.
- Glancy, D. M., et al. *HRB Record* 77, pp. 121-132.
- Haney, Dan G. *HRB Record* 12, pp. 1-18.
- Hill, Morris. *HRB Record* 180, pp. 21-34.
- Jessiman, William, and Brand, Daniel, et al. *HRB Record*, 180, pp. 71-80.
- Roberts, Paul O. *Transportation Research Forum*, 7th Annual Meeting (1966) pp. 169-183.
- Schlager, Kenneth *HRB Record* 238, pp. 153-158.
- Shimpeler, R. C. and Grecco, W. L. *HRB Record* 238, pp. 123-152.
- Thomas, T. C., *HRB Record* 245, pp. 17-35.
- Thomas, T. C., *HRB Record* 35, 1963.
- Winfrey, R. *Economic Analysis for Highways*, International Textbook Company, Scranton, Pennsylvania, 1969.

TUNNEY LAUDS KAPPA ALPHA PSI
LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAM

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity has undertaken a most laudable task in its guide right service program.

Conceived in 1922, guide right is a year-round program for the educational and occupational guidance of youth in high school and college. It is inspirational in character, as well as a source of information for young men.

Through guide right, Kappa Alpha Psi attempts to place the training experience and friendly interest of successful men at the disposal of young men who need inspiration and counsel regarding their choice of a life's career. And to arouse the interest of the entire community in the problems of youth as they seek to lead useful lives.

To be more specific, the objectives of guide right are:

Helping youth, especially those of high school age, in the selection of courses leading to vocations compatible with their attitudes and personalities.

Assisting students to get employment and progress successfully in their chosen vocations.

Assisting parents in counseling their children by giving the youth an opportunity to talk with people who are successful in their chosen vocations.

Sponsoring entertainment and cultural enrichment activities to give young people respite from the drudgery of the streets.

Informing young people of the values of higher education, assistance available for educational pursuits, scholarships, loans, professional counseling and fellowships. They also discuss the various opportunities in vocations and professions, current labor demands and trends, and the personal, scholastic, and economic requirements for employment.

The Los Angeles alumni chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi has implemented the guide right program through a social action project, the instructional leadership league, referred to as the Kappa League.

The Kappa League embodies the goals of the guide right program, with specific emphasis on leadership development and self-motivation for career achievement.

Since the fundamental purpose of the fraternity is achievement, Kappa Alpha Psi seeks to help the young men of its league achieve worthy goals for themselves and make constructive contributions to their community when leadership roles become their responsibility.

In an article appearing in the Los Angeles Times, on January 30, 1970, staff writer Jack Jones described the Kappa League and its programs:

YOUTH IN LEADERSHIP LEAGUE TO BE
HONORED BY BLACK FRATERNITY

Kappa Alpha Psi Helps Students from Ghetto Prepare for College and Then Gives Them Advice in Choosing Career.

"For a long time, we in the black middle class have been accused of going down our own road and not worrying about our young brothers in the so-called ghetto," said Mel Davis, a Hollywood film studio accountant.

Davis (as social action committee chairman for the Los Angeles alumni chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, directs a one-and-a-half-year-old program to build leadership talent and open the doors to higher education and careers for black male students from several local high schools.

"We feel we are making a contribution to assist our youngsters," said Davis.

"There is self-satisfaction in seeing these young guys come up and head for medical school or business. It's nice to think that in some cases it wouldn't happen if it weren't for us."

SECOND ANNUAL CEREMONY

More than 30 of the young men piled up enough achievement points in a variety of projects presented for honor March 7 in the Biltmore Bowl during the second annual ceremony staged by the black-fraternity-sponsored Instructional Leadership League.

The Kappa League, as it is more commonly called, began with 13 Locke High School students in June, 1968, as part of the national fraternity's Guide Right program.

By the end of the following school year, it had grown to 51 and by now has expanded to include 76 students in the 10th, 11th and 12th grades in seven high schools.

The Kappa League is a strictly run, demanding program which requires its enrollees to plan, execute and report on such projects as discussion groups, educational events and social gatherings.

League members meet every two weeks at the Kappa "Kastle," 1846 South Crenshaw Boulevard and are carefully graded by supervising alumni on their conduct, project performance and abilities to organize their own affairs.

A major thrust of the program is to prepare the young men for college, which involves bringing in undergraduate fraternity members from local universities and colleges to tutor. Alumni advisers work closely with high school counselors.

ARRESTED WITH APPLICATIONS

High school seniors in the group are appraised of available scholarships and are guided in writing admittance applications to universities offering the best educational ladders to desired careers.

"If a youngster wants to be an architect, we'll run interference for him and steer him to a successful man in that field," Davis said. "But he has to make his own contact. That's part of his leadership development."

Kappa alumni include men who have made the grade in many fields. "You name it and we have it," Davis said.

Some prominent Kappa alums, he notes, are Superior Judge Bernard Jefferson, Federal Judge David Williams, State Sen. Mervyn Dymally (D-Los Angeles), City Councilmen Thomas Bradley and Billy G. Mills, insurance executives Norman B. Houston and Norman O. Houston, and such sports figures as high jumper John Rambo and basketball stars Walt Hazzard and Wilt Chamberlain.

While the effect of the program on the high school students and their parents have been sharply positive, the impact on the fraternity's undergraduates on several local college campuses has also been noticeable Davis said.

FIVE PHASES

"This has been a lifesaver in rapport between the undergrads and the alums," he said. "They didn't feel we are doing anything relevant to the community. Now they are throwing themselves into this thing."

All activities and projects—such as a January weekend retreat centering on discussion of black equality, sex and drug abuse—are geared to five rigidly outlined phases of the Kappa League program.

These are self-identity (discipline, awareness, appearance . . .); training (academic, career preparation . . .); competition (politics, sports . . .); social (religion, communication, manners . . .) and health education (physical fitness, sex education, drugs . . .)

It was the Kappa League students themselves who ruled out smoking at the meetings and who confiscated drugs from a guest at one of their dances.

The social action committee members of the Kappa Alpha Psi alumni chapter in Los Angeles, who direct the Kappa League, are Mel L. Davis, chairman; Solomon Henderson and Burnell Hayes, secretaries; Earle Carrington, scholarship coordinator; Lloyd Goddard, testing and counseling coordinator; Burnell Hayes, training coordinator; John Merrill, Bernard Johnson Jr., and Lafayette Height, tutorial services coordinators; Edgar Bishop, ways and means coordinator, and Cagney France, identity phase coordinator. Committeemen are Oliver Barnett, Prosper Bullen, Ralph Butler, Gaston Boyd, Tom Bradley, Charlie Jackson, Mel Longmire, Jerrell Stephens and Dave Wilkerson.

They and Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity are to be commended for efforts to help young men make the most of the opportunities available to them in our society.

THE WATER POLLUTION PROBLEM
IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, those of us who live and work in the Washington, D.C., area realize the extent of the water pollution problem. One of our Nation's greatest rivers, the Potomac, flows just south of the Capitol, a vivid example of the seriousness of the situation.

My colleague, and close friend, from the Eighth Congressional District of Maryland, GILBERT GUDE, has demonstrated continually his concern about the conditions which lead to the pollution of the Potomac River. Just recently he examined an interceptor which carries waste from Virginia, Maryland, and the District to the Blue Plains treatment plant. His inspection tour disclosed raw sewage overflowing into the river at Key Bridge.

I understand that subsequent information has been supplied to my colleague that indicates that from 20,000 to 100,000 gallons of sewage empties into the river at this location each day—depending on the weather.

Below are an article and an editorial from the Washington Star about this situation. I hope each of my colleagues will take the opportunity to read about these deplorable conditions:

[From the Evening Star, July 7, 1970]

SEWER AT KEY BRIDGE HAS DAILY OVERFLOW
(By Robert Pear)

The D.C. Department of Sanitary Engineering has nicknamed the sewer "Old Faithful," so regularly does it gush raw sewage into the Potomac River at Key Bridge for two or three hours daily.

Rep. Gilbert Gude, R-Md., and Montgomery County Councilman Richmond M. Keeney were dismayed at the sight yesterday as they walked along an inadequate, 3,000-foot stretch of the Potomac interceptor in George-

town, which carries waste from Virginia, Maryland and the District to the Blue Plains treatment plant.

The two Marylanders pledged their support for a new relief sewer, but it is unlikely the proposed 84-inch pipe will be laid unless the District gets a supplemental appropriation of \$2.5 million from Congress.

Jean B. Levesque, water services chief of the Department of Sanitary Engineering, said the sewer, on Water Street NW between Key Bridge and 31st Street, has been overflowing for two years.

In dry weather, the sewage spews through a temporary weir and into the Potomac around 2 p.m. almost every day. After rain-storm, the combined sewer often discharges water and sewage all day, Levesque said.

North of Key Bridge the Potomac and Dulles interceptors run parallel. With completion of the Potomac pumping station and the Lincoln Memorial tunnel in 18 months, the two interlopers will extend without interruption from 31st Street south to Blue Plains.

The \$2.5 million required to fill in the gap tentatively has been approved by the City Council but Mayor Walter E. Washington says it must wait until location of the Potomac Freeway is finally determined.

The single 48-inch pipe that now links the two dual sections cannot handle the 50 million gallons of sewage that pass through daily, including most of the waste from the Cabin John watershed in Montgomery County.

At peak periods, the sewage flows exposed over the ground for about 25 feet, between a manhole and the interceptor, and then through an underground pipe straight into the Potomac.

A sanitation official estimated the overflow in the river on a dry day at between 20,000 and 100,000 gallons.

Montgomery County will help finance the interceptor through payment of user charges, and Keeney suggested yesterday that construction of the line could be hastened if the county paid a portion of its share in advance.

Gude said the Georgetown pollution hazard indicated again the need for suburban areas to construct small sewage treatment plants of their own.

About half of the 232 million gallons of sewage processed daily at Blue Plains comes from suburban Maryland. The Interior Department has proposed a 67-million-gallon limit on Maryland's input, noting that the treatment facility operates at 10 percent above designed capacity.

GUDE'S WALK

Over a period of years, Justice William O. Douglas' organized walks along the C & O Canal have served the useful purpose of publicizing the great natural assets of that area, and reminding us of the steps still required to conserve them.

For a similar purpose, Maryland's Representative Gude joined a few newsmen and sanitary engineers in a shorter walk the other day to publicize a glaring instance of public neglect in that same area: The overflow of raw sewage into the Potomac River near the canal at Key Bridge.

It is well known that this overflow pours millions of gallons of sewage directly into the river in times of rain. A fact less well known, discovered by the Gude party, is that the overflow actually occurs on nearly a daily basis, even without rain. In response, the congressman is pressuring the District government to expedite its work on a 3,000-foot gap in the giant Potomac interceptor sewer which would correct the fault—transmitting this sewage directly to the regional treatment plant at Blue Plains.

Last month, the District City Council conditionally approved a budget request to Con-

gress for this purpose—the condition being that the sewer job must be delayed until final agreement is reached on the Potomac Expressway, so that the two construction projects can proceed together. If the economics of the situation actually require such a delay, that conclusion, as we have noted before, certainly adds another compelling reason for speeding decisions on the District's deadlocked freeways.

But Gude is right to ask whether, in fact, some means could not be found to allow the sewer work to proceed immediately. We think the point might well be raised when the region's local sanitation officials get together this Friday to try to co-ordinate their sewage programs. Most of the immediate local concern properly involves the expansion of the Blue Plains plant. Even with that expansion assured, however, the sewer gap in Georgetown will continue to pour raw, stinking sewage into the Potomac on a regular schedule, every day.

WHY IS THE SENATE DRAGGING ITS FEET?

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Columbia, S.C., State on July 12 asks the necessary question, "Why is the Senate dragging its feet on the family assistance plan?"

This is an editorial that I believe all my colleagues should read. I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

WHERE ARE THE REFORMERS WHEN REFORM COMES ALONG?

Daniel P. Moynihan, the White House counselor, warned the other day that failure to get the Administration's Family Assistance Plan approved this year probably would doom welfare reform for a decade. It is a grim thought, considering the horrible botch that passes for "welfare" in our welfare state.

What needs to be asked, though, is why Congress persists in dragging its feet. The House passed the Nixon bill April 16. Here it is July and the Senate Finance Committee, to which the House bill was assigned, has yet to set a hearing date, let alone begin the tortuous process of enactment.

Mr. Moynihan may have put his finger on the problem when he observed that those who like to talk about the need for welfare reform are nowhere to be found when reform is proposed.

"They do not want us to fall," Mr. Moynihan was charitable enough to suggest. "That part of their spirit and goodness survives. But they somehow do not want us to succeed," he went on. "They do not, I sometimes think, want anything to succeed."

Though Mr. Moynihan declined to name names, it is not hard to spot those he had in mind. Conspicuous among them are the various "welfare rights" lobbyists who are forever squawking about the insensitivity of the Establishment and demanding more and more for less and less—but not for fewer and fewer. Mr. Moynihan is too charitable. Their purpose is not welfare reform. It is welfare growth.

Then there are those who, while in favor of reform as an abstract proposition are never heard to suggest any specific improvements. Sen. Russell Long of Louisiana may fall into this category. The senator wants reform in the worst way, but he objects to the Nixon

proposal on grounds that, while it includes effective work incentives for the first time in history, it doesn't include enough of them.

The senator may be right. No one is insisting that the Nixon plan is perfect; it might even be a mistake. The President himself concedes that it is no more than the first step in a difficult journey out of the existing quagmire in which countless unfortunates are stuck. If improvements are what Senator Long is after, however, his methods are certainly curious. As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, he could have scheduled hearings on the welfare bill. Instead he has elected to sit on it for nearly three months.

Maybe the Administration has failed to push the reform measure as far as it might have. But that is not the principal difficulty. If Mr. Moynihan is correct in predicting another decade of welfare degradation and despair, the blame will belong to our listless Senate.

MORE EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE OIL IMPORT QUOTA SYSTEM

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, at the time the Task Force on Oil Imports made its report the point was made that many of its recommendations would not hold up under the harsh light of reality. I was among the many who felt the task force relied too heavily upon academic experts who lacked the firsthand knowledge of the petroleum industry to really do a first-rate report or to conclude with any validity that the oil import quota system should be abolished.

The events of the past few months have already shown the weakness of the report.

The July 15, 1970, issue of the Wall Street Journal has an article entitled "Soaring Tanker Rates Damp Oil Imports and May Force U.S. Gasoline Prices Up."

The article presents first hand evidence that so-called cheap foreign oil may not contribute to lower prices for the consumer. In fact, the cost of foreign oil may end up higher than U.S. produced oil because of increased transportation charges and any number of other variables which cannot be controlled by the United States.

Adequate supplies of petroleum are vital to the security and well-being of our Nation. The only certain means to insure adequate supplies is by developing domestic self-sufficiency.

I include the July 15 article in the RECORD with my remarks:

COSTLIER FOREIGN CRUDE: SOARING TANKER RATES DAMP OIL IMPORTS AND MAY FORCE U.S. GASOLINE PRICES UP

Motorists in the U.S. and Western Europe may soon be paying more for gasoline because a pipeline slowdown in Syria and forced production cutbacks in Libya have sent oil tanker charter rates zooming to near records.

The tanker charges, which have doubled since April and quadrupled since this time last year, have bloated the delivered cost of Middle Eastern and African crude oil at U.S. East Coast refineries to 75 cents a barrel higher than the cost of delivered U.S. oil.

Normally the price edge is on the other side. The imported crude usually costs \$1.45 a barrel less than U.S. oil.

As might be expected, the price distortion has sharply reduced U.S. imports of foreign oil. And it has narrowed the profit outlook for some inland refiners who customarily obtain a windfall by trading off their oil import "tickets."

But it has sharply raised the profit outlook for such independent ship owners as Aristotle Onassis and Stavros Niarchos of Greece and Daniel K. Ludwig of the U.S., operators of the world's largest private tanker fleets.

The impact is mirrored in domestic production plans. The Texas Railroad Commission, that state's oil regulatory agency, is expected today to raise sharply the amount of oil that Texas wells will be allowed to produce next month.

Louisiana's oil regulatory body, the Conservation Department, has already acted to open up the August flow. Last Friday it announced that the August per-well oil production rate will be the highest since the Suez Canal crisis snuffed off the flow of foreign oil in 1956.

Canada, too, is rushing in more crude. U.S. imports from Canada in the first week of July ran at nearly double the year-earlier rate.

PIPELINE RUPTURE

This latest oil crisis had its beginnings May 3, when a bulldozer under mysterious circumstances rammed into the Trans Arabian Pipe Line in Syria, knocking out the line, which normally carries about 475,000 barrels of oil a day from Saudi Arabian fields to the Mediterranean port of Sidon, Lebanon.

The line carried only about one-sixth of the oil output of Arabian American Oil Co., which is owned 30% each by Standard Oil Co. of California, Texaco Inc. and Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) and 10% by Mobil Oil Corp. But this was oil that was close to Europe, only a short tanker's run away from Continental refiners.

Fixing the line would be simple enough, company officials asserted in New York. A spokesman said the job could be done "in about 24 hours." But so far, he stated, the Syrian government has adamantly refused to allow company technicians to do any repair work, and the line still sits idle.

Though Arabian American Oil officials are loathe to speculate about Syria's refusal, other Middle East specialists view the government stand as another ploy in the Arab-Israeli war. The line had often been attacked in the past by Arab guerrillas; one section of it goes through the Israeli-occupied Golan Heights. Evidently, by the analysis of some Middle East sources, Syria hopes to pressure the U.S., through the oil companies, to cut off Israeli aid.

Syria, though, was only the starting point for the current oil crisis. Libya has compounded the woes in the past month by ordering seven producers in that country to slash their output some 550,000 barrels a day, or about 15% of Libya's total output. Companies hit there are Occidental Petroleum Corp., Continental Oil Co., Marathon Oil Co., Amerada Hess Corp., the Royal Dutch-Shell Group, Texaco and California Standard.

The issue, by Libyan government account, is conservation. But some oil experts, see this, too, as a ploy, not in the war with Israel but in the war with the oil companies over tax payments.

Europe, as the Middle East's most immediate customer, has made up some of the almost one million barrels a day lost in Syria and Libya by shortstopping oil from Libya and Nigeria that normally would have gone to the U.S.

But Europe has had to do most of its emergency shopping in the Persian Gulf, and therein lies the cause of the tanker rate surge. Because the Suez Canal remains closed

by the Arab-Israeli war, all Persian Gulf oil destined for Europe, a six-times-longer journey than the voyage across the Mediterranean from Lebanon to Europe.

The resulting sudden jump in tanker demand has quickly eliminated what had been a traditional summer surplus. And it has sent spot charter rates for a single voyage soaring close to levels prevalent during the Suez crisis of 1956. They are more than half again higher than during the six-day Arab-Israeli war of 1967.

The cost of moving a barrel of oil from the Persian Gulf to the U.S. East Coast has skyrocketed to about \$3.25 a barrel; the oil itself in the Persian Gulf area costs only \$1.25 a barrel, producing a total cost in the U.S. of about \$4.50 a barrel. A barrel of crude oil from Louisiana, by contrast, costs only \$3.75 delivered to an East Coast refiner, or 75 cents less.

On the West Coast, too, "Persian Gulf Crude is quite a bit more costly than California crude," a California Standard spokesman says.

PEDDLING IMPORT "TICKETS"

The effect of the high tanker rates has been to render temporarily worthless a "ticket" to import foreign oil. In normal times, inland refineries, which are too far from ports to economically utilize foreign oil, work out exchange agreements with East Coast refiners. They deliver low-cost foreign oil to the East Coast refiner in exchange for receiving an equal amount of high-cost domestic oil at the inland refinery. The value of this swap can be a windfall as high as \$1.45 a barrel to the inland refiner.

This gain "often means the difference between a profit and loss" for an inland refiner, said one oil executive. And the smaller the refinery, the greater the impact, under a so-called "sliding scale" that provides quotas of up to 40% of a small refinery's total crude oil processing rate, compared with a big-refinery average of only about 7%.

J. Avery Rush, president of Diamond Shamrock Corp.'s oil and gas unit, said in Amarillo, Texas, his company was having increased difficulty arranging trades for about half its second half oil import quota of about 4,000 barrels a day. "The amount of our quota which we haven't placed yet is large enough for us to be concerned" about its potential effect on second half earnings, he said.

Clark Oil & Refining Co., Milwaukee, said "everything is still up in the air" in its efforts to work out exchange agreements for its second half quotas.

SEEKING TO EXTEND QUOTAS

"A number of companies holding unused tickets are likely to be hot-footing it to Washington in the next few weeks to seek an extension of their quotas," one oil executive said. The quotas are due to expire Dec. 31. During the 1967 world oil supply crisis, however, the Government permitted unused quotas to be used during the following two years.

Some inland companies also have protected themselves against the present situation with long-term exchange agreements. American Petrofina Inc., controlled by Petrofina S.A. of Brussels, said in Dallas it made "most of our deals on a full-year basis" good until next Jan. 1, so it doesn't expect to be hit too hard by the current difficulties.

As the foreign crude costs mounts ever higher, meantime, the big international oil companies continue to cut back on their use of foreign oil at U.S. refineries. "East Coast crude oil imports could fall to as little as 300,000 barrels a day from a normal level about 700,000 barrels daily," one major company predicted. Total U.S. imports of foreign oil other than that from Canada fell to 520,000 barrels a day in the week ended July 3 from 850,000 barrels daily a year earlier, the American Petroleum Institute said.

In the same period, imports of Canadian oil jumped to 609,000 barrels daily from 316,000 barrels a day a year earlier. This was despite the fact that Canadian oil was placed under an official U.S. quota for the first time July 1, limiting imports to an average of 395,000 barrels a day for the last six months of the year. "Companies are borrowing from future quotas to boost Canadian imports now at the expense of November or December," one oilman declared.

Some oilmen were hopeful the U.S. Government could be persuaded to ease restrictions on Canadian oil. Ashland Oil Inc. said in Ashland, Ky., it hopes the Government will foresee the possibility of a U.S. crude oil shortage and allow freer access to Canadian crude.

SPACE AND TOMORROW'S SOCIETY

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to offer for the Record a speech delivered in Sacramento, Calif., on Monday, July 20, by Karl G. Harr, Jr., president of the Aerospace Industries Association of America. The subject of Mr. Harr's speech is, "Space and Tomorrow's Society." I commend its reading to all those concerned about our national future:

SPACE AND TOMORROW'S SOCIETY

(Address by Karl G. Harr, Jr.)

President Stone, members of the Comstock Club, ladies and gentlemen.

Most thoughtful men and women everywhere must still retain some of the feeling of awe they experienced just a year ago today when Apollo 11 Commander Neil Armstrong cautiously placed a foot upon the moon's surface in that "one small step for a man—one giant leap for mankind."

Nothing that has happened since or will occur in space in the future is likely to have quite the same impact throughout the world as that historic achievement.

At the same time, of course, thoughtful people today have a lot of other things to think about—some of them quite awesome in their potential for good or evil; issues and problems which have intensified in recent years to a point of urgency.

In view of this, I have chosen as a title for this brief address "Space and Tomorrow's Society," and I welcome the opportunity to speak on the interinvolvement between our space activities and our society as a whole. Perhaps some aspects of the relationship may be new to you.

First let us review what has happened in the U.S. space exploration during the year since the first Apollo touchdown. Apollo 11 was completed with great success, and was followed by a near-perfect lunar-landing Apollo 12 mission of longer duration in November. Now four men had walked on the moon, bringing back rock and soil samples and a wealth of other data, and leaving behind a number of functioning scientific experiments.

The Apollo 13 mission in April, although its moon landing was aborted, also made a most important contribution to spaceflight progress by demonstrating to us and an anxious world that our space team could cope with such an emergency. A magnificent performance by the astronauts themselves and by Government and industry personnel on the ground—plus the fact that effective contingency plans for such an emergency had been made far in advance—brought the

Apollo 13 crew back from beyond the moon to a safe splashdown and recovery in the Pacific. Perhaps even more importantly, the danger in which Apollo 13's crew found itself demonstrated as nothing else had the universal identification with space exploration. Many millions of people throughout the world united in a common bond of prayer for their safe return.

The year since Apollo 11 also saw many successes in unmanned exploration, among them the flight past separate regions of Mars by two Mariner spacecraft. Launched a month apart early in 1969, the two craft completed their missions within a week of one another in mid-summer, they too returning a wealth of new information.

Dramatizing how far we have come in space, a less noticed event of the year was the re-entry on March 31 of Explorer I, launched 12 years and two months earlier on January 31, 1958. This spacecraft, America's first satellite as you may recall, weighed slightly over 30 pounds. Nevertheless, it not only discovered the Van Allen radiation belts but it got us going in space competition.

It is neither feasible nor appropriate to go into great detail here about how our space capability has grown in the twelve and one-half years since Explorer I. Just a few indicators tell that story. Our orbital payload weights, for example, have increased 10,000 times, our speed record 13 times, and NASA has successfully launched more than 150 unmanned spacecraft, apart from the manned Mercury, Gemini and Apollo capsules. An even larger number of unmanned satellites have been launched by the military to enhance the national security.

More important to our discussion here, however, is the record of contributions made by the space program to our general economy, to the advancement of our overall technology, and to the improvement of the quality of all our lives. Much has already been accomplished, and much we may look forward to in the 1970s and 80s and beyond—for the benefits we have reaped so far are merely the tip of the iceberg of that potential.

The great bulk of the money and effort that has been invested in space thus far has been applied to the manned flight program, to meet the national goal for the first space decade of landing men on the moon and returning them safely. A quick look at the budget shows that manned flight is continuing to draw the lion's share of the funding, although the ratio is declining.

Apart from the obvious lift to the national morale and the nation's international prestige afforded by the Apollo successes, there are deeper rewards to be found in extending our exploration—manned and unmanned—of outer space. These are for the moment largely intangible. They are very long-range, and involve the acquisition of knowledge of the nature of our solar system and its relationships with other parts of our galaxy, the composition of the moon and the planets and what use can be made of such new knowledge to improve life on earth.

Simultaneously some very tangible and direct benefits to mankind have been and are being accomplished through our unmanned satellites in orbit around the earth. Meteorological satellites have greatly enhanced our ability to forecast the weather around the globe. Communications satellites have not only vastly increased our available channels for private and business communication, but have made it possible to transmit television pictures instantaneously around the world with, among other things, enormous implications for education. Other satellite systems are aiding navigation, geodesy and mapmaking.

Within three years, first launches will be made of earth resources survey satellites. It is expected that these spacecraft alone will produce benefits that within a few decades

will cover the cost of the entire space program. They will locate sources of water, oil and minerals that were previously undetected. They will spot forest fires and crop blights, track the movement of concentrations of fish, and aid in control of pollution. It is estimated that savings in agriculture and forestry will amount to more than \$2 billion annually in the United States alone.

Another rich area of economic benefits is familiarly known as spin-offs—new products, materials and processes that have come into existence as a result of space research and development and have quickly found application in non-space activities. Whole new families of alloys and plastics, microminiaturized electronics, revolutionary fabrication techniques, previously unattainable standards, tolerances and degrees of quality control—all of these have grown out of space-related work and found their way into other areas of manufacturing. And this story has barely begun.

New products range from homely items like lightweight, indestructible frying pans to new medical equipment adapted from Apollo systems enabling doctors and hospitals to give better treatment to patients.

Thus, although in its beginnings, some 13 years ago, the space program was of no special importance to the national economy, this situation changed rapidly as our national interests dictated that we embark on a truly major effort, with the principal goal of manned lunar landing but with a wide range of supplementary programs.

By the mid-60s the accelerating space effort had created several hundred thousands of jobs, and the aerospace industry—including aviation as well as space and missiles—had become the nation's largest manufacturing employer. It is still number one, incidentally, in spite of the recent fall-off.

Early in the program it became clear that to meet the stern challenge of space flight we would have to achieve new standards of precision, reliability and durability. Breakthroughs in a variety of areas of science and technology were required if the program was to succeed. Government, industry, independent research laboratories and hundreds of colleges and universities were brought into this drive for excellence, and scientists and engineers in a myriad of disciplines found themselves working in close cooperation for the first time.

Far from the least of the important economic outgrowths of the developing space effort was the creation, by necessity, of an entirely new order of systems management capability. Bringing together such highly skilled but widely diversified teams and ensuring that they worked together effectively to overcome otherwise insuperable problems was a new experience that has now supplied us with a priceless national asset. If we will, we can utilize this unprecedented capability to help deal with our compelling domestic needs.

The pressing problems of urban decay, rising crime rates, congested transportation systems, and deterioration of our air, water and soil, require the attention of the best possible technological and managerial skills. No national effort has developed and honed such skills as has the space effort.

So much for a thumbnail review of what we have done and what it has meant to us.

Now let me turn to the ongoing dialogue about the dimensions of our future space effort.

I can remember, because I played a small role in it, the time when the United States had to decide whether or not it would invest in a space effort, and if so, to what degree.

At the time when this fundamental decision had to be made each of its components could be argued, pro and con, only on the basis of speculation.

Limited to such speculation either side

could be plausibly argued on such propositions as: a major national space effort will greatly bolster and advance our overall economy; a major space effort is directly related to our international, political and psychological status; it is directly related to our national survival in many ways, and so on.

Because all was speculation in the early days of space, that is, the late 1950s, no one could be faulted too severely for a lack of total comprehension of the significance of such a program.

We do not have any such excuse today. In the 13 years of our national space program much that was then mere speculation has been established beyond peradventure.

Today nobody can responsibly refute the fact that:

1. There is a direct and beneficial relationship between our space effort and the strength and growth of our overall economy.

2. There is a direct and beneficial relationship between our space effort and our standing among the peoples and the nations of the world.

3. There is a direct and beneficial relationship between our national space effort and our national survival.

4. There is a direct and beneficial relationship between that effort and our capacity to address ourselves effectively to all national needs.

In fact, no one really tries to refute these points directly. They cannot. They may snipe at them, poor mouth them and attempt to distort them, but they cannot refute them. Thirteen years has been long enough to firmly establish each of these conclusions, as well as the single overall conclusion that no other challenge to our nation presents anything remotely comparable to space as an opportunity to benefit our whole society by increasing our overall capability to deal with all of our problems. Why then do some people so violently oppose this program?

The fact is, I suppose, they do not really oppose the exploration of space per se. They oppose it simply because they mistakenly view it as a competitor for national resources with programs to which they ascribe a high priority.

This attitude, it seems to me, drives from a most fundamental misconception as to the true nature and effect of the space effort. Far from being a competitor with other programs, our national space effort is the best ally such programs could have. It is essential to them—particularly over the long run. Without the vigorous pursuit of the prudent and practicable programs available to us in our national space effort, I challenge anyone to show how these other objectives could be either sustained or even attained. Probably, in all candor, even this basic fact is appreciated by most of those who favor drastic reduction of our effort. What energizes them really, is that our space effort has at times had so much appeal on so many fronts to so many segments of society, both at home and abroad, that it has loomed at the prime competitor for resources to those who see it as such. Because it is so formidable, assault upon it can be very frustrating. There is no place to get a valid hold, really. This leads to a certain amount of frenzy and some pretty ironic intellectual and logical distortions.

For instance, among the principal detractors are numbered many of those who are most disturbed by what they regard as this nation's warlike and materialistic image both at home and abroad. Yet time and again we have seen how the whole world responds to the astronauts and their achievements. Even those people and governments around the world who are prone to be negative about much in America today are among the first to turn out their hearts and spirits to our space program. We would have to go far back indeed to find goodwill emissaries comparable to the astronauts. Yet this over-

whelming and unique benefit to our national image is hardly credited by those who profess the greatest concern about that image.

This ironic ambivalence goes way back. Let me refresh your recollection, by way of example, about the attitude of many of those principal current detractors during the 1960 election campaign. That election took place a little more than three years after Sputnik, at a time when the U.S. had not very much to point to in terms of dramatic achievement in space. One of the principal points being made by those who are today foremost among our space effort's critics was that U.S. prestige abroad had suffered dramatically and that the principal reason therefor was superior Soviet space achievements and all that allegedly implied.

The kind of frustration that produces such ambivalence also can produce dangerous oversimplification. One so oriented looks at a ghetto and sees a space capsule with a multimillion dollar price tag. Unfortunately such oversimplified emotion-charged disregard for the true nature of what our space effort has meant to us—has had its effect in terms of public support.

But the significance of pointing out the impact of our space effort on our national economy pales by comparison with the real reasons for sustaining a vigorous space effort. This has to do not with Congressmen who vote against the space effort nor editors who write against it. It has to do rather with our space effort's relationship to the fundamental aspirations of our youth.

Here is where today's most dangerous anomaly lies.

As the citizens of tomorrow's society, it is upon our youth that the impact of current national decisions will fall most heavily.

They must be brought to an understanding of the identification between our continued acceptance of this challenge and their ability to fulfill their own aspirations.

We know, because history has so often taught and retaught us, the cost of heeding those who would sell the day to profit the hour. We know that the story of nations, of people, and of whole societies has always been one of struggle between those with faith in the future and those unwilling or unable to face it because of immersion in immediate problems. As Senator Bible recently stated, "Every important advance in the history of mankind would never have occurred if it had been put off until other more immediate needs were handled."

We in America also know that where major technological advance beckons, a nation such as ours, which depends heavily on such advances for its survival, its well-being, its standard of living and even the viability of its free institutions, has but one area of choice. It can opt to accept or reject the challenge; it cannot opt to accept or reject the effects of its decision. We also have learned that technological advance is essentially indivisible. You either opt for it or you don't. If you advance technology in one area you advance across the board; and it is from such overall advance that the power and capability to make choices is preserved to a people.

Senator Monroney once stated particularly well the effects of a contrary decision in the following terms: "Starving technology mortgages the future of our society. Twenty years ago Britain picked immediate social goals over technical progress. Today it is paying the price, lacking the production base to support either social or technical progress."

Our youth must fully understand these facts and do so in terms of their own aspirations. They must appreciate the relationship, again on their own intellectual, economic and social terms, between America's continued acceptance of the greatest challenge earthmen have been privileged to assume and the range of options that will be theirs.

For when all is said and done what is at the root of their statement? What, in their eyes,

is the single most important attribute of the society in which they will live as adults? It seems to me there emerges clearly from all their various modes of expression and assertion that they most want a society unfettered by the past. They want to be free to make their own choices, free to determine not only their own life-style but also the scope of their horizons, the range of their options. They fervently seek such freedom. Explicitly and implicitly they demand it.

How can they have any chance for such a society if today's America turns its back on the greatest challenge with which it is presented? If we were to falter now, to let ourselves fall back into a stagnant, static posture based on weakness, confusion and abdication of our responsibilities to the future, we would surely doom any and all of their efforts to achieve such freedom. They must be brought to understand this fact.

America, as other nations, through choice or necessity, have done in the past, would for the first time in its history be closing the lid on the future. Not only would we thereby forfeit the most fundamental attribute we stand for, to our own youth as well as to others. Not only would hope, advance, opportunity, serendipity, faith, curiosity and determination no longer be, as they have always been, distinctive hallmarks of American life. Not only would we be the first generation in our nation's history to condemn our citizens of tomorrow to horizons prescribed by an absence of will, wit and vision. But history has shown us that once one generation makes such a denial of the future, a nation more often than not starts sinking inexorably, like a confused and frightened dinosaur, into the mud of the ages.

Our youth must come to understand that our space effort is no more "competing" with other priorities than the engine of a car "competes" with the seat cushions for design and funding priorities. In a practical sense some accommodations are always necessary, but if they are made at the essential expense of the engine, the seat cushions, no matter how comfortable and attractive they may be, will soon just sit and rot by the roadside.

Now we don't owe our youth prescriptions for their life-style or the scope of their horizons. They wouldn't pay any attention to us anyway. But we do owe them our best efforts to make them appreciate what is involved, and our best efforts to preserve for them the widest possible range of choice.

If when they become adults, when the world is theirs, they decide to sell the day to profit the hour, to remove their society from the mainstream of history, they will have to answer for it to future generations. If they decide to opt out, it doesn't make too much difference what we do now. But if they choose to sustain their growth, their strength and their independence of choice—and every indication is that is just what they will do—who among us will want to justify having deprived them of the chance?

ONE HUNDRED YEAR CELEBRATION—HAMBLLEN COUNTY, TENN.

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, this week-end will be a great occasion for the people of Hamblen County, Tenn. The county is celebrating its 100th birthday.

Today I want to pay tribute to this enthusiastic and hard-working group of people who have contributed so much to the progress and growth of the area.

Some of the finest schools and churches can be found in the towns of Morristown, Russellville, Lowland, and Whitesburg. A variety of industry abounds in Hamblen County, and it is a good farming area. Excellent newspapers, banks, and businesses serve the county.

Hamblen County was created on May 31, 1870, and was named for Hezekiah Hamblen. The first settlers had come to the county around 1783 and found a good location to live and farm at the bend of the Nollichucky River.

Morristown, the county seat, is actually older than Hamblen County itself, and the first county court was organized in an old storehouse in Morristown on October 3, 1770.

This weekend Hamblen County will relive some of its early days and will display the progress it has made in the past 100 years. On Saturday Hamblen countians will turn out for a gala centennial parade and the festivities will continue with a special program in the evening. Happy 100th birthday, Hamblen County.

HAROLD H. KAHN LEADS URBAN REFORM

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, with the problems of today's cities becoming increasingly acute, the need for effective and dedicated leadership for our metropolitan areas becomes ever more apparent. Citizens' groups and urban leagues can play a significant role in providing and encouraging the kind of leadership which produces solutions to the transportation, environmental and developmental problems which accompany the growth of metropolitan communities.

One example of that leadership and dedication in Metropolitan Cleveland is the work of Harold H. Kahn, one of Cleveland's most outstanding civil leaders and newly elected president of the Citizens League of Greater Cleveland. The accompanying article, from the Plain Dealer of June 3, describes his efforts to achieve a government system for Cuyahoga County, which comprises the Cleveland metropolitan area, which would be more effective in furthering efforts to solve urban problems in that area.

The article follows:

COUNTY REFORM TOP OBJECTIVE OF LEAGUE

The major objective of the Citizens League of Greater Cleveland this year will be adoption by Cuyahoga County voters of the alternative form of county government, Harold H. Kahn, the League's new president, said yesterday.

Kahn, 64, senior partner in the law firm of Kahn, Kleinman, Yanowitz & Arnsen, was elected yesterday succeeding F. J. Blake, senior vice president of Central National Bank, who had served the maximum two years. Kahn has been on the league board six years and was vice president last year.

"The solution of such problems as water and air pollution, transportation, storm drainage, sewage and waste disposal are stymied by the lack of a viable county or-

ganization," Kahn said. "Every effort must be made to communicate to the voters of Cleveland and the suburbs the vital importance of reform of their county government as the most basic and fundamental step to progress."

The alternative proposal was defeated by county voters last November. Officials of the Citizens League, and other groups, hope to get enough signatures to put the issue on the ballot, possibly this fall.

The proposal would create an elected administrative head of the county and expand the board of county commissioners from three to seven persons, who would serve as legislators.

Kahn is a graduate of Glenville High School. He received bachelor's and law degrees from Case Western Reserve University.

He is president of the board of the Jewish Convalescent and Rehabilitation Center of Cleveland and a trustee of the Council of Human Relations, Suburban Community Hospital, Fairmount Temple and the Jewish Community Federation.

He and his wife, Jean, live at 2985 West Belvoir Oval, Shaker Heights. They have two children, Mrs. Evelyn Safran and William H. Kahn.

CULEBRA

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to express an overwhelming feeling of personal outrage and to focus attention upon a situation which is intolerable to those who must live through it and avoidable by those who perpetuate it. The island of Culebra is an inhabited part of Puerto Rico which is currently used by the Navy for extensive bombing and shelling practice. Recent testimony before the House Armed Services Subcommittee on real estate as well as a study by the Puerto Rican Civil Rights Commission, have chronicled the history of U.S. involvement, pointing consistently toward blatant naval insensitivity to the welfare and safety of the Culebran people.

HISTORY

Culebra is a 7,000-acre island, approximately 7 miles long and 3 miles wide lying slightly east of the Puerto Rican mainland. It is one of 76 municipalities of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Culebra's 726 inhabitants, all of whom are U.S. citizens, rely for subsistence almost exclusively on farming and fishing.

The initial involvement of the United States with Culebra began in 1901. At that time, and again in 1902, Executive orders were signed by President Theodore Roosevelt which provided that all public lands on Culebra were to be for the use of the U.S. Government under the jurisdiction of the Navy. Both of these Executive orders were reaffirmed in 1903. Six years later Roosevelt dedicated the cays and islets surrounding Culebra as national wildlife refuges, thus acknowledging the rare ecosystem of the island. By 1911 the residents of San Ildefonso had been evicted by the Navy and had formed the new town of Dewey

on the southern part of Culebra. Up until 1936, the U.S. Government had only intermittent contact with Culebra and few complaints from its citizenry. However, it was in that year that the Navy commenced aerial bombings and offshore attacks. On February 14, 1941, President Franklin Roosevelt signed Executive Order 8684 reaffirming the U.S. naval presence and expanding its jurisdiction to include the air space over the island and 3 miles of territorial waters surrounding Culebra. Accessibility to the area was declared to be at the exclusive discretion of the Navy. Severe penalties were established for those who violated naval restrictions.

Throughout the midfifties and into the early sixties, the Navy attempted to gain control of the entire island. They apparently were willing to resettle the Culebrans on neighboring islands in order to facilitate more freedom in their weaponry practice. However, these plans were abandoned when it was pointed out that Puerto Rico's Constitution provides that no municipality can be dissolved unless its citizens vote for dissolution by referendum—The Armed Services Journal, June 27, 1970, page 23.

In 1960, there was a noticeable change in the bombings and shellings—they became both more frequent and more intense. By 1969 weaponry practice averaged 9½ hours per day for 6 days of the week, as well as 3½ hours on Sundays—testimony of Thomas C. Jones, Jr., attorney for the Municipality of Culebra, before the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Real Estate, June 10, 1970. Culebrans were forced to undergo 228 days of aerial rocket fire, 123 days of naval gunfire, and 114 days of strafing by jets—Wall Street Journal, June 10, 1970, page 1. Living in Culebra in 1970 is much like living in London during the German blitzkrieg. Furthermore, accelerated bombings have been planned for 1970. The Navy presently is ahead of its 1969 pace, having already made 17,860 runs to the target this year—Wall Street Journal, June 10, 1970, page 1.

As an added affront to the Culebran people, the Navy has, in recent years, given permission to Venezuela, Great Britain, Brazil, West Germany, the Netherlands, and Trinidad-Tobago to join with the United States in bombing Culebra.

At the present time, there is an acquisition request before the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Real Estate. It seeks approval of a Navy intention to purchase 2,350 additional acres on Culebra for the purpose of expanded bombings and missile testings. It is this request which initially brought Culebra public attention.

The history of U.S. involvement in Culebra is consistently interspersed with a succession of accidents and near misses—notwithstanding contrary assertions and denials by the Navy. In 1935, for example, Alberto Pena Garcia, a 15-year-old schoolboy, was killed when he smashed a USMC grenade with a hammer—The Armed Forces Journal, May 23/26, 1970, page 30. Similar, albeit non-fatal, accidents occurred in 1914 and 1964. In 1946, nine Navy men were killed

in an accidental bombing because their office was painted the same color as the bombing target—The Armed Forces Journal, May 23/26, 1970, page 30.

More recently, there has been an increase in the number of near misses. Several 1,000-pound bombs reportedly landed within a few feet of Culebra's shore and remained there unexploded for several days while children played nearby—the Armed Forces Journal, June 6, 1970, page 19. On May 22 of this year, the Governor of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Louis A. Ferre, was fired upon without warning. Ironically, he was visiting Culebra to investigate complaints that naval bombings were dangerous. Richard D. Copaken, counsel for the municipality of Culebra, collected signed statements from lower level Navy personnel concerning this incident. In their statement, they conceded that the red warning flag had not been displayed and that bathers had been seen in the firing area earlier and may still have been there. In fact, three children were in the line of fire and testified to that effect at the June 10 hearings before the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Real Estate. They further attested that during the firing they had seen a boat in the distance—Governor Ferre's.

On this past July 4, a day on which no military activity was scheduled, a Navy Phantom jet made three low passes 10 feet above the water on a fishing boat, dropping a bomb or firing a rocket on two of those passes. Mr. Jose Higuera, the owner of the boat, reported the incident to the Honorable Ramon Feliciano, mayor of Culebra. It is Mr. Higuera's opinion that the incident was done viciously by the Navy.

EFFECTS

As might be expected, the Navy's presence on Culebra has had tremendously detrimental effects—on the lives of the people, the economy of the island, and the ecology of the area.

The influence upon the human environment has been perhaps the most pernicious consequence of naval target practice. Through statements to their attorneys and in testimony before a House subcommittee, the people of Culebra have constantly emphasized the fear and apprehension which has resulted from the continual bombings of their homeland. They are subjected to the noise of supersonic booms, gunfire, rocket fire, and heavy air traffic. As a result, many Culebrans worry about the safety of their families. Thus Mercedes Morales Lopez told Culebra's lawyers:

There is much insecurity and danger for the children . . . I have certainly been afraid here, and so have the children, including the two-year old.

The naval attacks further manifest their inimical effects on the human environment in the operation of Culebran schools. Learning has been greatly hindered. Carmelo Feliciano, who has been a schoolteacher in Culebra for 13 years, testified at the recent Culebra hearings:

Teaching in Culebra is an extremely difficult job. The continuous flow of air traffic at low altitudes over the school, helicopters, jets and propeller planes, make an infernal

noise, creating a state of tension and anxiety and rendering virtually impossible to hold the attention of the students. . . . When bombs and shells are exploding, the school buildings tremble with every explosion. You can see fear in the children's eyes. They sit in school as if ready to run at a moment's notice. During the periods of heavy night bombing, students fall asleep in class. They look sleepless and the teachers there know why this is so. Bombing is carried out far past midnight every day and these kids are kept awake by the noise and the tremor caused by the bombs until early morning hours . . .

Due to all this noise caused by Navy aircraft and boats bombing and shelling, and also because they live in constant fear of losing their lives, the students' work at school is very poor. There has not been an honors graduate in Culebra in more than three years. Intelligence tests show a far below normal IQ for Culebran students. I have observed that many of these students have moved out and attend school in the main island of Puerto Rico and their grades are considerably higher at these other schools. The ones that return to Culebra fall back way below in their school work.

Furthermore, there are numerous reports of bomb-related property damage as well as complaints stemming from the inaccessibility of Culebra during its frequent attacks. However, the point need not be belabored. The consequences which result from naval bombardments are clearly deleterious in terms of Culebra's human environment.

A less apparent, yet perhaps equally destructive result of the bombings has been the erosion of a stable Culebran economy. The farmlands upon which the people depend for food have been pillaged by ship-to-shore bombings and aerial attacks. The fishing industry, long a principal support of Culebra, has been significantly harmed. Navy regulations prohibit fishing during bombings and thousands of fish have been found dead in the aftermath of weaponry practice. These harmful effects on the farmlands and fishing industry were recently observed firsthand by my district representative, Victor Robles.

The Commonwealth government has long been aware of Navy plans for expansion in Culebra. Cognizant of this, it has been reluctant to invest in the welfare of the Culebran people and has further damaged the economy of the island. Thus, Culebra's educational, health, and employment facilities are shamefully inadequate. Culebra's per capita income is only \$400—notably less than neighboring islands.—San Juan Star, June 6, 1970, page 3.

The ecosystem of Culebra and its adjoining cays and islets is in many ways unique. It provides important nesting grounds for various migratory oceanic birds, including the sooty tern, the nobby tern, and the laughing gull. In addition, the Bahama pintail, a rare and endangered species, can be—or used to be—found in the eastern part of Culebra. Navy shelling and bombing have greatly harmed these rare species. Several years ago, for instance, a bomb-related fire in an impact area destroyed 30 acres of nesting grounds—observed by Ricardo Cotte, the Department of the Interior's agent in Puerto Rico.

Moreover, the previously mentioned dead fish are contributing to a gradual pollution of Culebra waters. Its once beautiful cays have become sewers of dead fish. Thus, one of the most noxious, although less conspicuous, consequences of naval bombings is the snail-like, yet inevitable, transformation of the Culebran ecosystem. This ecological transformation will, in all probability, further adversely affect the lives of the people.

ALTERNATIVES

It seems evident that acceptable alternative sites to Culebra do exist but have not been adequately explored by the Navy. Representative JORGE CORDOVA, the resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, has suggested several possibilities—among them, Mona, Monita, and Desecheo. Furthermore, should these sites prove unacceptable, it seemingly is possible to construct artificial islands or platforms exactly to Navy specifications—Armed Forces Journal, June 27, 1970.

The Navy has consistently denied that satisfactory alternative sites exist. However, they have not proffered any suggestions of their own. They are the logistical experts who best understand their own training needs and hence, should be actively involved in seeking and securing a more acceptable training site. Instead they have been content to merely refute those offered by nonexperts. The crucial question revolves around contingency plans. What would the Navy do if they were told by Congress that they could no longer use Culebra? One seriously doubts that the Roosevelt Roads complex would completely shut down. Somehow, it seems, acceptable alternative sites would suddenly appear.

DISCONTENT AND SUPPORT

In the last several months, the Culebran people have vehemently voiced their fundamental dissatisfaction with the current situation. They not only adamantly oppose the Navy's efforts to acquire additional land, but seek to end all bombing activities on their island. These firm convictions can be seen in a recent survey reported in the Armed Forces Journal—May 23/26, 1970, page 29. It found that of the 313 families that were interviewed, 304 wanted the Navy to cease its bombardments. The validity of this survey was recently tested by Thomas C. Jones, Jr., attorney for Covington and Burling. He purposely slanted his study in the Navy's favor, yet still found that 95 percent of those interviewed opposed the Navy's acquisition of additional land and that 75 percent opposed any weaponry testing on Culebra. Demonstrations supporting "Culebra for the Culebrans" have been held both on the Island and on the Puerto Rican mainland—most recently on July 18.

Outside of Culebra, support has been steadily gaining momentum. Puerto Ricans in the Commonwealth itself, as well as their elected representatives both in Puerto Rico and Washington, have been acting in conjunction with Puerto Rican organizations and leaders in New York City to return Culebra to its people. Thus it can be seen that discontent among the Culebran people is both widespread and

intense, and that support for their cause is pervasive. So far, however, this support has been ineffective. The bombings go on. That they do, seemingly is an indication of the position of Puerto Ricans within American society. It is ludicrous to think that such a situation could continue anywhere else in this country. The realities of power politics dictate that it could not. Thus Culebra continues to suffer, partly because its citizens are Puerto Ricans and hence, at a distinct political disadvantage.

I unequivocally support the Culebran people in their efforts to regain control of their island and I am fully committed to assisting them by any legitimate means possible. I offer my support and assistance, independent of any political benefits or liabilities the issue may have for me personally, and fully cognizant of Culebra's political implications within Puerto Rico. I support Culebra simply because the Culebrans are right and the Navy is wrong—because I believe, and have always believed, in the fundamental right of people to decide for themselves issues which greatly affect their own welfare.

In keeping with my support of the Culebran people, I have met, and will continue to meet, with representatives from the Puerto Rican community both in Washington and New York, as well as with other U.S. Senators and Representatives who have expressed an interest in Culebra. Our purpose has been to plan effective collective efforts aimed at saving Culebra. Further, I have written to Senator HENRY M. JACKSON in his capacity as chairman both of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Construction. I have urged him to hold hearings to investigate whether or not the Navy should be permitted any future use of Culebra as a weaponry training site.

On July 18, 1970, I sent a representative from my New York office, one who is fluent in Spanish, to personally deliver a statement to the Honorable Luis Ferre, Governor of Puerto Rico. My letter to Governor Ferre reaffirmed my support for the Culebran people and pledged my continuing efforts on their behalf.

I strongly urge you, as colleagues in the House of Representatives and as people interested in fair play, to join with me in supporting the Culebran people. There is a fight for human rights. Reason urges your support; justice requires it.

AROUND THE WORLD FACTFINDING TOUR

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I recently returned from an around-the-world fact-finding tour which included Southeast Asia and the Middle East. I have just completed a report of this tour for my constituents in the Third Congressional District of Kentucky. I would also like

to share my experiences with my colleagues in the Congress.

The following is a description of my visits in Southeast Asia and the Middle East:

AROUND THE WORLD FACTFINDING TOUR

On June 8, I left Louisville for an around-the-world fact-finding tour of Southeast Asia and the Middle East. In November of 1967, I toured several countries of Asia and upon my return made a report to the Congress. President Richard Nixon read our recommendations and asked Congressman Fred Schwenkel, of Iowa, and I to return again and to report to him our "observations and recommendations". As before, the tour was made at no expense to the Federal government, but was paid for from private and personal funds.

VIETNAM

I arrived in Saigon after a long 12,000 mile flight, with stops in San Francisco, Hawaii, Guam, and Manila. There was immediately visible improvement in Vietnam since my visit there two and a half years ago. For all practical purposes Saigon is secure and no longer do your hotel windows rattle every night from bombing and gunfire on the outskirts of the city. The de-Americanization of the war is immediately evident with the obvious reduction of American troops in the area. Vietnamization has brought about full mobilization with over one million men under arms in the regular and provincial forces of South Vietnam.

I toured the jump-off bases along the Vietnam-Cambodia border from which President Nixon ordered U.S. ground troops' intervention on May 1. By gunship helicopter I was able to visit almost all of our bases in the Fishhook and Parrot's Beak area. I talked with our troops on Special Forces duty in isolated camps along the border that have been under constant fire from North Vietnamese regulars who crossed the border from Cambodia. The enemy has been using their sanctuaries to inflict rather substantial losses on these outposts.

By helicopter I was able to fly into Cambodia within sight of the Mekong River and touch down at our most forward fire bases. At one encampment I inspected two enemy bunkers where caches of weapons and ammunition had not yet been removed. Our intervention into Cambodia caught the North Vietnamese completely by surprise, not only to the extent that they did not have time to evacuate their supplies and munitions, but their booby traps and deadly land mines were almost non-existent.

I stopped at a fire base west of the Angel's Wing area which was occupied by a combined force of U.S. and South Vietnamese artillery. Their big guns were firing on enemy positions within a twenty-mile radius. Amid all of this thunderous noise, I had a "C" ration lunch with some of our troops in Cambodia.

I was very much impressed with the success of this operation and by the effectiveness of the South Vietnamese troops. Since my visit two and a half years ago, they have been well trained and supplied with our latest equipment. They are tough little fighters who cannot be expected to win all of the battles, but are dedicated to self-help and self-determination.

I also had an opportunity to tour the northern battleground near DaNang, Hue and the DMZ. I inspected our Marine fire bases that protect the giant air base at DaNang. The enemy has changed their strategy from frontal assault to terrorist attacks. I flew to within sight of the Au Shaw Valley where our patrols have almost daily fire fights with smaller elements of North Vietnamese regulars. Again I was impressed by the ARVN forces, under General Lam, who are fighting alongside the remaining Marines and the 101st Airborne Division. Formerly the Marines had this whole sector under their command but most of them have re-

turned to the States under President Nixon's withdrawal program.

Back in Saigon, I had the opportunity to meet with members of the Vietnam National Congress. I visited with the Speaker of the House and attended one of their morning sessions. I had a particularly interesting discussion with the former Mayor of Hanoi, the capital city of North Vietnam, who is now an elected member of the South Vietnamese Senate. I was surprised to learn that almost half of the Senate are from North Vietnam and moved south when the Communists took over control of their country.

Democracy is working in Saigon and surprisingly a free society exists in a war time atmosphere. This is the first time in all history that a developing nation has simultaneously tried to fight a war, attain economic self-sufficiency, install constitutional democracy and move into the twentieth century. I have great respect for the people of South Vietnam.

CAMBODIA

I flew into Phnom Penh, capital of Cambodia, at a time of great crisis. While I was meeting with officials of the American Embassy, and the Ambassadors of India, Singapore and Australia, we could hear gunfire outside the city. The beautiful city of Phnom Penh is completely mobilized with a civilian army with very few rifles. I met with a group of students and faculty leaders who represented 15,000 college and university colleagues who had volunteered for defense of their country. I was deeply moved by their intense patriotism and noted their hatred of Prince Sihanouk.

Unfortunately, much of the truth about Cambodia has not been properly reported by the news media. On March 18 the National Assembly voted unanimously to remove Prince Sihanouk as Chief of State. However, the Lon Nol government is not a new one for he has been Prime Minister for almost a year. From Peking, Sihanouk called upon Red China, North Vietnam, communist elements from Laos, and the Viet Cong to invade his country in his behalf. Contrary to news reports, Prince Sihanouk has almost no support in Cambodia.

I met with the President of the National Assembly and some of the leaders of the Cambodian Congress. As the only U.S. Congressman or Senator to visit Phnom Penh during this period of crisis, they wanted me to tell the true story in America. They are not asking for U.S. troop intervention, but they are badly equipped to fight a war. We have made available \$8 million in arms and ammunition and have supported South Vietnamese troops who came to the defense of Phnom Penh. I was very much relieved to leave Cambodia because the Phnom Penh airport was closed two days after my departure.

THAILAND

I next visited Bangkok, the capital of Thailand. The Thais have had a volunteer army division fighting with us in South Vietnam for several years. There was talk that the famous Black Panther Division from Thailand would be deployed into battle in Cambodia.

Eleven nations from Southeast Asia recently met in Djakarta and called for the territory integrity of Cambodia. The war in Indo-China cannot be properly termed a civil war for it is more correctly an invasion by North Vietnam into its neighboring countries. I was quite aware of a change in attitude since my visit two and a half years ago. There is now a much closer feeling among the free countries of South Vietnam, Cambodia and Thailand.

THE MIDDLE EAST

After a long flight from Bangkok to Bombay and then to Tel Aviv, I landed in Israel. I visited the Israel Ministry of Defense where I received a most unusual briefing on all four borders of conflict. There is almost daily ac-

tion on all fronts, but by far the most sensitive is the battle area adjacent to the Suez Canal. The interdiction of Russian pilots and sophisticated SA-3 missiles in this zone brings new dangers.

I also visited the biblical City of Jerusalem, which is the capital of Israel. I went to City Hall where I met with their famous Mayor, Teddy Kollek. As always, we found the problems of a big city to be about the same anywhere, except Teddy has the additional crisis of dealing with a war torn country with Jews, Arabs, Moslems and Christians trying to live together in one community.

I next had a meeting with the Israel Foreign Affairs Ministry and then toured the old walled city of Jerusalem, including a visit to the wailing wall at the Temple.

CYPRUS

In order to enter the Arab world from Israel, it was necessary for me to fly to Cyprus. Actually, I had to use two passports and two sets of plane tickets. I landed at Nicosia, the capital of Cyprus, which is an independent island in the eastern Mediterranean and another hot spot in the world. Eighty percent of the population is Greek and twenty percent is Turkish and their nationalism for their home countries erupts into occasional fighting. Twice in 1964 and again in 1967 open warfare existed. Now there is an uneasy peace patrolled by 3,500 United Nations troops from Canada, England and the Scandinavian countries. I drove through no-man's land between the Greek and Turkish armies. Four convoys a day are allowed by agreement to cross through this area, escorted by U.N. forces. The United States plays an important role in Cyprus because both Turkey and Greece are good allies of ours.

ARAB WORLD

First I visited Beirut, Lebanon, where they have the same explosive situation that existed in Jordan a short time ago when the Fedayeen ("freedom fighters") prompted a three-day battle in Amman. There are many Palestinian refugee camps in and around Beirut which are controlled by the Fedayeen. They have been causing most of the border incidents from Jordan, Syria and Lebanon.

After flying over the Suez Canal, the pyramids and the Nile River, I landed in Cairo. In Egypt they have the longest recorded history in the world—five thousand years. President Nasser has tried hard to promote Arab nationalism and unity. He recently escalated the Mideast conflict by shelling the Israeli positions on the east bank of the Suez. There are almost daily air strikes from both sides.

I visited the United States Embassy where there exists the most unusual situation in American diplomatic history. Egypt and the United States severed relations after the 1967 six-day war. Both countries now have Embassy staffs in the other's capital, but under a foreign flag. Our sixteen-man staff occupies the same buildings as before, but each morning we run up the Spanish flag. We are officially recognized as a section of the Spanish Embassy. In Washington, the Egyptians operate under the Indian flag.

From Cairo I flew to Albania, Paris and Washington, D.C. On June 25, I completed the last leg of my around-the-world tour by returning to Louisville.

THE UNITED STATES HAS
THREE CHOICES

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a very easy thing to appropriate more money than is in the budget for any pet social

scheme that comes along and then say, "If you wish to balance the budget, cut defense spending."

It is very easy and very irresponsible. Those who seek to cut our defense spending down to virtually zero for the sake of building a bigger welfare state are taking us to the brink of war and maybe into war itself, a war we will not be able to win because of their foolish notion that we do not need to be strong to be free.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has three choices. It can continue to spend beyond its income and collapse from within under the weight of a galloping inflation.

It can steal from defense funds in order to finance welfare state spending and fall prey to ruthless forces from without.

Or it can live within its income and strike a reasonable balance between domestic spending and defense spending.

Mr. Speaker, that last course is the course President Nixon has chosen. That is the responsible course.

A SALUTE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Sheboygan School District has been most fortunate these past 16 years in having as its superintendent, Leslie W. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson has proven himself an excellent educator and has demonstrated his concern for students throughout his years in Sheboygan.

The following editorial from the July 1 edition of the Sheboygan Press both congratulates Mr. Johnson on his retirement and thanks him, on behalf of all of us who know and respect him, for his years of leadership in the field of education:

A SALUTE

Sheboygan is a bit different today—or hadn't you noticed? The end of June has come. July is here and there is a new hand at the helm of the Sheboygan public school district. It is appropriate that we salute Leslie W. Johnson, who has retired as superintendent of schools.

Sixteen years is a long time for a local school administrator. And those 16 years have been difficult years for Wisconsin public school administrators. The state has gone through the throes of school district reorganization. The joining together of school districts has not always been a happy time everywhere in Wisconsin. Under Superintendent Johnson's leadership, there has been a minimum of bickering in the ever-enlarging Sheboygan district and a maximum of striving for better educational opportunities for all. The past 16 years have been years of increasing financial stress. Superintendent Johnson has not sought much plush or finery but he has carefully and quietly stressed the need for quality education and he has never sidestepped the costs of education—be it good education or bad. These past 16 years have been years of urgent need for new buildings, for more buildings, for different buildings, for bond issues, for educational

planning and selling. Superintendent Johnson has done well and the evidence is at every hand.

These past 16 years have been years of increasing demands for more and better accomplishments by the schools. Many school administrators have yielded to the pressures and have become budget operators, building planners, or labor negotiators. Superintendent Johnson has given leadership to all of these leadership roles but he has insisted that first and foremost he is an educator. He has been concerned about boys and girls, about the teaching and learning processes and about genuine accomplishments in the classrooms.

Mr. and Mrs. Johnson have played large and important roles in our community. We are glad that Mr. Johnson is not leaving education completely—education needs the Leslie Johnsons. We are glad that they will continue to live in Sheboygan.

We salute them both and wish them many more happy years among us. We do appreciate what has been accomplished and how it has been accomplished during these last 16 years, the Johnson years.

CONGRESSMAN ESHLEMAN'S LATEST NEWSLETTER

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today sending to my constituents my latest newsletter. I am including the contents of that newsletter in the RECORD at this point:

REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN
ED ESHLEMAN

CAMBODIAN WRAP-UP

The President made good on his promises. His primary purpose for crossing the border into Cambodia was to hurt the enemy and thus secure—probably hasten—United States withdrawal from Vietnam. He accomplished his goal and got us back out of Cambodia. All the gloomy talk that the war was being expanded and that the United States had plunged into another quagmire proved exaggerated. What was originally a courageous decision by the President became an apparently successful military operation. As more and more American troops come home even the critics may begin to realize the extent of our success in Cambodia.

WHO IS ON SECOND

First there was the McGovern-Hatfield amendment which was stronger than the Cooper-Church amendment which got tangled up with the Byrd amendment which was supposedly hawkish, but which lost, but then was reworded and won about the time that the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was being tied to the Cooper-Church amendment which finally was passed in the Senate and was considered a victory for the doves even though the hawkish wording was in it, but when it got to the House, it was rejected—so who's on second?

BIRD'S EYE OBSERVATION

Several months ago I was receiving waves of correspondence from irate constituents who had received some unwanted pornographic mail in their homes. Today I am hearing from almost no one on this subject. Perhaps this is an indication that the anti-pornography laws passed by Congress and the tough anti-pornography drive launched by the Nixon Administration are beginning to take effect.

STUDENT VISITORS

I met with a group of honor students from Lancaster County junior high schools on the Capitol steps several weeks ago. Some picture taking after I talked to them produced the photo on the left.

GOOD NIGHT CHET!

And the babbling brook called the ocean shallow.

PRESERVE AND PROTECT

There is a precious document in Washington which we go to great trouble to protect. So treasured is this single sheet of aged parchment that the bronze and glass case in which it rests is filled with helium gas, protecting it from possible damage from free oxygen. Special filters have been blended into the glass, shielding the document from the ultraviolet rays of sunlight. There is a steel and concrete vault beneath the floor to protect the parchment from fire, bombing, or invasion, with a special mechanism that can quickly lower it into this fireproof-bombproof chamber should danger threaten. An armed guard is present at the site 24 hours a day. All of this care is taken to preserve and protect the original copy of the Bill of Rights. These days there are incidents which make one believe that perhaps we should be just as concerned about the preservation and protection of the liberties set forth in this document.

RESPONSIBLE SPENDING

When House and Senate majorities decide that larger expenditures for health and education are justified—and a strong case can be made that they are—the House and Senate should take the responsibility for deciding what other programs are less essential. This kind of responsibility is being shirked. The Johnson Administration demonstrated, at the enormous cost of a serious national inflation which has not yet been controlled, that huge wartime costs cannot be met along with greater domestic spending without weakening the whole economic system. The Nixon Administration has undertaken to trim back budgetary overgrowth by setting a series of priorities. Congress has not followed suit. It would be fine to see health and education funds increased by Congress, if only Congress would show comparable zeal in cutting back other programs. The House and Senate should not be bound by Administration priorities, but should make certain we live within our national budget.

AT THE ROOT

A nationally known news commentator spoke recently on Capitol Hill. He set forth in his talk the things which he believed to be at the root of many of our present national problems. Vietnam, racism, and the generation gap were not on his list because these, he said, were manifestations of more basic factors. Three of these basic factors were listed and deserve, I think, some wider attention. They are: (1) the continued loss of individualism in our mass society, (2) the sharply spiraling and largely untempered flow of technological advance, and (3) the unresponsiveness of government to the legitimate needs of the American people. They are not problems which will be easily programmed toward solution or cured with large doses of federal money, but they are the kind of underlying considerations which should influence our judgment as we seek solutions to more visible national dilemmas.

DO NOT SPOIL THE FUN

It is obvious that all of the great problems of our time are not getting solved quickly enough, but it is also a fact that much progress is being made. Yet, even as the steps forward are taken, voices of discouragement are heard, sometimes screaming more loudly than ever. Why? Perhaps a story making the rounds in Washington reveals an answer. It is

a story about an Englishman who met a nationalist revolutionary just before Britain withdrew from India in 1947. "Why do you look so glum?" asked the Englishman. "We are giving you your independence." The Indian replied, "You don't understand. We don't want you to give us our independence. We want to wrestle it away from you."

FORMER COLLEAGUE

The picture at the right was taken in Secretary of Defense Mel Laird's office at the Pentagon. This month I had occasion to talk with him about some matters affecting the New Cumberland Army Depot. However, as might be expected, the conversation also turned to some remembering of Mel's prior service with us on Capitol Hill as a Congressman from Wisconsin.

TO COME HOME

An emerging debate which is likely to become quite bitter in the post-Vietnam era is what to do about the thousands of American young people who have fled into exile to avoid the draft, and the smaller number of servicemen who have deserted rather than face combat duty. To forgive and forget is a charitable pattern deeply rooted in Christian beliefs and yet—aside from the legal issues involved—there are some moral questions which need to be answered. Those who fled to avoid conscription or Vietnam duty set themselves above both statutory and ethical law. For each of them who was not drafted, some other American boy was. For each of them who declined to go to Vietnam, someone else made the trip. It would be intolerably unjust to grant full and unconditional amnesty to those who refused to serve their country when it, rightly or wrongly, called upon them. To do so would be to cheapen the personal sacrifice made by other young Americans who did what was required of them, some at the cost of their lives. I don't think it is necessary to be punitive or harsh in our judgment of those who fled. But their mistake should not go unrecognized. For some—in particular those who because of deeply felt convictions left the country to avoid the draft—our approach should be benevolent but firm. We should require from them two years of alternative service. For those who knowingly, willfully and brazenly deserted their country, we can only hope they will make better Canadians or Swedes than they did Americans.

BUMPER STICKER

Seen in Washington on Honor America Day: "If you don't like policemen, the next time you're in trouble call a hippie."

SLASHING SUBSIDIES

Farm subsidy payments are a basic feature of our national agricultural policy which seems to stress farming by government handout. Our Pennsylvania farmers have condemned this policy on many occasions as disastrous for the man who wants only to market a superior product. There is another factor worth consideration too. Last year the Commonwealth received less than one-tenth of one percent of all subsidy money. In the House of Representatives the unfairness and the failures of the handout approach to agriculture have been acknowledged in recent years. On several occasions the House has voted to limit the amount any one farmer could receive in subsidy payments to \$20,000. However, the Senate has always failed to go along with this initiative; that is, until this year. Recently the Senate also voted for a \$20,000 subsidy limitation which gives some hope that a more reasonable approach to agriculture may be on its way.

CAMPUS CONCERN

What can the new Presidential commission on college problems tell us? We already know that when political dissent turns criminal the law must be enforced. We know that when the law is enforced it must be enforced

legally and with restraint. We know that the independence and integrity of the schools must be protected and that education must reform. We know that an end to the war would help, so would further reforms of the draft, but that these things in themselves are not at the root of campus turmoil. We know that in times of public passion reason becomes more difficult but more necessary to apply. What we know we don't have to be told again. But by looking closely at our schools, perhaps the commission can refine and articulate some of the problems. In so doing it can help the country, the Administration and the Congress to think more constructively about the issues to be faced.

THE SWITCH IS ON

The Nation is gradually being geared from a wartime into a peacetime economy. There are some figures compiled this month in Washington which show the shift. The budget for the Department of Defense has dropped \$17.3 billion since 1968. Since June, 1969 Defense Department employment, civilian and military, has been trimmed by 840,000. Defense takes 35% of the total Federal Budget as compared to 43% three years ago. Meanwhile, the spending for other Federal programs has risen \$18.4 billion in that three year period.

HEALING DIVISION

That division is a fact of life in our country today cannot be denied. When President Nixon, campaigning in 1968, applauded a young girl's placard which read "Bring Us Together," he hardly foresaw, nor did anyone else, the polarizations now visible in America. The efforts to affix blame for these divisions cannot be helpful in finding solutions. Some meaningful effort toward healing divisions could be helpful. That effort should not be based entirely in Washington. Americans' all of them have always been ingenious problem-solvers. They have often shown that they can see and work toward the larger good; that compassion in communities can be practiced; and that, above all, respect for the individual is the essence of the American dream. The strength and reason available from such insights can enable the United States to deal with division, but even more importantly can enable us to heal division.

LET US LOOK AT THE RECORD,
PLACE THE BLAME WHERE IT
BELONGS

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN, Mr. Speaker, recently one of New Mexico's leading newspapers properly received and summarized the partisan attacks by those who attempt to place responsibility for today's inflationary problems on the Nixon administration. Many of these same partisans continue to bemoan inflation while at the same time they continue voting for more and more deficit Government spending. Let us look at the record closely, some folks speak and vote against inflation, others only speak, and speak, and speak.

The article follows:

[From the Albuquerque Journal, June 20, 1970]

BLAME WHERE IT BELONGS

Democrats including New Mexico's Sen. Joseph M. Montoya have said they will make

inflation and the cost of living key issues in this year's congressional campaigns.

Republicans should welcome that since they can accurately pin the blame on the Democrats who controlled the federal government through most of the 1960s and spawned inflation through spendthrift policies.

Dr. Arthur A. Smith, economist and senior vice president of the First National Bank in Dallas, has some pertinent comments in the June 15 issue of Bank Letter. He notes that Congress has been asked to raise the ceiling on the federal debt by \$18 billion to a record high of \$395 billion and adds:

"After at least nine of the most prosperous years in our history . . . you might wonder why the federal government was not able to reduce its indebtedness . . . Basically the answer is that there has been no real intention to control the debt—no serious thought of ever paying it off, or even reducing it very much.

"On the contrary, the kind of fiscal policy deliberately followed since 1961 utilized deficit financing as a major stimulant to advance the economy—a policy not even suspended, let alone abandoned, when the Vietnam war accelerated . . . Instead we have stubbornly held to the contention, so strongly emphasized by President Johnson, that we 'can have guns and butter both.'

"The above prodigal fiscal policy . . . has been almost entirely responsible for inflation . . ."

Dr. Smith also states that "inflation has cost (low- and middle-income taxpayers) much more than their share of the taxes that would have been required under balanced budgets . . ."

Even though the Democrat-controlled Congress should be aware of the financial havoc it already has wrought it persists in undermining President Nixon's efforts to balance the budget.

Inflation should be a campaign issue but let's put the blame where it properly belongs.

THE EMERGENCY HEALTH AMENDMENT

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1970

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. Speaker, the misery and tragedy of disease has no geographic, economic, or racial boundaries. Cancer, heart disease, diabetes, and other ailments strike equally at rich and poor, black and white, farmer and city dweller, old and young.

This Nation's resources, financial and intellectual, have been and are being used to explore space, to fly faster than the speed of sound, to assist underdeveloped nations throughout the world.

Can we not apply these same resources to make certain that our own people have the necessary facilities and medical personnel available when illness or accidents strike and make hospital or medical care necessary?

The emergency health amendment to the labor, health, education, and welfare appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971 can help us to begin to rationally apply our resources to the very real health crisis faced by all Americans. This amendment would add \$360,454,000 for health needs to a bill that totals \$18.8 billion. This would add only one-tenth of

1 percent of the total cost of the \$18.8 billion bill we are voting on here.

Is it so much to ask that we make this beginning effort toward meeting our Nation's serious health care crisis?

Health care problems continue to worsen, for as health costs continue their upward spiral, health services deteriorate. Today health expenditures per person average \$294 a year. For a family of four the average cost is \$1,176, or more than 13 percent of the median family income in this country, and about 20 percent of the average annual family take-home pay. But even with these high costs, Americans find it difficult to get critically ill family members into overcrowded hospitals. A shortage of doctors results in long waits in crowded reception rooms or no care at all for the poor. Any mother who has waited an hour or more in a doctor's waiting room with a child that has a high fever knows the anguish that these problems cause.

Our national health statistics are bleak. We rank below most Western nations in general health care. In 1950 our country ranked sixth in infant mortality; today we have fallen to 21st among nations. In 1959 we ranked 13th in male life expectancy; now we rank 18th.

But by far the most immediate problem is the drastic shortage of health personnel. The U.S. Public Health Service has indicated that as of today we need, to meet existing health needs: 48,000 more doctors, 17,800 more dentists, 150,000 more nurses, 266,000 more allied health workers. About 3,000 Americans are attending foreign medical colleges as the United States turns to the schools of other countries, importing every year almost as many foreign doctors as American medical schools graduate. Without the 7,000 physicians coming into the United States every year from abroad, many of our city hospitals would have to close down.

In this amendment we are asking for \$138,954,000 in additional funds for medical manpower institutional support and student loans. This is less than the price of a major missile launch but I believe that it is certainly far more important to the welfare of the American public. Is \$15 million for the National Heart and Lung Institute too much to add to this appropriations bill? I think not—and for those who do, I would suggest what will be a very sobering visit to the respiratory disease ward of their local hospital. Is \$80 million in additional funds for the Hill-Burton direct grant program excessive? The vote on June 25th by the House of 279-98 to override the President's veto of Hill-Burton should indicate not.

President Nixon himself has indicated his awareness of the Nation's health problems. He said: "We face a massive crisis in this area (health care), and unless action is taken administratively and legislatively to meet the crisis within the next 2 or 3 years, we will have a breakdown of our medical care system which could have consequences affecting millions of people."

I will take the President at his word and sincerely urge that we support this emergency health amendment on a bipartisan basis.

ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL
SPEAKS ON DRUG ABUSE CON-
TROL LEGISLATION

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Ways and Means Committee has begun hearings on the subject of drug abuse control legislation. On Monday, our committee heard an excellent presentation by the distinguished Attorney General of the United States, John N. Mitchell. Because there is a great need for new legislation in the field of drug abuse control and because this is a matter of such importance it should receive broad, bipartisan support. I am inserting the Attorney General's testimony in the RECORD and calling it to the attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE: STATEMENT BY JOHN N. MITCHELL, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON H.R. 17463 JULY 20, 1970

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee: I deeply appreciate your invitation to appear before you today to discuss legislation dealing with control of dangerous drugs. I assure you that the need for more effective control is a matter of the deepest concern to the President and to the Department of Justice and to me, just as I know it is to the Congress and the members of this Committee.

In a few weeks the young people of our nation will be returning to school—an event which American parents once looked upon with a smile and a sigh of relief. Today, it is a sad fact that parents view the opening of school with trepidation and concern because the drug traffic—narcotics and pills—has penetrated the school rooms and school yards of America at virtually every level.

It is no exaggeration to say that the drug danger threatens the moral and physical health of an entire generation.

I am accompanied today by Mr. John E. Ingersoll, Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, and by Mr. Michael R. Sonnenreich, Deputy Chief Counsel of the Bureau. I would like to address my testimony to the major features of the legislation recommended by the Administration and I have asked Mr. Ingersoll to discuss the more technical aspects of the bill.

On July 14, 1969, the President sent a message to the Congress relating exclusively to the narcotics and dangerous drug problem in the United States. At that time, he expressed the Administration's concern with the serious problem caused by drug abuse and misuse in the United States and outlined ten specific steps the Administration would take as initial counter-moves against this growing national problem.

Mr. Chairman, the President's ten-point program is directed at the many facets of the drug abuse problem. The program calls for new Federal and State laws, new cooperation with foreign governments and increased effort at our borders to halt the flow of drugs into the United States from outside sources; it calls for improved and increased training and resources for law enforcement; and finally, it recognizes that new laws and increased enforcement alone will not solve the drug abuse problem—rather we must also have effective programs of research, public education, and addict rehabilitation. For the convenience of the Committee, I have attached a copy of the President's message to my statement and would like to

request that it be included in the record following my statement.

All of these areas discussed in the President's message are vital in our Federal effort to deal with the problem. Today, however, I shall focus my comments principally on the law enforcement aspects of the problem, since this is the area of major concern to the Department of Justice.

Education, research, and rehabilitation are the long-term answers to the drug abuse problem in the United States. But while we plan, prepare, and explore in detail each of these areas, it is important that we regulate the manufacture, importation and distribution of narcotics and dangerous drugs through a logical and enforceable control scheme.

On July 15, 1969, the Administration sent to Congress the proposed "Controlled Dangerous Substances Act." This is the proposal the President promised in his message. This legislation, amended during consideration in the Senate, passed that body as S. 3246 on January 28, 1970 by a unanimous vote—82-0.

In the House of Representatives, there has been a jurisdictional problem of which you are well aware, and the original bill was divided between this Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee commenced hearings on February 3, 1970, and is about to conclude its work on the legislation. This Committee has several drug proposals before it, however, H.R. 17463, introduced by Chairman Mills and Mr. Byrnes, embodies the provisions recommended by the Administration. H.R. 17463 is very similar to S. 3246, which the Administration also endorsed.

Since the introduction of H.R. 17463, representatives of the Administration have had extensive and extended discussions with the Public Health and Welfare Subcommittee. As a result of these discussions, the Administration has endorsed several changes in the provisions of our proposed bill which we believe improve the legislation and resolve the problems that many witnesses raised during the hearings before the Public Health and Welfare Subcommittee. Accordingly, we would like to submit to the Committee later this week a number of recommended changes for H.R. 17463. I have asked Mr. Ingersoll in his testimony to highlight the major areas where we have sought to resolve apparent problems in the Administration's legislation.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to have truly effective drug enforcement, we must have a new Federal law. It is very important that both your Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reach agreement with regard to the proposed revisions in the drug laws. Without such agreement, we are likely to have divergent Acts emerge from the House of Representatives when our purpose is to unify and clarify the laws into a new code. We stand ready to assist this Committee in any way we can to facilitate your consideration of this legislation and coordination of the work of your Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I would now like to briefly mention some of the problems that exist under our present system of narcotics and dangerous drug laws and the design of our proposed legislation to deal with these problems.

First, we presently have a hodgepodge of laws with differing regulatory features for controlling drugs. The disunity of the existing law is the result of piecemeal, ad hoc attempts over the last 50 years, to deal with the problem of controlling dangerous drugs. Beginning with the Harrison Narcotic Act of 1914, nine major pieces of legislation have been enacted in the narcotic and dangerous drug field. An examination of these measures, from the Harrison Act through the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937, through the

Narcotic Control Act of 1956, through the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965, provides both a chronology of our sporadic efforts to deal with a growing problem and an insight into our failure to do so effectively.

In passing these laws, use was made of the power to tax and, more recently, the power to regulate interstate commerce. They represent limited responses to what was deemed to be the given needs of the times. There was no conception of the problem growing to the dimensions it has reached today. Drug abuse has outstripped the growth of our technology and population, while our laws have remained static.

Today we have one Federal agency responsible for the enforcement of these laws, and it must approach its enforcement and regulatory responsibilities with divergent schemes of authority. For example, we have subpoena power as to the narcotic drugs but not as to the other dangerous drugs. We have order forms and quota requirements as to the narcotic drugs and marijuana but not as to LSD and the other hallucinogens. We have registration requirements for the narcotics and marijuana that are different from those of the other dangerous drugs.

We have forfeiture powers as to the narcotics and marijuana but a completely different type of forfeiture for the dangerous drugs such as the hallucinogens and amphetamines. Efficient law enforcement requires both an effective organizational structure and a sound, coherent legal basis. The Administration's proposed legislation—as embodied in H.R. 17463—would create such a structure and basis by providing a single, integrated body of law and derivative regulations based solely on the power to regulate interstate commerce. Controls and other enforcement tools would be interrelated and consistent.

Second, as the result of a series of cases that have arisen recently, namely, the *Leary*, *Covington*, *Buie*, and *Turner* cases—we no longer have an effective possession law for the narcotic drugs—except heroin—and marijuana. As I am sure you are all aware, the presumption of illegal importation as to marijuana, cocaine, and the other narcotics no longer exists. While possession offenses are not the major thrust of Federal law enforcement, they are a necessary concomitant to drug conspiracy cases against large-scale traffickers. We need a law that clearly defines possession as possession, and H.R. 17463 does this.

Third, there is ample evidence both in the news media and in scholarly journals that there is a real credibility gap among the population—both young and old—as to the existing penalties for marijuana, the dangerous drugs, and the narcotics. It is often pointed out that existing penalties are out of phase internally among themselves and externally with the rest of the Federal criminal code. This lack of credibility has not only a serious effect on the prosecution and sentencing of defendants, but undoubtedly has also had the more insidious effect of undermining respect for the entire criminal justice system. There is a need for more careful delineation of the entire narcotic and dangerous drug area, both as to substantive offenses and penalties. We believe that the penalties of H.R. 17463 are realistic and an effective deterrent.

The bill makes simple possession of any drug as a first offense punishable as a misdemeanor. In addition, the first offender may receive the benefit of a special provision whereby he may fulfill probationary terms set by the court and earn dismissal of his case and elimination of a conviction record. H.R. 17463 also eliminates most mandatory minimums, to which Federal judges are almost unanimously opposed. Individuals established as professional criminals, however, do face mandatory minimums, and a maximum of life imprisonment and substantial

forfeiture. Mr. Ingersoll will go into more detail on the penalty structure, but I can assure you of my satisfaction that these new penalties are both realistic and flexible enough to fit the offense and offender.

Fourth, the diversion of legitimately produced drugs from their normal channels of distribution into illicit sources must be halted. There has been a tremendous upsurge in this kind of diversion in the last five years, and we must tighten the regulatory controls now so that we are not faced with utter chaos in the future. We need a better system of identification of those persons engaged in dealing with dangerous drugs, as well as better methods for inspection and the keeping of records. These are fundamentally law enforcement functions. There are many who say that the dimensions of the drug abuse problem in America today indicate that we are ten years too late in effectively meeting it. Be that as it may, I feel that we must move more effectively into this area of regulation of the legitimate industry now, so that the same is not said of us in 1980. I should like to point out that H.R. 17463, as did S. 3246, borrows heavily from the existing narcotic regulatory controls that were shaped by this very Committee. We feel they are necessary and will not hinder the legitimate manufacturers, distributors, and dispensers of these drugs.

Fifth, key inventory requirements under the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965 have expired for most of those drugs, which means that these inventory requirements no longer must be maintained in accordance with law. This glaring loophole must be plugged to facilitate accountability audits to be conducted by Federal Agents. H.R. 17463 closes this loophole by requiring inventories which must be conducted every two years.

Sixth, there is a need for a more flexible import-export control system to trace all legitimately produced controlled dangerous drugs; the Department of Justice must be able to follow the flow of drugs, not just within the United States, but also those drugs leaving the country and coming into it. This new system, which again borrows heavily from the existing narcotic laws, comports with the needs of protecting the public as well as the consumer. It will allow for a system of authorization by and notification of the Department of Justice on all shipments of drugs in and out of the United States, depending on their schedule classification.

Seventh, H.R. 17463 provides new and important law enforcement tools for the investigation of narcotic and dangerous drug cases. It provides for "no-knock." Some 31 States already have this authority.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a minute of the Committee's time, while I am on this subject of "no knock," to try to give a better perspective to this type of legislation.

The impression seemingly held by a wide audience is that if "no knock" is enacted into law, which I strongly hope will be the case, a policeman may, on his own decision, enter any private home at any time of the day or night.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

Under the "no knock" rule an agent may enter a person's premises without announcing his authority and purpose *only* if he has obtained a search warrant from a judge and the judge has been persuaded there is probable cause that evidence will be quickly and easily destroyed or that there is a danger to life and limb of the agent.

I would remind you that we are dealing with clever and ruthless drug peddlers, who have no hesitation about taking the life of an agent. And the moment of entry is the moment of greatest peril.

Without "no knock" an agent not only risks his life, but gives the drug peddler the opportunity to destroy the evidence at the same time.

The American people—and the news media

which inform them—are fond of catch-words or phrases that neatly sum up what is often a complicated or intricate solution to a pressing problem.

Unfortunately, these shortcuts may often lead to erroneous conclusions or opinions on behalf of our citizens—and, I might add, by many newsmen. Such is the case, I think, with the term "no knock" and its application in our uphill battle against drug traffickers.

If I were to try to supply a phrase to describe this type of operation, I would call it "quick entry," because that is what we seek to do.

I might point out that during the most successful Operation Eagle, conducted by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs last month, "quick entry" would have proven a valuable tool in four instances, three of which involved the destruction of evidence and one of which involved the safety of two agents.

H.R. 17463 also provides for an administrative inspection warrant procedure that comports with the Supreme Court rulings in the *Camera*, *See*, and *Colonnade Catering* cases. Since administrative inspections are a prime means of uncovering drug diversion from legitimate channels, such an administrative inspection warrant procedure is vital to effective law enforcement.

The administrative procedures set out in H.R. 17463 have been streamlined, somewhat along the lines of the existing narcotics laws, to insure due process but not cause undue delay in bringing drugs under control. Where a drug has a potential for abuse, there must be a quick procedure for bringing that drug under control, while allowing for an administrative hearing and judicial review.

Lastly, H.R. 17463 allows the Attorney General to deny, revoke, and suspend registrations to insure the integrity of the registration system, and to deny those persons who should not be allowed to deal in these drugs the ability to do so. I might point out that under present narcotic and dangerous drug laws, such authority does not exist, and it is sorely needed.

CONCLUSION

As you know, Mr. Chairman, drug abuse has reached the epidemic stage among our young people. It is a critical national problem that needs all the attention we can focus on it.

Virtually no area of the country has escaped this menace. It has invaded the country estates of our most wealthy families with the same ease that it has involved the most desperately poor. The pusher is just as comfortable and as readily available in the halls of our suburban high schools as he is in the halls of our ghetto apartment buildings.

As I said earlier, schools all across the country are about to reopen for the fall semester. Millions of young people will begin leaving for classes early in the morning, not to return until many hours later. Concerned parents will ask themselves: Is this the day that our son or daughter will swallow a pill or smoke a marijuana cigarette?

Mr. Chairman, this Committee and the Congress can offer an exciting "back-to-school present" to the families of America by moving swiftly on this legislation and letting them know that more effective tools for drug control are on the way. And when these tools become available, I give you my personal assurance that the Department of Justice will use them to the full extent of the law.

COMBATING DRUG ABUSE

(Message from the President of the United States)

To the Congress of the United States:

Within the last decade, the abuse of drugs has grown from essentially a local police problem into a serious national threat to the personal health and safety of millions of Americans.

A national awareness of the gravity of the situation is needed; a new urgency and concerted national policy are needed at the Federal level to begin to cope with this growing menace to the general welfare of the United States.

Between the years 1960 and 1967, juvenile arrests involving the use of drugs rose by almost 800 percent; half of those now being arrested for the illicit use of narcotics are under 21 years of age. New York City alone has records of some 40,000 heroin addicts, and the number rises between 7000 and 9000 a year. These official statistics are only the tip of an iceberg whose dimensions we can only surmise.

The number of narcotics addicts across the tional origin. This union, as well as others United States is now estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands. Another estimate is that several million American college students have at least experimented with marihuana, hashish, LSD, amphetamines, or barbiturates. It is doubtful that an American parent can send a son or daughter to college today without exposing the young man or woman to drug abuse. Parents must also be concerned about the availability and use of such drugs in our high schools and junior high schools.

The habit of the narcotics addict is not only a danger to himself, but a threat to the community where he lives. Narcotics have been cited as a primary cause of the enormous increase in street crimes over the last decade.

As the addict's tolerance for drugs increases, his demand for drugs rises, and the cost of his habit grows. It can easily reach hundreds of dollars a day. Since an underworld "fence" will give him only a fraction of the value of goods he steals, an addict can be forced to commit two or three burglaries a day to maintain his habit. Street robberies, prostitution, even the enticing of others into addiction to drugs—an addict will reduce himself to any offense, any degradation in order to acquire the drugs he craves.

However far the addict himself may fall, his offenses against himself and society to not compare with the inhumanity of those who make a living exploiting the weakness and desperation of their fellow men. Society has few judgments too severe, few penalties too harsh for the men who make their livelihood in the narcotics traffic.

It has been a common oversimplification to consider narcotics addiction, or drug abuse, to be a law enforcement problem alone. Effective control of illicit drugs requires the cooperation of many agencies of the Federal and local and State governments; it is beyond the province of any one of them alone. At the Federal level, the burden of the national effort must be carried by the Departments of Justice, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Treasury. I am proposing ten specific steps as this Administration's initial counter-moves against this growing national problem.

I. FEDERAL LEGISLATION

To more effectively meet the narcotic and dangerous drug problems at the Federal level, the Attorney General is forwarding to the Congress a comprehensive legislative proposal to control these drugs. This measure will place in a single statute, a revised and modern plan for control. Current laws in this field are inadequate and outdated.

I consider the legislative proposal a fair, rational and necessary approach to the total drug problem. It will tighten the regulatory controls and protect the public against illicit diversion of many of these drugs from legitimate channels. It will insure greater accountability and better recordkeeping. It will give law enforcement stronger and better tools that are sorely needed so that those charged with enforcing these laws can do so more effectively. Further, this proposal creates a more flexible mechanism which will allow quicker control of new dangerous drugs be-

fore their misuse and abuse reach epidemic proportions. I urge the Congress to take favorable action on this bill.

In mid-May the Supreme Court struck down segments of the marihuana laws and called into question some of the basic foundations for the other existing drug statutes. I have also asked the Attorney General to submit an interim measure to correct the constitutional deficiencies of the Marihuana Tax Act as pointed out in the Supreme Court's recent decision. I urge Congress to act swiftly and favorably on the proposal to close the gap now existing in the Federal law and thereby give the Congress time to carefully examine the comprehensive drug control proposal.

II. STATE LEGISLATION

The Department of Justice is developing a model State Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Act. This model law will be made available to the fifty State governments. This legislation is designed to improve State laws in dealing with this serious problem and to complement the comprehensive drug legislation being proposed to Congress at the national level. Together these proposals will provide an interlocking trellis of laws which will enable government at all levels to more effectively control the problem.

III. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Most of the illicit narcotics and high-potency marihuana consumed in the United States is produced abroad and clandestinely imported. I have directed the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to explore new avenues of cooperation with foreign governments to stop the projection of this contraband at its source. The United States will cooperate with foreign governments working to eradicate the production of illicit drugs within their own frontiers. I have further authorized these Cabinet officers to formulate plans that will lead to meetings at the law enforcement level between the United States and foreign countries now involved in the drug traffic either as originators or avenues of transit.

IV. SUPPRESSION OF ILLEGAL IMPORTATION

Our efforts to eliminate these drugs at their point of origin will be coupled with new efforts to intercept them at their point of illegal entry into the United States. The Department of the Treasury, through the Bureau of Customs, is charged with enforcing the nation's smuggling laws. I have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to initiate a major new effort to guard the nation's borders and ports against the growing volume of narcotics from abroad. There is a recognized need for more men and facilities in the Bureau of Customs to carry out this directive. At my request, the Secretary of the Treasury has submitted a substantial program for increased manpower and facilities in the Bureau of Customs for this purpose which is under intensive review.

In the early days of this Administration, I requested that the Attorney General form an inter-departmental Task Force to conduct a comprehensive study of the problem of unlawful trafficking in narcotics and dangerous drugs. One purpose of the Task Force has been to examine the existing programs of law enforcement agencies concerned with the problem in an effort to improve their coordination and efficiency. I now want to report that this Task Force has completed its study and has a recommended plan of action, for immediate and long-term implementation, designed to substantially reduce the illicit trafficking in narcotics, marihuana and dangerous drugs across United States borders. To implement the recommended plan, I have directed the Attorney General to organize and place into immediate operation an "action task force" to undertake a frontal attack on the problem.

There are high profits in the illicit market for those who smuggle narcotics and drugs

into the United States; we intend to raise the risks and cost of engaging in this wretched traffic.

V. SUPPRESSION OF NATIONAL TRAFFICKING

Successful prosecution of an increased national effort against illicit drug trafficking will require not only new resources and men, but also a redeployment of existing personnel within the Department of Justice.

I have directed the Attorney General to create, within the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, a number of special investigative units. These special forces will have the capacity to move quickly into any area in which intelligence indicates major criminal enterprises are engaged in the narcotics traffic. To carry out this directive, there will be a need for additional manpower within the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. The budgetary request for FY 1970 now pending before the Congress will initiate this program. Additional funds will be requested in FY 1971 to fully deploy the necessary special investigative units.

VI. EDUCATION

Proper evaluation and solution of the drug problem in this country has been severely handicapped by a dearth of scientific information on the subject—and the prevalence of ignorance and misinformation. Different "experts" deliver solemn judgments which are poles apart. As a result of these conflicting judgments, Americans seem to have divided themselves on the issue, along generational lines.

There are reasons for this lack of knowledge. First, widespread drug use is a comparatively recent phenomenon in the United States. Second, it frequently involves chemical formulations which are novel, or age-old drugs little used in this country until very recently. The volume of definitive medical data remains small—and what exists has not been broadly disseminated. This vacuum of knowledge—as was predictable—has been filled by rumors and rash judgments, often formed with a minimal experience with a particular drug, sometimes formed with no experience or knowledge at all.

The possible danger to the health or well-being of even a casual user of drugs is too serious to allow ignorance to prevail or for this information gap to remain open. The American people need to know what dangers and what risks are inherent in the use of the various kinds of drugs readily available in illegal markets today. I have therefore directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, assisted by the Attorney General through the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, to gather all authoritative information on the subject and to compile a balanced and objective educational program to bring the facts to every American—especially our young people.

With this information in hand, the overwhelming majority of students and young people can be trusted to make a prudent judgment as to their personal course of conduct.

VII. RESEARCH

In addition to gathering existing data, it is essential that we acquire new knowledge in the field. We must know more about both the short and long-range effects of the use of drugs being taken in such quantities by so many of our people. We need more study as well to find the key to releasing men from the bonds of dependency forged by any continued drug abuse.

The National Institute of Mental Health has primary responsibility in this area, and I am further directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to expand existing efforts to acquire new knowledge and a broader understanding in this entire area.

VIII. REHABILITATION

Considering the risks involved, including those of arrest and prosecution, the casual

experimenter with drugs of any kind, must be considered at the very least, rash and foolish. But the psychologically dependent regular users and the physically addicted are genuinely sick people. While this sickness cannot excuse the crimes they commit, it does help to explain them. Society has an obligation both to itself and to these people to help them break the chains of their dependency.

Currently, a number of federal, state and private programs of rehabilitation are being operated. These programs utilize separately and together, psychiatry, psychology and "substitute drug" therapy. At this time, however, we are without adequate data to evaluate their full benefit. We need more experience with them and more knowledge. Therefore, I am directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide every assistance to those pioneering in the field, and to sponsor and conduct research on the Federal level. This Department will act as a clearinghouse for the collection and dissemination of drug abuse data and experience in the area of rehabilitation.

I have further instructed the Attorney General to insure that all Federal prisoners, who have been identified as dependent upon drugs, be afforded the most up-to-date treatment available.

IX. TRAINING PROGRAM

The enforcement of narcotics laws require considerable expertise, and hence considerable training. The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs provides the bulk of this training in the Federal government. Its programs are extended to include not only its own personnel, but State and local police officers, forensic chemists, foreign nationals, college deans, campus security officers, and members of industry engaged in the legal distribution of drugs.

Last year special training in the field of narcotics and dangerous drug enforcement was provided for 2700 State and local law enforcement officials. In fiscal year 1969 we expanded the program an estimated 300 percent in order to train some 11,000 persons. During the current fiscal year we plan to redouble again that effort—to provide training to 22,000 State and local officers. The training of these experts must keep pace with the rise in the abuse of drugs, if we are ever to control it.

X. LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT CONFERENCES

The Attorney General intends to begin a series of conferences with law enforcement executives from the various States and concerned Federal officials. The purposes of these conferences will be several first, to obtain firsthand information, more accurate data, on the scope of the drug problem at that level; second, to discuss the specific areas where Federal assistance and aid can best be most useful; third, to exchange ideas and evaluate mutual policies. The end result we hope will be a more coordinated effort that will bring us visible progress for the first time in an alarming decade.

These then are the first ten steps in the national effort against narcotic marihuana and other dangerous drug abuse. Many steps are already underway. Many will depend upon the support of the Congress. I am asking, with this message, that you act swiftly and favorably on the legislative proposals that will soon be forthcoming, along with the budgetary requests required if our efforts are to be successful. I am confident that Congress shares with me the grave concern over this critical problem, and that Congress will do all that is necessary to mount and continue a new and effective Federal program aimed at eradicating this rising sickness in our land.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 14, 1969.

A TRIBUTE TO THE FLAG

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in Memorial Day services on Sunday, May 31, in Safford Park, Wollaston, Mass., I had the privilege of presenting an American flag which flew over the U.S. Capitol Building in honor of the men and women of Wollaston who served their country.

A monument was erected with subscriptions contributed by Wollaston residents, business and professional men, and members of Wollaston American Legion Post, which headed the effort to establish the monument.

I include my remarks for the RECORD:

A TRIBUTE TO THE FLAG

There are too many today who do not know what our flag stands for, and it is the American Flag to which countries of the World look and hope. This flag, which we honor and under which we serve, is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and purpose as a nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The Choices are ours. It floats in majestic silence above the hosts that execute those choices, whether in peace or in war. And yet, though silent, it speaks to us—speaks to us of the past, of the men and women who went before us, and of the records they wrote upon it. Traditionally a symbol of Liberty, the American flag has carried the message of freedom to many parts of the World.

I know that the citizens of Wollaston will enjoy having and displaying this most meaningful symbol of our Country's great heritage and will be reminded often of the noble principles it represents.

Mayor James R. McIntyre accompanied me to the ceremony and the following remarks are his:

REMARKS BY JAMES R. MCINTYRE

I am proud to be here as Mayor of a concerned community at this dedication of this memorial at Safford park to the memory of the Wollaston servicemen and women who served their country in time of need.

Little did I realize when as a young boy attending Wollaston School and daily walking by this park, that at some future date I would be here as Mayor of Quincy, addressing a group of my fellow citizens at this dedication of this memorial to those who sacrificed their lives in the cause of freedom.

We owe a great debt of gratitude to them. Those who are not able to be here physically, are here in spirit. We can thank them for the freedom that we possess in this country today, for they have purchased it with their lives. May we long have in this country men and women who are willing to serve their country in time of need. When the day comes that we have young men and women in America who are not willing to answer the call to their country in time of need, then there will be no more America.

I am pleased as Mayor of the City of Quincy, to officially accept this monument which was made possible by the donations of so many members of the Wollaston community; in particular, the Wollaston Legion Post 295; the Wollaston Business and Professional Men's Association; and also the United Commercial Travelers.

PROBLEMS FOR THE AGED

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Aging has called institutional care for the elderly an "imperfect substitute" for independence, stating that "institutionalization" can mean that one way of life is wrenched away while another, far less satisfactory mode of life, is substituted.

In this Nation's 24,000 nursing homes and homes for the aged, institutionalized health care has become a way of life for over a million Americans. Until the past decade, this concept of care was relatively unused. The aged remained at home, with families and friends.

Recent Federal programs, notably medicare and medicaid, have furnished the aged with readily available medical care. But to obtain this care, independence must be sacrificed. Medicare and medicaid payments—which are made to institutions, not people—have become a "bounty," trapping the aged in nursing homes. Other, perhaps more rehabilitative, forms of care are not possible.

In Britain, the situation is somewhat different. There are few nursing homes. Government funds have been channeled instead into other forms of long-term care. One British official summed up feelings in that country:

Our philosophy is that old people want to remain at home, in their own houses, surrounded by their own possessions, their own memories. We don't mind whether it is a good home, a bad home, a tiny home. That's where we believe they should be—where they feel secure, where they've got confidence. It's tempting to think that it's a matter of institutions and that sort of thing. I think it is rather like condemning old cars to the scrap heap.

Human scrap heaps have become profitable business in the United States. And, since making patients well does not tend to make nursing homes rich, rehabilitation within these institutions is minimal.

I believe that Prof. Jules Henry in "Culture Against Man" has summed up rather well the role of the nursing home in our society:

In many primitive societies the soul is imagined to leave the body at death or just prior to it; here, on the other hand, society drives out the remnants of the soul of the institutionalized old person while it struggles to keep his body alive. Routinization, inattention, carelessness, and the deprivation of communication—the chance to talk, to respond, to read, to see pictures on the wall, to be called by one's name rather than "you" or no name at all—are ways in which millions of once useful but now obsolete human beings are detached from themselves long before they are lowered into the grave.

U.S. Federal dollars were poured into long-term care institutions with little foresight. There was little contemplation of what kind of care would be best, little contemplation of economic, social or medical aspects of the problem.

Those confined to nursing homes have time for such contemplation. A few glimpses:

"... Although I do not think that the patients suffer for lack of cleanliness or medical care, they suffer so by just being there, waiting for death."

"No matter who they were before—their accomplishments, their stations in life, or whatsoever—most of them quietly wait the end now..."

"But the smell, the atmosphere, is what stands out in my mind the most. No disinfectant smell prevailing here. It was mostly covered by urine, and the smell of despair, of loneliness of waiting for the big event of death to end the monotony of the T.V. in the lobby; the wandering without hope; of staring out windows for hours at a time."

"The air was thick with disinfectant and urine and the cries of lonely and sick patients pierced the quiet. It was supposedly a good home yet there seemed to be nothing for the yet-ambulatory patients to do except wander aimlessly, or clutch dolls..."

In such an atmosphere, rehabilitation in any form becomes, as Saturday Review recently put it, simply "not a profitable field of investment."

THE THOMAS BATEMAN STORY

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, contrary to popular opinion, people still care for each other. An outpouring of the human spirit can accomplish wonders, and has, in Jackson, Tenn., and surrounding area. The touching story of how real folks rallied to the assistance of an unfortunate fellow human being is proof that people are the best things we have going for us, after all.

Radio station WDXI in Jackson, Tenn., learned that a 24-year-old resident of Humboldt has been suffering from chronic nephritis. Unable to work, the patient, his wife, and 5-year-old son receive their total income from social security. Doctors advised that the patient's kidney function rate was only 10 percent and would cease to function completely in a very short time. The prognosis was obvious unless an artificial kidney machine and, hopefully, a kidney transplant could be arranged. Since a kidney transplant is not an easy thing to come by—use of an artificial kidney machine costs about \$12,000, not to mention the expense and time required to train someone in the use of the equipment. What is a man to do—unable to fend for himself—seriously ill, with a wife and young son?

The family's plight was brought to the attention of WDXI by Mrs. Danny Waynick, president of the Spring Creek, Tenn., Jaycettes.

The organization had undertaken a project to help raise money for the Thomas Bateman family. WDXI, believing citizenship to be a subject best expressed in positive action, set to work.

On Tuesday, June 23, WDXI program director Curtis White and announcer Leonard Fielding read an announcement supplied by Mrs. Waynick. Time: 5:30 a.m. A discussion between the two men

followed on their early morning broadcast as to how best try to help a fellow in such difficulty. One offered to give \$10 if the other would match it. It was immediately done. They next challenged the audience—5:30 a.m.—to call WDXI and pledge assistance in cash.

Now, WDXI is quite used to excellent audience participation but this time the reaction was instantaneous and overwhelming. The phones started ringing and continued the whole day. People brought money in cash, checks, silver, and varying denominations. By 5 p.m., the amount had reached \$3,400 with more coming in. Staff members quickly consulted and decided to keep the opportunity open the next day for the Thomas Bateman project.

On Wednesday, June 24, Jackson and surrounding area kept the human spirit busy. At 5 p.m. the total was \$5,700 and counting. The usual jobs of writing, scheduling, news broadcasting, and the countless other tasks performed in a radio station had to be done, but they became secondary in importance. The entire staff devoted itself to the Bateman project sensing that, perhaps for the first time in a long 5 years of sickness and despair, Tom Bateman was seeing a glimmer of hope, \$7,500 and counting.

Fund raising in Humboldt, Bateman's hometown, as well as other projects by the Spring Creek Jaycettes continued and the response was gratifying. In fact, the human response in the interest of a young man, seriously ill and discouraged, was simply overwhelming. Over \$13,000 has been received and the project is assured of success.

In these days when bad news seems to be the only thing around, a positive response by human beings for one of their own is as cleansing as a breath of fresh, clean air. Several things come to mind. Thomas Bateman has a new lease on life.

The expensive kidney machine is assured.

A kidney transplant is not as impossible as once seemed.

Mrs. Bateman and 5-year-old Jeff have had their dreams come true.

And, people power is still with us after all.

There may be some who think that all a radio station does is play music, read news and commercials, but you will not find many of those people in Jackson. Of course, WDXI has told its audience for years that citizenship is broadcasting in action. And they believe it. Thomas Bateman is living proof.

A UNIQUE GARDENING PROGRAM

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the task of improving conditions in our country's urban areas is one with which we are vitally concerned. Projects to aid inner-city youngsters have been increasing over the years as concerned citizens realize that the best way to keep children off the streets and free from trouble is to

channel their energies into constructive programs. The wealthy must not be thought of as the only ones able to appreciate beauty... in particular, young people from all walks of life can learn a deep and desired respect for beauty. It has been proven time and time again in many areas of this country, that places which are cleaned up and beautifully landscaped create respect. And most important, where the people themselves have created this beauty through their own work that beauty will be maintained and perpetuated.

In Washington, a short time ago, a group of concerned citizens joined together to form the Washington Youth Garden Council. Today it is a very successful program serving nearly 1,000 children throughout the city encouraging and supervising them to plant and maintain their own gardens in the District. The program develops a sense of responsibility and maturity for these youngsters in order that they do not feel the need or desire to turn to less productive activities.

The June 21, 1970, issue of the New York Times, carried an article, "Radishes, Lettuce—'All in a Row'" explaining and praising this unique gardening program. Because of the importance of this program the need for it to continue to flourish, I feel this article would be worth reading.

I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, June 21, 1970]

RADISHES, LETTUCE—"ALL IN A ROW"

(By Barbara Dubivsky)

When you are only nine years old and not yet fully won over to the disciplines of gardening, keeping your vegetables "all in a row" can seem an uneven struggle. Weeds spring up where stringbeans should. Beetles and squash borers threaten. And the hot, summer sun beats down relentlessly.

Yet, only a handful of the 800 city children participating in Washington's youth gardens program "quit out." The children derive a strong sense of responsibility toward their tender sprouts.

Under the joint sponsorship and direction of the District of Columbia's Department of Recreation and the Washington Youth Gardens Council (an all volunteer community governing board), the eight-year old program, which is designed to involve city youngsters in all aspects of gardening, operates the year round at 45 locations throughout Washington. Children from all income groups are welcome, but there is a special commitment to those from the inner city.

In many disadvantaged neighborhoods, however, lack of adequate open space limits individualized gardening, the core of the program. Activities in such areas center around horticulturally related projects such as weed and insect collections, garden scrapbooks, potted plants and window boxes. Many of the neighborhood recreation centers, through which the program operates, maintain a club plot, communally cared for, as a green reminder of greater efforts elsewhere.

More and more inner city children are being assigned plots of their own at the National Arboretum. Volunteers provide the necessary transportation. When additional supervisory staff is available, land already donated in the Kenilworth and Anacostia sections of the city will be parcelled out.

The largest concentration of individual gardens, 100 in all, is now located at Twin Oaks, the youth gardens demonstration center at 14th and Taylor Streets in northwest Washington. In this lower middle-class

neighborhood, recruiting is no problem. Children from nearby elementary schools respond gratefully when William Hash, program director, visits their classes. In poorer sections of the city, parents not long removed from rural southern backgrounds are often reluctant to let their children do what they still think of as "fieldhand work."

Though the program begins as an after-school activity, it will continue all summer. Youngsters between the ages of 8 and 19 are eligible to join, but 9-to-13-year-olds are most responsive. Mr. Hash finds children under 9 often lack the necessary physical strength to handle garden tools and have not enough experience to follow directions, and the mobility of early adolescence tempts teenagers farther afield.

A graduate agronomist with horticultural experience, young Hash introduces his recruits to the soil by having them finger various samples to differentiate between sandy soil, clay, etc. Lectures and indoctrination movies are kept to a minimum. Hash's theory is that, "children this age learn best by doing."

In the new greenhouse, recently christened by having tulip petals tossed at its windows, children planted seeds last spring, at the proper time, the seedlings were moved outdoors.

While waiting for outdoor planting time, the youngsters draw up their own garden plans. After consulting posted lists of vegetables that grow well, and checking with their parents to make sure these would be acceptable fare at the family table, the young gardeners marked in their favorites on specially prepared plotting paper. Collards, mustard greens, onions, kale, stringbeans and leaf lettuce were popular choices. Almost everyone chose radishes because they grow fast.

Using rulers the children themselves made out of garden labels, they made careful notation how vegetables should be spaced out, onions, 2-inches apart; spinach, 1/2-inch and how deep they should be planted, kale, 1/2-inch deep; collard seeds, "sprinkle along."

Before putting seed to ground, the children are trained in careful soil preparation and told that watering, fertilization and cultivation are important steps in producing an onion or a carrot but can as easily aid the growth of weeds. Though they may look pretty, the children are taught that weeds only crowd and weaken productive crops.

Followup instruction is provided by student junior leaders, whose white pith helmets are their symbols of authority. Barbara Cook, wears hers rakishly as she explains to a confused beginner, "If you don't see another plant like that in the row, you know it's a weed." She chastizes another for not pulling weeds out vigorously enough. "I'm ashamed of you. Pull out the root and all or you're going to have the weed right back." At an even more overgrown plot, she can only shake her head in exasperation as a young lad responsible for its condition, tells her, "I guess the devil came to visit it."

Most children are eager and hardworking, and if allowed, would work their plots more than twice a week. When told, "the plants need time to rest," one girl translated this to mean, "you need time for the weeds to come back."

At council rings during the summer morning hours, instruction is given in conservation as it affects one's immediate environment. There is also some nature study, when children learn about insects, which are friends (lady bugs, garden spiders, toads) and insects which are foes (Mexican beetles, squash borers).

Organized with the personal and financial assistance of Mrs. Martin Voegel and the estate of Irene Lewishohn Washington's youth gardens has over the years received support from the Sears Roebuck Foundation, a sustaining group of the Junior League of Washington, the American Association of

Nurserymen and the Sevin and Rudolph B. Behrend Foundation. Its annual funding comes primarily from the Federal government through the District of Columbia budget's allocation to the Department of Recreation. Private subscriptions are also solicited.

The current Gardens Council chairman, Mrs. Orville Freeman, wife of the former Secretary of Agriculture, would like to raise additional funds to provide for more trained staff. "In an operation like this, you can use volunteers just so far," she observes. Some long range thinking has also gone into offering vocational landscaping scholarships.

Spreading the idea of youth gardens, particularly those supported and encouraged by a council of concerned citizens, also concerns Mrs. Freeman. In this she is supported by the A.A.N., which has produced a brochure which sets out step by step how interested people can start similar projects in their own communities. Free copies are available for the asking from the American Association of Nurserymen, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A PERSPECTIVE VIEW OF THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Middle East continues to remain explosive. Soviet military activity is threatening to upset the balance of power and jeopardize the very existence of Israel, the region's only bona fide democracy.

This is obviously not the time when the United States' support of Israel should vacillate. The Soviets and Arabs must be made to understand that the United States will not abandon Israel to those who seek to destroy it as a sovereign state.

For an excellent perspective of the dangerous predicament in the Middle East and what possibly might be done about it, I recommend the reading of the following testimony delivered before the House Foreign Affairs Near East Subcommittee by I. L. Kenen on July 22. Mr. Kenen is a veteran analyst of Middle East affairs and presents a cogent case for continued firm American support of the beleaguered state of Israel:

STATEMENT BY I. L. KENEN, EXECUTIVE VICE CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EAST OF THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

In the Near East today we are witnessing a grim spectacle.

Twenty-five years have passed since World War II revealed the destruction of some six million Jews, the degradation of the survivors of that holocaust and the desolation of the Jewish people around the world. At that time, the civilized international community reacted vigorously and, like the League of Nations after World War I, the United Nations reaffirmed the right of the Jewish people to establish its homeland in Palestine, with which it has been linked for thousands of years of recorded history.

But today that homeland is in danger and there is an incredible indifference to its fate.

Today the tiny nation of Israel, with her three million people, is defending herself

from the attacks of the Arab states and the Arab terrorists who have waged war against her since her establishment in 1948.

Israel is caught up in the crossfire of three wars: the war between the Arab states and herself; the Arab-Arab conflict between the radical Soviet-supported states and the conservative Western-oriented states; the cold war between East and West, where she finds herself defending the interests of the Free World but without its active support.

The crucial Arab-Israel issue is the Arab refusal to recognize Israel's right to exist. From the beginning, Arab states, in violation of the UN Charter and their UN obligations, have persisted in a state of war against a neighbor. In contrast, Israel has steadfastly offered to negotiate peace treaties.

The United Nations has been powerless to cope with violations and to establish peace.

There is a major reason. The Soviet Union, on the diplomatic and military fronts, backs the Arab states as part of her strategy to dominate the Near East. Whatever may be her intention—whether it is to destroy Israel or merely to exploit tensions to further her own imperialism—is a matter for speculation. What is alarming is that the Soviet Union can pursue this evil policy without effective challenge from any source.

But while the Soviet Union must bear primary responsibility for the long struggle—so costly in life and resources to both Arabs and Jews—our own Government has some share in the blame. Over the years, American policy in the Near East has been equivocal, erratic and inconsistent. We have often reversed ourselves. We have been reluctant to take a strong position. We have been immobilized by doubts and fears. As a result, the Arab states still like to believe that the United States will ultimately abandon Israel.

What explains the U.S. attitude?

First, there is fear that the Arab states may retaliate against America's economic and strategic interests. Second, there is danger that the Soviet Union may gain prestige and power in a polarized Near East. And, third, there are the pressures of special interests concerned with short-term advantage, trying to buy some space and time for themselves by offering up bits and pieces of Israel to appease the Arabs. They like to identify their own interests with those of the United States; they wrap the flag around oil derricks.

These special interests always claim that the United States favored Israel over the Arab states because of pressures exerted by Israel's friends and that we need a more "even-handed" policy.

The record refutes the myth.

The fact is that we have been less than even-handed.

In the beginning, in 1947, the United States reluctantly endorsed the UN proposal for the partition of Palestine. But we did nothing to implement that decision. We failed to help Israel to defend her right to the promised state. Instead, we imposed an arms embargo depriving Israel of military assistance from this country. Then, responding to pro-Arab lobbying in and outside the Government, we reversed ourselves; we tried to set partition aside and to substitute an unrealistic UN trusteeship plan.

Subsequently, the United States recurrently pressured Israel to abandon territories she had won in the struggle with the Arabs. While we gave generous economic assistance to both Israel and the Arab states—and Congress was primarily responsible for initiating that program—we repeatedly refused Israel's requests for arms, even after the Soviet Union began arming the Arab states. We detoured her to other countries. In lieu of arms, we offered guarantees, but these faded into scraps of paper when the time came to carry them out.

We declined to support Israel's pleas for direct Arab-Israel peace negotiations. We failed to challenge the Arab boycott. We imprudently perpetuated the Arab refugee

problem by urging unrealistic repatriation proposals and by failing to insist on resettlement. And often, over the years, we seemed to be in competition with the Soviet Union for the favor of the Arab states, and certain charismatic Arab leaders, like President Nasser of Egypt.

THE ATTITUDE OF CONGRESS

Throughout this period Congress has displayed greater realism on these issues.

The restoration of the Jewish national homeland was supported by Congress in 1922 and again in 1945—and in the post-war debate, a large majority of the Senate and House vigorously favored the same objective; they were reflecting the views of most Americans.

The State of Israel came into being with the help of Congress, which also assisted her remarkable development. It was Congress which initiated the economic aid program for Israel, which called for direct Arab-Israel talks, which advocated resettlement of the Arab refugees, which urged arms for Israel, which sought to combat the Arab boycott, which questioned our unrequited affection for Nasser.

Regrettably, its views have not always been accepted by the Executive Branch.

Congressional support for Israel is denigrated and disparaged by pro-Arab forces, which insinuate that Congressmen yield to pressures. The implication is that a minority are prejudicing America's interests and that American Congressmen sacrifice judgment and patriotism for selfish political ambitions.

Those who circulate this mischievous slander reflect on the loyalty of Israel's supporters and impugn the integrity of America's political leaders.

The best answer to this smear is that history shows that Congress actually has been right on these issues.

Support for Israel has been consistent with the highest interests of the United States from every standpoint.

ISRAEL'S ROLE

Israel has proved to be a situation of strength in the Near East, resisting the attempts of radical Arab states and the Soviet Union to dominate the region.

The destruction of Israel would permit anti-democratic forces to gain control over every government, every economic resource and strategic outpost.

The first countries which might face a Soviet takeover are the so-called moderate Arab states where the United States has substantial economic interests.

There are many governments in the Near East—Arab as well as non-Arab—which regard Israel as a balancing factor checking the spread of the radical Arab states which are led by President Nasser and supported by the Kremlin. Whatever may be their public posture, they would not grieve if we strengthened our support for Israel.

But further, and of prime importance, Israel is an eloquent advocate of democracy and freedom, informing many people by its example, by its instruction and by its cooperation that independence for the state is not enough—that the individual must also be free and that men can advance to higher standards in a democratic and open society.

Men will defend their institutions from aggression and subversion if they have a stake in their society as free, equal and secure citizens.

We read in the press about the daily exchanges of fire across Israel's frontiers. What we do not read—and what may some day prove of great significance in man's struggle for freedom—is about the daily exchange of learning.

Israel's program of international cooperation today involves some 80 countries all over the world.

Each year more than 1,000 trainees arrive in Israel for courses in agriculture, labor,

economics, science and technology—some 12,000 in the last 11 years.

At the same time, Israel annually sends out some 450 experts to help other peoples; 3,000 in 64 countries in the last 11 years.

The program continues despite the war, at a higher rate in 1969 than in 1968.

THE COMMITMENT

In the last few years many Americans have become more isolationist because of reaction to Viet Nam. Some American diplomats have tried to give the impression that we have no commitments to Israel. This trend toward disengagement is predicated on the claim that what happens to Israel is not of vital interest to the United States.

That view has now been challenged by President Nixon's welcome observations on July 1.

Mr. Nixon and his aides have spoken vigorously on the dangers that now confront the Near East. They warned that the situation there is more dangerous than in Viet Nam, that we need to take action to induce the Russians to pull out their forces.

They made it clear that the United States would not permit the arms balance to be tipped against Israel. They differentiated between the aggressive intentions of the Arabs and Israel's desire for peace.

The White House pointed out that the Soviet combat base in Egypt may transform the Mediterranean into a Soviet sea, obstructing the U.S. Sixth Fleet, putting land bases and oil supplies at the disposal of the Soviet Union and endangering moderate Arab regimes, NATO countries and Iran.

WHAT WE CAN DO

The President's views justify full support for Israel at this time.

1. At the very least we should quickly end our inexplicable tactic of withholding military aid at this critical moment. Such aid should be open so that there is no misunderstanding in either the Kremlin or Cairo. If we are diffident and weak the Arab states and the Soviet Union will be emboldened to push their war further. Symbols and tokens are inadequate to block the Soviet advance.

2. The Administration and Congress should consider what can be done to help ease Israel's economic crisis. We have never given any arms to Israel, and grant economic aid to Israel ended almost a decade ago. Israel has had to pay high prices in life and resources to maintain her security and survival. If the Israel citizen is defending the interests of the United States and the Free World, we should not ask him to carry the entire burden alone.

Israel's defense expenditures have tripled since the six-day war. They will approximate \$1.2 billion in the current year—about 22 percent of Israel's gross national product, which is three times the proportionate burden borne by the United States. The foreign exchange debt will increase in 1970 by \$570 million, reaching a total of \$2.7 billion.

Israelis have heavily mortgaged their future. Israel's per capita foreign debt is the highest in the world; the Israelis are assessed extremely high taxes and forced loans.

Foreign currency reserves dropped to about \$400 million by the end of 1969—the lowest figure since 1962—and since the trade deficit has risen because of huge defense expenditures, Israel's reserves are descending to a bare working minimum.

It is obvious that Israel urgently needs large-scale economic assistance from friendly foreign governments to maintain economic stability.

I do not need to recall to this Committee that we have given \$239 million in grant military assistance to seven Arab states, and that our economic aid and military aid to Greece, Turkey and Iran has been in the billions.

In addition, we have provided billions in aid to strengthen countries which are on the Sino-Soviet periphery. Now for the first

time, Soviet military personnel have moved into the Near East, along with huge quantities of sophisticated armaments.

Today Israel faces a much graver threat than ever confronted most of the countries which have enjoyed massive economic and military support from the United States. In the light of our record everywhere else, it is difficult to understand hesitation to provide Israel with assistance.

3. The direct Soviet military involvement in the Near East should be condemned by world opinion. We should mobilize other nations to join in the demand that Russian military personnel withdraw from Egypt. How can the Soviet Union pretend to be a peacemaker in the Big Four talks in the light of her brazen military operations?

4. We should not condone Arab terrorism nor should we reward and encourage it by diplomatic gestures; we should act vigorously to condemn and to combat it. We should withhold assistance from countries which are involved in harboring or subsidizing El Fatah and other guerrilla groups. There is no glamor or heroism in a movement which "resists" Israel by shooting down passenger planes, by murdering civilians in cafeterias and supermarkets, school busses and bus stations. The international community should impose sanctions against countries which provide sanctuary for terrorists who are involved in hijacking or attacks on planes. We should not permit their planes to land at our airports, nor should our planes land at theirs.

5. Above all, we should insist on a real peace. Arabs and Israelis must negotiate treaties. We cannot be satisfied with half-way measures which fall short of a real peace. We should reconsider our involvement in procedures like the big Four talks which enable the Soviet Union to try to dictate the terms of a settlement and to entrench itself as the dominant power in the region.

THE RECORD SINCE 1967

When the six-day war ended back in 1967, there was a real chance for an Arab-Israel peace. Many of us believed that two measures were essential:

1. To promote peace, urge the parties to talk over their differences in direct negotiations;

2. To prevent war, keep the Israelis strong enough to deter the Arabs and the Russians from military action.

To its credit, our Government rejected Soviet pressures that we repeat our 1957 blunder. The United States refused to go along with the Soviet-Arab demand that we pressure Israel to withdraw to the 1967 lines. Instead, our Government endorsed the view that the parties themselves must reach agreement on frontiers, as part of a comprehensive peace agreement.

And it is pertinent to note that more recently, in his television interview on July 1, President Nixon rightly emphasized the need for what he called "defensible frontiers."

The resolution unanimously adopted by the United Nations in November 1967 provided for a UN envoy "to proceed to the Middle East to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in this resolution."

The resolution meant different things to the differing parties.

1. The Arab states and the Soviet Union have insisted that the resolution obligated Israel to withdraw completely and unconditionally to the 1967 armistice lines.

2. To the United States and to Israel the language and the legislative history showed that the frontiers had to be agreed upon, by the parties.

Both the Arab states and Israel insist that they have accepted the resolution. But while

some Arab governments give lip service to the resolution, Syria, Iraq, Algeria and the terrorist organizations have summarily rejected the document and will have nothing to do with it. Their declared objective is the liquidation of the state of Israel as a Jewish state. Arab leaders have emphasized that they do not commit the Arab terrorists and that these organizations have the right to reject the resolution because it does not satisfy their objectives.

Thus, President Nasser told the Palestine National Council on Feb. 1, 1969:

"The UAR appreciates the resistance organizations' stand in rejecting the Nov. 22, 1967 Security Council resolution, which the UAR has accepted. It is the Palestinian organizations' right to reject this resolution. This resolution may be adequate to eliminate the consequences of the June 1967 aggression but it is inadequate to fulfill the Palestinian destiny."

Can this double interpretation be considered as a sincere acceptance?

The United Nations' attempt to bring the parties together to implement the resolution failed.

The Arabs blamed the Israelis. They insisted that the resolution was self-executing.

If the parties accepted its principles, it would then be up to Israel to withdraw completely. But the Israelis insisted that the resolution was not self-executing and that it was up to the UN envoy to bring the parties together to reach agreement.

The Russians supported the Arab position. Our Government has supported Israel's stand. This was made clear by former Under Secretary of State Eugene Rostow, who has said on a number of occasions that it was the Russians and the Arabs, not the Israelis, who were obstructing implementation.

On March 1, 1969, at San Francisco, Mr. Rostow said:

The basic obstacle to peace has been the continuance and intensification of terrorist activities supported or condoned by some Arab governments, and the policy embodied in the Khartoum formula—no negotiations, no recognition, no peace.

And he went on to say that the UAR—bears primary responsibility at this time for the stalemate in the Jarring mission. . . . It says that it is ready to implement the Security Council resolution as a package deal. . . . But thus far, at least, it has not made clear its willingness to implement the provision of the resolution requiring it to make an agreement establishing peace, nor its acceptance of any practical procedure for reaching such an agreement with Israel.

THE BIG FOUR TALKS

The Arabs and the Russians had another objective. Because of the stalemate over interpretation, they insisted that the Great Powers draw up guidelines for the Jarring mission. In actuality, the Arabs and Russians want the Great Powers to impose a settlement. They regard the Big Four as an admirable instrument to formulate such guidelines because the United States is outnumbered and outpressured in that forum.

Long ago, in 1964, Sir Bernard Lewis wrote that the Arabs want an imposed settlement "in which, perhaps, Soviet arms would wield the knife, while Western diplomacy administered the anaesthetic."

The Israelis kept appealing for direct negotiations but Arab sympathizers in this country mocked this demand as an insincere tactic to avoid settlement. They oppose direct negotiations for they consider that it would be a humiliation and beneath Arab dignity to sit with the Israelis.

DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS

The call for direct negotiations is not merely a bargaining tactic. Israel learned in 1949, after the successful Rhodes armistice

talks, that agreements could be reached when she met directly with the Arab states.

But in 1949 and 1950 the UN Palestine Conciliation Commission yielded to the Arabs at the Lausanne talks and, as a result, the Israelis were in one hotel, the Arabs in another, the UN commission in a third. The parties never met; the negotiations were stalemated for a year and a half. Israel learned its lesson at that time.

A principle is involved. The Israelis believe that if the Arab states are not ready to meet and to negotiate the issues directly with them, they are not really ready to live in understanding and peace. What the Israelis are looking for is more than uneasy coexistence. What they want is a full peace of sincere reconciliation which will end incitement to hate and which will open frontiers to an exchange of goods and goodwill—a cooperative effort toward security and a higher standard of living for all the peoples of the area.

Years ago I heard the leader of the American Friends of the Middle East tell an audience that our duty was to keep Arab and Jew apart—not to bring them together. This curious line drew some support from the Department of State.

In 1961 the Democratic platform called for direct Arab-Israeli talks and Candidate John Kennedy announced that he would try to bring the parties to the peace table.

But in the fall of 1961 the U.S. delegation voted at the United Nations against the so-called Brazzaville resolution, which was initiated by Afro-Asian countries and which called upon the Arab states and Israel to negotiate. That negative vote was a blunder which was criticized by many Members of Congress.

We hoped that this strange opposition to direct negotiations had ended in 1967, but there was no sign of it in the diplomacy of this period.

In the summer of 1967, King Hussein could have reached an agreement with Israel if he had entered negotiations with her. But there is no evidence that the United States encouraged the Jordanians to meet with Israelis at that time.

If Hussein had moved, he might have anticipated and averted the growth of a terrorist movement which now shares control over his country, blocks a peace and incites a never-ending war against Israel. Instead of going to Jerusalem, as he might have done, the Jordanian king elected to go to Khartoum in Sudan, where he and Nasser obtained their subsidies from the oil-rich Arab states to sustain their economies and strengthen their war machines.

Early in 1969, the Administration accepted the French proposal for Four Power talks. This meant that the Arab states would no longer be under any need to negotiate directly with Israel. It also meant that the United States would be under strong pressure from the Russians to accept their interpretation of the resolution.

The United States did in fact retreat on a number of major issues. This became evident in the proposals offered by Secretary of State William P. Rogers in December 1969 for Egypt and Jordan. These proposals critically undermined Israel's position in any future negotiations.

I would like to put into the record the policy statement adopted by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee which comments on these proposals:

After the Big Four talks began in 1969, 70 Members of the Senate and 282 Members of the House joined in a declaration which insisted that there could be no half-way measures and that there was no effective substitute for direct talks.

It is no coincidence that just about the time the Big Four began to meet, Nasser was emboldened to denounce the UN cease-

fire, which all the parties had accepted, and to open his war of attrition against Israel.

ISRAEL'S ARMS REQUEST

On the Suez front, the Egyptians outgun and outnumber Israel and they inflicted heavy casualties. The Israelis used their highly efficient air arm to silence the Egyptian guns and to reduce the heavy casualty toll.

At the same time, the Israelis renewed their appeal to the United States for additional planes. The French were refusing to deliver Mirage planes which Israel had already paid for. After a long delay, the United States announced in March that it believed that Israel still had a qualitative advantage over the Arab states—even though the Arabs had a four-to-one advantage—and that it would therefore defer action on Israel's request.

This decision was taken despite the news that the Russians had already agreed to install the sophisticated SAM-3s inside Egypt. The State Department said that it had taken this into account, characterizing that new Russian initiative as merely "defensive."

Our country had several reasons:

1. It feared Arab retaliation against U.S. economic interests, specifically the flow of oil and the profits from oil.
2. It hoped that the Arabs might be more receptive to a peace settlement.
3. It hoped that the Russians might similarly curtail the flow of arms.

I do not propose to debate an issue as sacred as oil. But I do recall that both in 1956 and again in 1967, the Arab states realized they were courting economic disaster when they tried to withhold their oil from the West. Moreover, we should bear in mind that Nasser and Hussein would collapse if the oil-rich Arab states had to cut off their subsidies.

Now it is quite possible that the West might suffer short-term losses if it helped Israel, but this short-range prospect ignores the implications of a Soviet diplomatic and military victory. If the Soviet Union is permitted to weaken or destroy Israel, then every state in the Near East will be vulnerable to Egyptian-Soviet subversion and pressures for nationalization.

Israel's existence is a *priori* protection for American oil interests in the Persian Gulf—in Saudi Arabia, in Kuwait and Bahrain, in the Trucial States, and in Southern Arabia and Iran.

The plain fact is that Israel is the only stabilizing factor in the entire Near East—the only factor that keeps the area from flying apart, from becoming a scene of chaos—with the Arab states, goaded on by the Soviet Union, at each other's throats.

Without an Israel, Jordan would long ago have disappeared, swallowed up by either Syria or Egypt, probably the spoils of a war between them. And Lebanon would have gone the way of Jordan. Without an Israel, Nasser and the Soviet Union would be well on their way, through Yemen, to Saudi Arabia and the rich oil fields there and in the Persian Gulf.

Without Nasser's defeat by Israel, he and the Russians would have rushed in to fill the vacuum left by the British at Aden, exposing the oil-rich areas of the southern tip of the Arabian peninsula, such as Muscat and Oman, to their ambitions.

Our negative answer to Israel's request for planes did not produce a more receptive Arab attitude toward the U.S. peace initiative. On the contrary. When Mr. Sisco visited the Arab states, feeling was so high against the United States in Jordan that our Ambassador thought it unwise for Mr. Sisco to enter that country.

On the major issue—the arms race—the Russians soon showed that they had no intention of reducing their involvement. Twenty-five days after the Rogers press con-

ference it was learned that the Soviet Union was sending pilots into Egypt. Obviously, the Russian action was not defensive. The new Russian technicians help in the installation and use of the new missiles which provide an air cover for offensive action along the Canal, while the pilots undertake missions against the Israel air force.

Meanwhile, in Washington, there were reports that the Administration was hesitating to say yes to Israel because there were some doubts about the attitude of Congress. There was a swift answer on Capitol Hill. In a remarkable demonstration of support for Israel, a letter was signed or endorsed by 79 Senators—and there were similar communications to the President endorsed by 239 Members of the House. These letters all urged the Administration to provide planes to Israel.

This was not the first such demonstration. Earlier this year, a declaration calling for direct negotiations and military support for Israel was endorsed by 70 Senators and 281 Representatives.

THE NEW PEACE INITIATIVE

Yet the Administration was still reluctant to grant Israel's request. And on June 25, Mr. Rogers announced a new peace initiative—the reactivation of the Jarring mission and a 90-day truce period during which neither side would attempt to gain a new military advantage. In order to win acquiescence of both sides, the United States will delay action on Israel's request for planes.

It has been widely reported that the United States is using Israel's application for planes as leverage. It is a carrot to be fed the Israelis if they cooperate with our peace proposals; it is a stick to fly the Arabs if they are not. Accordingly we may expect the Russians and the Arabs to stall for time. They will claim to be receptive to the Rogers peace initiative while they continue to prepare to force Israel to withdraw from the Suez Canal.

Both the Egyptians and the Russians want to reopen the Suez Canal—the Russians particularly because they want to send their fleet and shipping from Odessa in the Black Sea to the Indian Ocean, Africa, India and Viet Nam; the Egyptians because the Canal is a money maker. They can do it if they can wrest control of the air from Israel. They can do it if Israel begins to run out of planes.

Nasser said in Libya on June 25:

"The Egyptian army has completed its canal-crossing training, and once the army has acquired a balance in the air, no power in the world can stop it from crossing.

"We will be able very soon to make up for Israel's air superiority by obtaining a balance in the air because we are training hundreds of pilots and obtaining hundreds of planes."

Why must Israel hold the Suez until there is a peace settlement? Because Israel's frontiers are now much shorter and more defensible than they were in 1967. Israel now, for the first time, has defense in depth. Its front lines are far removed from its populated cities.

Today there are more Arab soldiers on Israel's frontiers than in 1967, but the Israelis do not have to mobilize as they did in 1967, paralyzing their economy, for they not only have distance from the Suez Canal front but they also have the depth of the Canal to bar the advance of Egyptian forces.

Meanwhile, there are inspired dispatches which assure us that Nasser is for a peaceful solution—that he does not really wish to drive Israel into the sea.

But on the very day that Mr. Rogers announced his peace initiative, Nasser said in Libya:

"The Arab masses know that their strength lies in their unity . . . and unity means the end of imperialism and its collaborators and the liquidation of Israeli aggression and the Zionist entity."

All Arab calculations are predicated on their hope to intimidate the United States into standing aside.

The involvement of Soviet pilots has diminished—if not eliminated—Israel's qualitative superiority. The Israelis have begun to lose planes in their battle to defend the Suez sky—and prevent an Egyptian crossing. And their older French planes are wearing out.

There have been reports that Israeli is getting some replacements for planes she has lost. I hope this is true. However, we are told that the United States will not announce the extent of any new military supplies to Israel.

But many are asking, why not? Can we deter the Arabs and the Russians from pressing their war to the finish if we do not put them on public notice that we are standing firmly with Israel? Our past experience with the Russians has shown that they will push aggressively into every corner where they encounter no resistance, that they increase arms shipments precisely when we hold back. If we want to stop Russian penetration in the area, we must move to strengthen Israel at once. That is the most practical and most effective deterrent. If the Russians are determined on reckless military adventure, it must be made expensive for them. They must be made to realize that they will have to pay a very high price.

THE OPPOSITION PRESSURE

Unfortunately, there is a school of thought in Washington which argues the other way. They do not want to make it harder for the Russians. They seem to think that we must placate the Arabs and that we will gain popularity among them if we exercise "restraint" in our support of Israel. This, of course, would make it easier for Nasser and his Russian friends.

I know Arabists in Washington who believe that Israel's victory in 1967 was a disaster for the West, for, they argue, it enabled the Soviet Union to pick up the pieces and re-instate Nasser. Some even suggest that the Soviet Union tricked Nasser into war in 1967 in order that he might lose so that the Soviet Union might come in as his savior.

And today there are some who think that we would be better off if we stood aside and permitted the Russians a free hand in the area. They are paralyzed by an obsession with polarization.

I am not debating here with imaginary straw men. Recently, one of our ex-cryptodiplomats, an ex-CIA agent in Cairo, Miles Copeland, published a book which reveals how he and other CIA agents tried to court Nasser in Egypt.

That book is damaging to the United States because it confirms for many Arabs—as well as for Israelis—that the United States had a major objective in the Near East—to build up Nasser as its protégé and agent. It is interesting to note Mr. Copeland's views on Phantoms:

In a letter to the *Paris Herald Tribune*, on June 13, 1970, Mr. Copeland reveals that in a recent visit to Washington he was assured that "the principal fear of the Executive Branch . . . unlike those Senators who are up for reelection—is not what the Soviets are doing in Egypt but of what our own Government may be forced by domestic policies to do for Israel."

Mr. Copeland believes that the Soviet Union wants us to supply Phantoms to Israel because that will enable them to win all the Arabs over to their side, to the prejudice of American interests. The implication of Mr. Copeland's thesis is that any military aid we give Israel really helps the Russians. He attributes this view to American diplomats in Washington. Would he turn this around to argue that the way to stop the Russians is to withdraw all aid from Israel and join the Russians in prayers over Israel's memory?

I believe that such arguments impede progress toward peace in the Near East, and are inimical to American interests. For they feed the flames of Arab intransigence. They encourage the Arabs to believe that ultimately

a frightened United States will abandon Israel to Cairo.

THE HOPE FOR PEACE

We should not be pessimistic about the prospects of peace in the Near East. It will take a long time before the Arab states become reconciled to Israel's existence and perhaps new Arab leadership will be needed. But I like to think that eventually the people of the Arab world will come to understand that they can live at peace with Israel and that they stand to gain more by reconciliation and peace than by hatred and war.

We need to have positive goals in the Near East. We need to reaffirm principles which offer new opportunity and hope to the peoples there.

Our current policy appears to be based on negative considerations: the avoidance of dangers, the avoidance of a nuclear confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States, the avoidance of an interruption in communication lines, the avoidance of nationalization, the avoidance of polarization. But what are we for? We seem to be on the defensive and we seem to be reacting to dangers rather than creating a new climate and environment for the acceptance of ideas and ideals cherished by America and the Free World.

There is a vast difference between Israel and the Arab states. All of them struggled and won independence from foreign domination. But the people in Israel have gained something more than independence for the state. In Israel the people achieved freedom and equality for the individual, democratic institutions to enable them to find self-expression, social security to ensure them a stake in their country. This has not been the case in the Arab world where any experimentation with democracy has been short-lived and where people are ruled by military dictatorship or by feudal and dynastic regimes.

I am not suggesting that the way to peace is for us to promote new coups to overthrow the military dictators and thus to establish democratic societies.

But I do submit that it is our task to stand firmly with those who resist totalitarian aggression and who cherish freedom for the individual and democracy for his community. When the ballot box replaces rule by rifle in the Arab Near East, we may hope for a change in the Arab attitude.

If the Arab states and the Soviet Union continue to defy the UN cease-fire and to prosecute their war of attrition against Israel, it is because they believe that they can weaken both Israel and the United States to the point where our country will feel that it must surrender to what the Soviet Union is pleased to call a political solution.

If we can make it clear that we are enlisted with Israel in the struggle for a genuine peace—and that we are enlisted for the duration and will not waver—the time may come when wiser men will come to power in the Arab lands to lead their people away from destruction and war to genuine cooperation and peace with all their neighbors.

FREEDOM AND DREAMS

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert at this time a very poignant editorial from the Asbury Park, N.J., Evening Press.

The editorial discusses essays written by the children of Harlem's Public School

186, on the subject of what freedom means to him. Their comments, their hopes should bring to us all a new dedication to provide the kind of world these children have in mind—a world where, as one child said, a white person who sees a black person would not "make fun of the black person." A world "without rats and mice."

The Congress has, in past years, made long steps in providing freedom for these children, but there is yet a long way to go—in housing, in education, in equal opportunity. We have the opportunity, the responsibility, to take these next steps.

The editorial follows:

[From the Asbury Park Evening Press,
July 15, 1970]

FREEDOM AND DREAMS

If they will listen adults can learn from children, such as the youngsters in the lower grades of Public School 186 in Harlem who were asked to write essays on what freedom means.

To one freedom is a world with unlocked doors. To another it's a city whose parks are safe at night and "a place without rats and mice."

One boy saw it this way: "Freedom means to me that nobody who is white and sees a black person would make fun of the black person. That you can live in a pretty house. And when a black child is walking and asks a white child to play with her, she won't say no."

Some of the children are in a choral group that has made 11 recordings dealing with their heart-warming concepts of freedom. They sing of their high hopes. Some would like to be president. Others would rather be astronauts.

Adults often reckon wisdom by years. Children express it in dreams that only genuine freedom can fulfill.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, we in this Nation sometimes lose sight of the real meaning of the word "equal opportunity" in the heat of public debate and frustration over lingering racial injustices. There are still those who scream "never" in defiance of the law and morality. There continues to be a racist counterreaction from some of those who are rebuffed.

Mr. Speaker, what is at issue here is the matter of whether or not America may fully utilize the talents and capabilities of all her citizens. To the extent equality of opportunity is denied to members of our society, we stand self-crippled and partially immobilized in a strongly competitive, rapidly changing world. I believe most Americans understand this—the rhetoric and venom of the polarizers notwithstanding.

We are just beginning to see our first concerted efforts in behalf of equal opportunity come to fruition. The news is heartening, both North and South.

In the city of Atlanta, a black business-

woman is proving that franchised restaurants are not the exclusive domain of white America.

Geraldine White, a Negro American, owns and operates a nationally franchised restaurant in Atlanta's Westside area near the Atlanta University complex. Mrs. White, this restaurant chain's first black franchise holder in the South, does not see herself as a pioneer. She believes that the black business community's future lies in full participation in the American dream.

I should like to point out that Mrs. White's view is far different from that of the black entrepreneur of the past. His business was based upon service to the black community. His efforts and investments were confined there. He had a guaranteed market there.

Mrs. White believes that it is time for blacks to develop and participate in the economy on the same basis as whites. The key to this is equal opportunity.

The beginning was not easy. Mrs. White grew up in Atlanta's Vine City area, a poverty area remote from the much-talked-about affluent Negro community of Atlanta.

Mrs. White and her husband, Gary, worked up to the proprietorship of a small community grocery store. That beginning success generated their mutual desire for something better. When the Bonanza Sirloin Pit restaurant chain announced plans to develop minority franchising, the Whites decided to try for one.

Mrs. White sold the company on her plan. It granted her the franchise—the impossible dream in the improbable place was off and running. Geraldine White, a charming woman with an easy manner and friendly smile was that rare thing, a natural restaurateur. Taught the management-operations approach in Bonanza's Dallas-based restaurant school, she drew in her entire family and set what bids to be a pattern for minority groups to move into the mainstream of the American economy. Her husband, her children, her sister, her niece, are all employees and a solid sales team in this particular restaurant.

The restaurant opened October 6, 1969, and that beginning, featuring a black businesswoman with a dream—and a restaurant with a popular concept—is now firmly established in the Atlanta scene. Customers, white and black, from the Atlanta University complex and from the business community around the unit are ample testimony that Mrs. White and her restaurant are a solid community asset when it comes to eating time.

The ease with which Mrs. White worked into the pattern of a highly competitive and specialized business deceptively hides the very sound and practical approach she uses to manage and build her business. Bonanza, hard-nosed in its operational aspects to keep its hard-won image, makes no exception for either her race or sex. Mrs. White has her own pattern and rates class A. The company regularly inspects and evaluates her unit, measuring it against the 190-plus other units around the country.

Perhaps the most distinctive feature to her efforts is the simple fact that the unit she operates look like and produces the same quality meal served in the top units all over the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, the case of Mrs. White carries a lesson that cuts two ways. It provides eloquent testimony to the hard work and perseverance of a black American who was afforded opportunity. Mrs. White was given nothing but the chance to participate as an equal.

It serves notice to those who would segregate themselves into a black fortress within America that the future lies in full and open participation in a non-racial society. Black racism is as much a dead end as white racism.

Mrs. White is gently but firmly established on a course which is taking her family into the mainstream of the economy and the society.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, it has become fashionable in some circles to disparage the efforts being made by the Federal Government to combat poverty.

There are those who contend that the administration is insensitive to poor people and minority groups. Some of these critics appear disinclined to look at what is being done to solve the problem of poverty in this country by the Office of Economic Opportunity under the leadership of our former colleague, the Honorable Donald Rumsfeld.

It is at Mr. Rumsfeld's desk that the rhetoric ends and the reality begins. If concrete results are to be achieved in antipoverty programs, idealism must be mixed with pragmatism. I believe that Don Rumsfeld and OEO are making a meaningful attempt to cure this ailment in our society. It is not an easy job and it never has been for OEO from its very inception.

Mr. Nick Thimmesch, the noted columnist, recently discussed what Don Rumsfeld and the OEO are doing in a political environment no less hostile than in the past. For the information of my colleagues, who might not have had an opportunity to read the piece, perhaps the best yet on the subject, I herewith insert in the RECORD:

SOME TRUTH ABOUT THE GOP POVERTY PROGRAM

(By Nick Thimmesch)

WASHINGTON.—The Office of Economic Opportunity, a pale horse limping in limbo in 1968, is now running in directions which please Director Donald Rumsfeld, and this makes some people unhappy.

Critics squawk that Rumsfeld, 37, is gutting programs, ignoring idealistic militants and changing the anti-poverty agency's role from that of advocate to enforcer. Rumsfeld doesn't agree.

"Teddy Kennedy and Fred Harris (the Oklahoma Senator) go around saying that President Nixon doesn't like blacks and wants to end the war on poverty," Rumsfeld said in his second floor office in the White House.

"Part of their future seems to be based on saying that everything is rotten in the country. If people would quit wringing their hands and get to work, maybe we'd make even more progress. How can Congressmen say the President is against the poor, when they cut his anti-poverty budget request by \$100 million last year?"

"Sure, there's unrest, but black people became cynical about promises long before we took office. We've cut the promises. Sometimes I meet with people (in poverty programs) who are hostile because they've heard the criticism of those who over-promised. Those people usually go away saying they have been fed a bunch of baloney about what we're doing."

After a year in office, Rumsfeld has a young staff which he calls "compassionate and tough-minded." The rhetoric is diminished and poverty is looked at with a colder eye. Instead of confrontation with traditional social agencies, Community Action Agencies funded by O.E.O. are encouraged to cooperate with them. Some lawyers in the Legal Services division are dismayed that Rumsfeld wants them to be more conciliatory and less contentious. Community Action agencies, often riddled with waste and controversy, have been told to shape up.

"I told a meeting of CAP agencies in Tennessee," says assistant O.E.O. Director Frank Carlucci, "that I'd shut them down if they didn't manage themselves right. They responded with a standing ovation. We've changed the attitude. O.E.O. is maturing."

O.E.O. is also involved in a "performance contract" experiment by which an educational firm will be paid on the basis on gains made in math and reading skills by backward students most of whom are poor. This is an idea the late Sen. Robert F. Kennedy unsuccessfully pushed several years ago—the government telling educators, "If you don't produce, no more federal money."

There's also a push for economic development by the poor. O.E.O. funded: a catfish farm in Hancock County, Ga.; a supermarket and modular housing in Durham, N.C.; furniture and rug manufacture by Mexican-Americans and Indians in New Mexico, along with cattle feeding; and the Bedford-Stuyvesant neighborhood project in Brooklyn.

Other innovations are recruiting VISTA volunteers for specific duties rather than for some vague, idealistic impulse; funding a Kentucky program for midwives; and making a \$2 million grant for health manpower development by John W. Gardner's celebrated Urban Coalition, an outfit which so far has operated mostly on the luncheon circuit.

Despite all the noise about cutbacks in anti-poverty spending, the current budget is the same as 1969, and the administration is asking for an increase of \$132 million next year. The current \$1.948 billion budget shows big increases in health and nutrition; economic development; and research and evaluation. Administration opponents still sharply criticize the \$108 million cut from the Job Corps and the \$64 million trimmed from the program to get jobs for youth. Vice-President Agnew recently announced an administration request for an extra \$50 million for summer youth employment.

What's happening at O.E.O. is that a Republican administration is seeking to employ a low-key, keep-your-voices lowered, practical approach to solving the problems of the poor. Naturally, Democrats who authored and pushed the anti-poverty program are going to squawk. They just don't like the

thought of Republicans running such a big program for the poor. Rumsfeld is determined to show them that Democrats have no monopoly on humanitarianism. This kind of competition between Democrats and Republicans is good for the nation.

THERE ARE 180 MEMBERS SPONSORING O'NEILL-GUBSER AMENDMENT

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we will shortly be considering the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER) and I have proposed to provide for recording of teller votes on amendments in Committee of the Whole. Earlier this week, the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER) and I sent Members of the House a letter regarding various aspects of the amendment and noting that it is receiving exceptionally widespread support, including that of the distinguished majority and minority leaders. At that time a total of 141 Members had sponsored the amendment. Since then, the number of sponsors has continued to grow and at this time a total of 180 Members are sponsoring the O'Neill-Gubser amendment. As we noted in our letter, many Members have given this proposal long and careful consideration so as to accommodate all valid concerns and possible problems and the strong showing of support the proposal has received is evidence of its soundness and workability. Mr. Speaker, while Members may continue to sign up as sponsors by calling either my office or Mr. GUBSER's office, I would like to take this opportunity to list those Members who are sponsoring the amendment to date. I also insert a copy of the amendment and our letter of July 20 which answers questions various Members have raised about our proposal.

The material follows:

SPONSORS OF THE O'NEILL-GUBSER AMENDMENT TO PERMIT RECORDING OF TELLER VOTES

Mr. Adams, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Anderson of Tennessee, Mr. Andrews of North Dakota, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Beall, Mr. Bell, Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Blester, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Blatnik, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Boland, Mr. Brademas, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Broomfield, Mr. Brotzman.

Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Burke of Florida, Mr. Burke of Massachusetts, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Button, Mr. Chappell, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Clay, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Don Clausen, Mr. Cohelan, Mr. Conable, Mr. Conte.

Mr. Conyers, Mr. Corman, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Crane, Mr. Culver, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Daniels, Mr. Dellenback, Mr. Denney, Mr. Dennis, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Donohue, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Eckhardt.

Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Edwards of Louisiana, Mr. Ellberg, Mr. Erlenborn, Mr. Esch, Mr. Evans of Colorado, Mr. Evins of Tennessee, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Fascell, Mr. Findley, Mr. Flowers, Mr. Foley, Mr. William

Ford, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Fulton of Tennessee, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Gibbons, Mr. Green of Pennsylvania, Mr. Gubser, Mr. Gude, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Hanley, Mr. Hansen of Idaho, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Hathaway.

Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Hechler, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Hogan, Mr. Howard, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Jones of Tennessee, Mr. Karth, Mr. Kastenmeier, Mr. Keith, Mr. Koch, Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Leggett, Mr. Long of Maryland, Mr. Lowenstein, Mr. Lujan, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. McClure, Mr. McDade, Mr. MacGregor, Mr. Madden, Mr. Mailliard, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. May, Mr. Mayne, Mr. Meeds, Mr. Melcher, Mr. Meskill, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Miller of Ohio, Mr. Minish, Mr. Mize, Mr. Mollohan, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Morse, Mr. Mosher, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nedzi, Mr. Obey, Mr. O'Hara, Mr. O'Konski, Mr. O'Neill, Mr. Olsen, Mr. Ottinger.

Mr. Patten, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Pettis, Mr. Philbin, Mr. Pike, Mr. Pirnie, Mr. Podel, Mr. Preyer, Mr. Pryor, Mr. Quile, Mr. Railsback, Mr. Rees, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Robison, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Rogers of Florida, Mr. Roe.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Roth, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Saylor, Mr. Schadeberg, Mr. Schenebell, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Schmitz, Mr. Schwengel, Mr. Shriver, Mr. Stafford, Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin, Mr. St. Germain, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Symington, Mr. Talcott, Mr. Teague of California, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Tunney, Mr. Udall, Mr. Van Deerlin.

Mr. Vander Jagt, Mr. Vanik, Mr. Waggonner, Mr. Waldie, Mr. Weicker, Mr. Whalen, Mr. White, Mr. Widnall, Mr. Winn, Mr. Charles Wilson, Mr. Bob Wilson, Mr. Wold, Mr. Wolf, Mr. Wydler, Mr. Zwach.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Washington, D.C., July 20, 1970.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: This week we will offer our amendment to H.R. 17654 to permit recording of teller votes in Committee of the Whole. For your guidance, we are enclosing a copy of our amendment plus a list of its sponsors to date.

As of last Friday, 141 Members had sponsored this proposal. In addition, it has received the support of leading members of both parties, including the personal endorsement of Reps. Carl Albert and Gerald Ford.

We believe this strong showing of support is evident of the soundness and workability of this proposal.

As we have noted, our amendment would permit recording teller votes on major amendments while retaining the present non-record teller procedure for less important amendments. It would also guarantee Members at least 12 minutes to reach the floor to vote.

The amendment is designed to make the least change in present procedures and it has been kept as uncomplicated and simple as possible. For example, while there are several effective and foolproof procedures for recording teller votes, we have purposely avoided specifying any particular method so as to give party leaders and House officials maximum flexibility to develop and implement the best possible system.

The "best" system might involve running two teller lines simultaneously, having Members call out their names as they pass the tellers and having the clerks repeat each Member's name as it is checked off on the roster.

Teller votes could also be recorded electronically should the House authorize installation of such equipment.

It is our feeling, however, that the tech-

nical question of *how* to record names should be considered separately from the policy question of *whether* to record them. House rules do not specify any particular method for taking non-record teller votes and we see no reason for doing so with record teller votes.

Another key consideration in formulating our amendment involved the number of Members required to obtain a recorded teller vote. After long deliberation, we decided on 20—the same number as is now required to obtain a non-record teller vote. We believe this will adequately protect against frivolous amendments and that setting a higher requirement would prevent record votes on many important issues and thereby make a sham of this long-overdue reform.

We are aware of the argument that a larger number of Members should be required to obtain recorded tellers in order to protect against politically-motivated amendments. A higher requirement, however, would not prevent a determined effort to obtain a record vote, it would simply delay proceedings by forcing those desiring such a vote to seek quorum calls to get additional supporters on the floor.

We are aware also that a substitute amendment may be offered which, like the original Gubser proposal, would provide for roll call votes in the House on amendments defeated in Committee of the Whole. Such a procedure has several serious drawbacks in our view. It would be extremely time-consuming, it would involve a major change in House procedure, and it could result in complicated parliamentary problems requiring the House to return to Committee of the Whole to reconsider legislation.

Thus we urge that you examine closely any alternatives which may be offered and we solicit your support for our amendment. We and many other Members have given this proposal long and careful consideration in an effort to accommodate all valid concerns and possible problems. We believe we have succeeded and we hope you will agree.

Sincerely,

CHARLES S. GUBSER.
THOMAS P. O'NEILL.

P.S.—If you wish to add your name to those listed in the RECORD as sponsors when this amendment is offered, please call either of our offices.

RECORD TELLER VOTES—O'NEILL-GUBSER
AMENDMENT TO H.R. 17654

On page 39 immediately below line 4, insert the following:

"RECORDING TELLER VOTES

"SEC. — Clause 5 of Rule I of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"He shall rise to put a question, but may state it sitting; and shall put questions in this form, to wit: "As many as are in favor (as the question may be), say Aye;" and after the affirmative voice is expressed, "As many as are opposed, say No;" if he doubts, or a division is called for, the House shall divide; those in the affirmative of the question shall first rise from their seats, and then those in the negative; if he still doubts, or a count is requested by at least one-fifth of a quorum, he shall name one or more from each side of the question to tell the Members in the affirmative and negative; which being reported, he shall rise and state the decision. *If before tellers are named any Member requests tellers with clerks and that request is supported by at least one-fifth of a quorum, the names of those voting on each side of the question shall be entered in the Journal. Members shall have not less*

than twelve minutes from the naming of tellers with clerks to be counted."

And make the appropriate technical changes in section numbers and references.

WAR PRISONERS NEED PUBLIC'S
SUPPORT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in the June 25, 1970, edition of the Daily Californian an article appeared concerning prisoners of war in North Vietnam. The story tells of a San Diego-based organization that is attempting to arouse public interest in this subject. The organization, the National League of Families of American Prisoners in Southeast Asia, hopes that a public letterwriting campaign will pressure Hanoi into abiding by the terms of the Geneva Convention governing the treatment of war prisoners. With the permission of my House colleagues, I should like to insert this article into the RECORD with the hope of carrying its message to a greater number of concerned citizens:

WAR PRISONERS NEED PUBLIC'S SUPPORT

San Diego County reportedly has the largest concentration of wives and relatives of U.S. servicemen held captive by North Vietnam.

Many of these individuals do not know if their husbands, sons and fathers are alive or dead. Some of them have waited in agony for years for a tiny shred of information about the men taken prisoners by the enemy.

But North Vietnam, despite the most persistent pleas, has been slow to respond with anything more than an occasional gesture toward fulfilling its obligations as a signatory to the Geneva Convention governing the treatment of war prisoners.

The Communist regime has refused even to honor its basic obligation to release the names of the prisoners it has taken. Likewise, it has declined to give the International Red Cross permission to inspect prisoner-of-war camps and has violated the article forbidding prisoners to be paraded or photographed for propaganda purposes. Mail sent to known prisoners of war has been returned.

After years of impatient and fruitless waiting, the relatives of men believed to be prisoners in North Vietnam have launched a campaign to enlist public support for their efforts to get the Communists to abide by the terms of the agreement which they signed.

A San Diego-based organization, the National League of Families of American Prisoners in Southeast Asia, hopes an aroused public will have more influence on Hanoi than it alone has so far been able to muster.

The organization's leaders have reason to believe that public pressure will produce results. They have discovered that the North Vietnamese government usually makes some slight concession when an event, such as the trip to Paris by wives of prisoners, focuses public attention upon its dereliction in honoring the Geneva Convention.

What can the public do?

The league suggests that letters be sent to the Office of the President, Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Hanoi, North Vietnam, via Hong Kong, and to Minister Xuan Thuy, Paris Peace Talks, Paris, France.

Airmail postage, it should be noted, will be 25 cents for the letter sent to Vietnam; 20 cents for the one sent to Paris.

"Write again and again to the leaders of North Vietnam, to news editors both here and abroad, to members of Congress and the United Nations and to ambassadors of foreign nations," the league suggests.

"Americans and the rest of the free world must insist on humane treatment of these 1,500 American servicemen who are in desperate need of YOUR public support. Your voice, your letter, could be the one that makes the difference for them."

Letters should be brief and to the point. They should not be abusive. All that the wives and other relatives ask is that North Vietnam honor the terms of the Geneva Convention which it signed in 1957.

That agreement requires (1) release of names of prisoners held; (2) immediate release of prisoners who are sick or wounded; (3) impartial inspections of facilities used for prisoner detention; (4) assurance that all prisoners receive proper medical care and adequate food; (5) prisoners shall not be paraded or photographed for purposes of political propaganda; (6) belligerents must not use false information about prisoners which would be harmful to the mental health of the prisoners or their families at home; (7) provisions for frequent exchange of mail between prisoners and their families.

So far, Hanoi has spurned pleas by the International Red Cross, U.N. Secretary-General U Thant, dovish U.S. Senators, the late socialist leader Norman Thomas and such anti-Vietnam War groups as SANE (National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy).

Whether a public letter-writing campaign will be any more successful remains to be seen. We owe it to the American prisoners to try it and see.

WHY WE SHOULD BE LOYAL TO OUR
FLAG

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, Pamela Crumb, a young sixth grader from Cloverdale, Calif., has written a very thought-provoking essay on "Why We Should Be Loyal to Our Flag."

Her essay was judged the best in districtwide competition and second in the State of California in the Veterans of Foreign Wars essay competition.

Pamela is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Manuel Crumb.

In my judgment, this young lady has come forward with a very simple and honest statement of her feeling for the flag of her country, and I sincerely commend her for having done so. The essay follows:

WHY WE SHOULD BE LOYAL TO OUR FLAG
(By Pamela Crumb)

There are many Americans today that do not show loyalty to their flag.

I think we should be loyal to our flag because it is the symbol of our country.

We should respect our flag because it reminds us of long ago when early Americans gave their time and lives to make our country free.

We should be loyal to our flag because of

the many things and freedom it gives us, such as the right to get an education, the right to choose our church, and the right to publish things.

We should be proud of our Flag because it has flown over our nation from the time that our country was a savage wilderness to the present day with our modern skyscrapers.

Americans should be loyal to the Flag because it gives them the right to dream for the future. We can dream for good homes, good schools, for food, shelter and clothing.

Our dream of continued freedom is the most important dream of all. Its the most wonderful thing, to be free, to think, speak, write and worship as we please.

I want to be loyal to my Flag. It represents the greatest nation on earth.

ANOTHER VIEW OF ALLEGED AMERICAN ATROCITIES IN VIETNAM

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the other day Mr. Thomas C. Piddington, 3606 Colony Road, Fairfax, Va., requested me to bring to the attention of the Congress another and a much often neglected view of the recent wave of charges against American service personnel for alleged atrocities against civilians in Vietnam. In this case it is the view of the serviceman himself, Al. C. William K. Piddington, now serving in Vietnam, recently sent his father the following poem, penned by T. Sgt. William O. Hasting, Jr., 377 Transportation Squadron, TSN AB RVN, which Airman Piddington feels should also be included when anyone considers the conduct of American troops in the Vietnamese war:

UNNECESSARILY DEAD

The young man comes from far away

To a land where death is near
He walks in jungles throughout the day
At night he rests in fear.

He was trained by America's best
But his skills are yet untried
In this land he will meet the test
With hopes to pass in stride.

He is told "you will not fire your gun
Till the enemy is defined
For if you kill an innocent one
You'll be court-martialed in no time."

The chopper hovers above the ground
The air is charged with fear
They said this was a V.C. town
Our young man's test is near.

The noise of battle in his ears
His buddies left and right
He tries to conceal his fear
As a figure comes in sight.

His weapon is raised and ready
His heart beat is wild
He forced his aim to be steady
Then he realized it was a child.

He remembered other incidents
And G.I.s now on trial
They claimed it was an accident
But are convicted all the while.

His moments lost in thought
Was his first mistake
But the way this war is fought
One is all it takes.

The grenade landed at his feet
The explosion he did not feel
His god he has come to meet
For a child he did not kill.

Who killed this young man
Was it the ones who trained him
Was it the one who placed a grenade in a
child's hand
Or the ones who say "don't shoot first, let
them?"

WHITE HOUSE REPORT ON THE PROBLEMS OF THE BLUE COLLAR WORKER

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there have been several articles recently in the press based on the "White House Report on the Problems of the Blue Collar Worker."

These articles were based on the report which apparently has been leaked to certain newspapers but not generally distributed to the public.

I am pleased that I have been able to obtain the report through my own sources.

I am placing it in the RECORD today because I believe it is of paramount importance that this Nation finally awakens to the fact that America's blue collar and white collar workers can no longer be expected to carry the major burden of the cost of Government and get very little in return.

I have said here on the floor of the House, time and again, that many of those in Government have become so obsessed with the plight of the poor and of minority groups, that they fail to realize the problems of America's blue collar and middle-income white collar workers.

It is this middle-income American who carries the greatest burden of taxation, who suffers most intensely the ravages of inflation, and who is consistently excluded from assistance programs because he supposedly earns enough money to take care of his own needs.

Nothing can be more misleading than to believe that the middle-income American worker is without problems or burdens.

I recently made an analysis and showed how a blue collar worker in America, earning \$7,000 a year, has only \$200 more of spendable income to take care of his wife and three children than a similar family with a husband, wife, and three children who derive their income entirely from public aid.

Is it any wonder that the middle-income American worker of this Nation is in revolt? When you consider that he goes out and works very hard to earn \$7,000 a year, and then, in the final analysis, has only \$200 more to spend on his family than those who rely entirely on public aid.

I hope all administrators of public agencies and Members of Congress will carefully read the "White House Report

on the Problems of the Blue Collar Worker," and I hope the President himself will diligently address himself to the problems of these forgotten, and forsaken, Americans.

"The White House Report on the Problems of the Blue Collar Worker" follows:

THE PROBLEM OF THE BLUE-COLLAR WORKER

The social and economic status of blue-collar workers has become a subject of increasing concern in the last few years. Recent reports have identified the economic insecurity and alienation which whites in this group have felt. What such reports have failed to note is that there are some two million minority-group males who are skilled or semi-skilled blue-collar workers who are full-time members of the work force and who share many of the same problems as whites in their income class. This non-white group also shares the same concern as white workers for law and order and other middle-class values. Many have moved from subemployment to low-income entry-level jobs, but they now feel blocked from further opportunity.

In 1968, 34 percent of all minority-group families were in the \$5,000 to \$10,000 income category. Of course, on the average, most black families are still not anywhere as well off as white families: The median income of all Negro families was \$5,590, that of all white families \$8,937. But the point is that both these groups have essentially "working-class" economic and social problems related to wage, tax and government benefit structure for the nonpoor—a fact not given adequate recognition by the media, which, to the extent it emphasizes only the black ghetto, perpetuates a stereotype.

We should recognize:

(1) the common economic problem which many blue-collar workers have, of both races (mostly white, of course, in numbers); and
(2) the common social problems concerned with housing, education, jobs and personal safety which are related to income class but also are a function of the close proximity of the blue-collar workers to the disadvantaged people.

These two points are worth further consideration.

I. THE ECONOMIC SQUEEZE

Forty percent of American families—including 70 million family members—have incomes between \$5,000 and \$10,000 a year and might be termed "lower-middle-income." The head of the household is usually a vigorous, fully employed blue-collar worker with heavy family responsibilities although many of this group are also in white-collar or service jobs. It is precisely when his children reach their teens and family budget costs are at their peak that two things happen to the bulk of such male breadwinners:

They reach a plateau in their capacity to earn by promotion or advancement;

Their expenses continue to rise, as the last family members are born, as they become homeowners, as car and home equipment pressures mount, as the children may become ready for college, or support is needed for aging parents.

The American wage and salary structure does not respond directly to this situation, since it is based on the ethic of "equal pay for equal work." It does not provide additions for either growing family size or age (except as it may reflect job seniority); payment is exclusively for work done—the same pay is given to everyone in the same job; and, unlike the situation in many other countries, the wage structure is not supplemented by public payments based on family size, although income tax exemptions give some recognition:

Income needs for a growing family rise faster than are normally provided by advance-

ment. Family budget costs for a two-child family are three times the needs of a single individual, according to BLS, while a typical semi-skilled steelworker's increase in job level results only in a wage rise of somewhat less than one and a half times.

The result is illustrated by the accompanying table, which portrays the case of a typical steelworker. The worker has some margin beyond his budget needs when he is young, but only if he saves and does not acquire a living standard commensurate with his pay. If he does not anticipate later family needs by adequate early savings—and usually he does not—he begins to be squeezed in his later thirties, and finds himself in deeper straits as his children reach their teens.

Many other industries have fewer promotion opportunities than steel. A study of 11 major industries estimated that one-third of all non-supervisory jobs were "dead-end." The lack of an adequate adult education system geared to workers hinders movement out of these jobs. Relatively few

firms have work-site education and few community colleges direct courses for upgrading purposes to blue-collar workers.

Upward job mobility is also hindered by age discrimination against older workers; by lack of detailed, free information about other jobs; and by the high costs of private employment agencies (which often have job openings which the Employment Service does not have).

The result for semi-skilled blue-collar workers as a whole is that, when general wage rate increases are added to increased individual earnings due to promotion, real income has somewhat less than doubled in the past two decades, which is still not enough to meet the cost of the same standard of living throughout the period. Males aged 45 to 54 years in 1968 who had one to three years of high school—the educational level typical of blue-collar workers in that age group—had increased their incomes by only 84 percent between 1949 and 1968.

wives from working or minimize their contribution to family income. Yet it is precisely working wives who make very meaningful contributions to the family income, and who have the potential to make even more: In the 40 percent of husband-wife families where wives do work, median income in 1968 was \$10,700, compared to \$8,200 where they didn't. Part-time employment has almost doubled since 1956 and provides a new opportunity for more women to combine work with family responsibility.

The problem of restricted economic opportunity for the blue-collar worker also spreads into the next generation. The children of this group in our society are not "making it" to the same degree as are children in the middle and upper-middle classes.

Despite the broadening base of college enrollments, we still find marked evidence that the lower-income groups have a much smaller proportion of their children continuing beyond high school. Only one-fourth of the youth in college are from the half of the families with a below-median income. Worse yet, the great majority of high school dropouts are not from the disadvantaged ghetto population. Many white and black school dropouts are from this lower-middle-income group; in some of the urban areas the dropout rate for this group runs about 30 percent. Here we sense the stirrings of a new type of unfortunate cycle, as some of the children of these blue-collar workers are unable to achieve a reasonable entry into productive society. Twenty percent are unemployed in the fall following the year they drop out of school. Present efforts to reduce youth unemployment (e.g., Neighborhood Youth Corps) are geared to disadvantaged youth—not these people.

Other government aids—minimum wage, training, welfare payments—are not for this group because they have presumably "made it," and whatever the government may have done to keep employment and jobs up generally has faded or is overwhelmed.

Economic insecurity is compounded by the fact that blue-collar workers are often the first to feel the effects of an increase in unemployment, feel most threatened by automation, and are also more dependent on sheer physical health for their livelihood than white-collar workers. Yet there is inadequate protection for temporary or permanent disability under State workmen's compensation laws.

There are other dimensions to the problem too: the shortage and high cost of housing; the high cost of medical and legal services; the lack of inexpensive entertainment and recreation facilities (e.g., few summer camps for the worker's children).

All these factors add up to an economic squeeze and insecurity for the working man. We have no package of solutions to deal with this problem. However, in fashioning any attack, certain things should be recognized: (1) that government aid being given to the disadvantaged is sorely needed, and (2) that it would be impossible and undesirable to try to modify the American wage structure; and (3) that almost anything which could be done by the government would cost money.

II. THE SOCIAL SQUEEZE

People working and living close to the margin of economic needs are under constant pressures. These pressures have an economic base but find other outlets, other frustrations of a social nature.

People in the blue-collar class are less mobile, less organized, and less capable of using legitimate means to either protect the status quo or secure changes in their favor. To a considerable extent, they feel like "forgotten people"—those for whom the government and the society have limited, if any, direct concern and little visible action.

Some of the problems which "bug" the blue-collar class include:

Fear of violent crimes. This is a growing

COMPARISON OF FAMILY BUDGET COSTS AND STEELWORKERS' EARNINGS (1967 BUDGET COSTS AND WAGE RATES)

Age and family status	Family budget costs		Pay grade	Estimated annual earnings	
	Amount	Index		Amount	Index
22—Single	\$3,358	100	2	\$5,747	100
23—Married, no children	4,538	135	2	5,747	100
28—1 child, under 6	5,627	168	7	6,629	115
33—2 children, older 6 to 15	9,076	270	12	7,510	131
41—2 children, older 9 to 18	10,347	308	15	8,039	140

NOTES

Budget costs and wage rates as of 1967.

Annual earnings are based on hourly rates, with no further adjustments for effect of seniority on immunity from layoffs and opportunities for more overtime and no allowance for the value of fringes.

Grade 15 in the chart is approximately the midpoint of the U.S. steel job evaluation wage structure and is at beginning point of skilled craftsman wage scales.

Family budget costs are based on BLS moderate living standard for a 4-person family, spring 1967, and include occupational expenses, gifts and contributions, life insurance, social security payments, and Federal, State, and local income taxes, in addition to the goods and services for family consumption. For equivalence scale appropriate for total budget—see table A-1, p. 14, BLS Bulletin 1570-2.

The worker who established his standard of living when he was single or first married thus finds that he can maintain it only by:

1. Having saved when he was younger (which he didn't do); or
2. moonlighting on a second part-time job; or

3. having his wife work even in spite of the obstacles to doing so; or

4. continued pressure for wage increases.

If a younger worker has no opportunity for advancement, the entire annual productivity-related rise in wages, about three percent, is needed just to keep up with his increasing family needs. If such a worker wants to improve his standard of living he must be able to move up the ladder. The pressure on wages promises to increase as those born in the post World War II baby boom move into their late twenties and early thirties, and thus assume family responsibilities in the next five years. Workers in the 25-34 age group will represent 25 percent of the labor force in this decade.

This problem is intensified by inflation. Since 1965 money wages have advanced 20 percent, but real earnings measured in true purchasing power remained almost static. These men are on a treadmill, chasing the illusion of higher living standards. Thus their only hope seems to be continued pressure for higher wages. Their only spokesmen seem to be union leaders spearheading the demand for more money wages. They are overripe for a political response to the pressing needs they feel so keenly.

The tax structure offers little relief to this worker since it gives only small recognition to family size considerations. Even the Tax Reform Act of 1969 does not provide adequate relief to these families:

A married couple with an \$8000 income who has two children will pay \$263 less under the new law—which doesn't fully take effect until 1973—than the old one. This fails to bridge the budget gap described above;

Deductions for family members are taken in character, even under the new tax law, and provide more at higher income levels than at lower or moderate levels (the \$750 deduction is a tax savings of \$125 for the person in the 16 to 17 percent bracket and \$300 for the person in the 40 percent bracket). Moreover, the size of the tax deductions has no relation to the age of the children, even though budget costs for older children are more than for younger.

There is no provision for tax relief as family education costs rise, either in terms of the \$100 a year that it costs to send a child to school or the additional cost of going to college.

Regressive State and local taxes also hit heavily at this group. Average State and local taxes are almost \$700, and have increased rapidly in recent years. Moreover, in at least some states income is redistributed from lower-income to higher-income groups to subsidize higher education for the children of the latter.

Government policies on child care designed to enable the wife to work also give little relief. At present, families with income of \$6900 or above cannot deduct child care expenses. This figure was set in the Internal Revenue Act of 1964 and is now unrealistically low. Adjusted to current prices the ceiling would be about \$8200. Government child care centers under Headstart and Win are for the "poor," and so do not help this group. Their costs for child care (when not provided by other family members) may run from \$25 to \$40 a week. The Family Assistance Act of 1970 will aggravate this problem. Welfare mothers will receive subsidized child care to facilitate their move from welfare to work. Lower income mothers who seek work and are outside the welfare system will incur the full cost or be unable to add to family income.

Finally, high transportation costs, wage discrimination and lack of education and training also discourage many blue-collar

fear of crime in the inner cities and this fear is spilling over to the outer ring of the metropolis—primarily areas where they live. Economic immobility blocks a flight from these conditions.

Class status. Many of these workers are immigrants or sons of immigrants, they feel unsure about their place in the "mainstream" of American society. Some live in mixed neighborhoods—feeling the pressure of constant succession by lower status groups, especially minorities. As the minorities move up a bit, they squeeze these people. Minority inroads in housing, schools, and jobs create fears. They worry over merging of seniority lists, changing entrance requirements for jobs, and lower admissions standards for public schools.

Feeling of being forgotten. These people are most exposed to the poor and the welfare recipients. Often their wages are only a notch or so above the liberal states' welfare payments. Yet they are excluded from social programs targeted at the disadvantaged—medical aid, housing, job training, headstart programs, legal aid, and the like. As taxpayers, they support these programs with no visible relief—no visible share.

Educational level. Since most blue-collar workers have barely completed formal high school education, they have limited leverage to change occupations, and they have limited mobility to use their education as a lever to escape from their economic and social problems. Overt hostility between ethnic and racial groups is probably greater between less educated groups than between more educated groups. Thus, the blue-collar worker is more prone to transfer his economic and social frustrations to racial and ethnic prejudices, and of late to overt hostilities.

Low status of blue-collar work. The American working man has lost relative class status with the growth of higher education. Changes in the nature of the labor force have dramatized the professional and technical experts to the relative detriment of the skilled worker. Skilled workers also have hostility toward those below them at semi-skilled and unskilled levels and the feeling is mutual. But all blue-collar workers, skilled or not, have been denigrated so badly—so harshly—that their jobs have become a last resort, instead of decent, respected careers. Manual and skilled occupations have become almost invisible in terms of the propaganda of today. Fathers hesitate—and even apologize—for their occupations instead of holding it up as an aspiration for their sons. This attack has been so strong, so emotional and so unfounded that the workers have suffered a loss of self respect and the nation is suffering a loss of future manpower.

Low status also derives from the working conditions and nature of much unskilled and semiskilled work. Much of it is oppressively tedious, noisy, and mind numbing, with little room for human contact. Research has found a significant relation between poor mental health and such types of work.

Let us examine the problem of the low status of blue-collar work further:

According to union leaders, the blue-collar worker increasingly feels that his work has no "status" in the eyes of society, the media, or even his own children. While the nation has, in recent years, sold the importance of science and technology to our younger people, it has neglected to communicate the importance of some ten million skilled blue-collar workers who are responsible for transforming the ideas of scientists and the plans of engineers into tangible goods and services. These workers make and maintain the models, tools and machines without which industrial processes could not be carried out. They exercise considerable independent judgment and are responsible for extremely valuable equipment and products.

A good auto mechanic, for example, must know hydraulics, pneumatics, electricity, and some chemistry and other skills. Yet many

youth learn that status accrues to the white-collar job (and so "prefer" it) even though a job in coveralls, such as mechanic, may pay better. The average mechanic working for a metropolitan auto dealer earns nearly \$10,000, yet there is a short supply of them due to lack of interested youth. A recent survey showed that only one out of four male high school seniors wished to work as blue-collar workers, even though almost half of all jobs in the economy are blue-collar jobs.

Schools tend to reinforce this tendency, since most teachers know little about blue-collar work. So do the media; the only publicity given to workers is when they are out on strike and there they are often shown in a bad light.

Adding to the problem is that fact that the long-term narrowing of manual skill wage differentials (temporarily halted) has relatively worsened the position of semi- and skilled blue-collar workers compared to the unskilled. At the same time, high-skilled white-collar workers have been making substantial and publicized improvements in their economic position, with salary increases often far higher than wage increases. Furthermore, the educated workers with college and advanced degrees have been getting the biggest pay gains.

The result is chronic and inflationary shortages in many skilled blue-collar fields; a feeling of "failure" for the many youth who won't get white-collar jobs; exacerbation of racial friction when black youth refuse to take "dirty" blue-collar jobs offered them "by a white society," even when they may be good-paying; and a general resentment by blue-collar workers which is translated into wage demands.

Resentment is likely to worsen with any increase in unemployment, together with a continued push for opportunities for the disadvantaged, plus the addition of returning veterans to the labor force.

III. POSSIBLE DIRECTIONS FOR ACTION

Our attention has been focused on an analysis of the economic and social situation faced by the blue-collar worker and not on private or public steps that might be taken to relieve the pressures he faces. Still, the analysis itself identifies several specific areas of concern:

Upgrading. What can be done to assist the worker in moving out of a dead-end job?

Income. Upgrading will provide more income, but this may need to be augmented by a job for the wife, and perhaps in other ways.

Expenses. The workingman's budget squeeze can be relieved through subsidized housing, transportation, recreation, and education and various kinds of tax relief.

Social Issues. Such things as low status of blue-collar work, poor urban environment, and inadequate medical facilities contribute to a feeling of neglect and should be addressed.

Again, though we have not developed a specific action program, some ideas appear worthy of consideration by the Nixon Administration to reach out and come to grips with many of the basic needs:

1. Job upgrading

The JOBS program is placing a new emphasis on upgrading for both disadvantaged and others but even more manpower services could be provided the blue-collar worker. Much authority exists but imaginative proposals are needed for such things as instruction in plants, community college courses designed to meet specific skill shortages, worker leave of absences, and loans for non-instruction expenses. The Employment Service could do more to help the blue-collar worker get ahead—through such steps as counseling and upgrading, soliciting jobs for experienced workers and opening its offices nights and Saturdays to serve the employed as well as the unemployed.

2. Child care

The Nixon Family Assistance Plan will provide child care facilities for welfare mothers who go to work. Child care facilities might next be provided to slightly higher income groups on a partial fee basis. This would enable many more mothers to work and relieve the costs of child care for those who already work. Steady expansion of part-time employment opportunities can open new avenues for wives to work without neglecting their family role. Tax relief for child care is now limited to families earning less than \$6,900 and this could be raised to \$10,000 with deductions increased to \$900 for the first child and \$1,200 for two or more children. This change can be made with little revenue loss. The public pressure for action in this area is expected to mount.

3. Education for adults

The Vocational Education Act of 1968 is already financing evening courses for about three million adults. However, this meets only a fraction of the need. Moreover, above and beyond vocational education, there is a need to allow workers to study for high school diplomas and for two-year community college degrees. For many blue-collar workers and their wives, the result should be new or better jobs and promotions. Increased education also frequently leads to less racial hostility.

4. Higher education for the worker's children

The right to higher education implicit in the President's Higher Education Message for college loans and grants where families are earning less than \$10,000 is a significant promise to the blue-collar workers. The President also proposed a \$100 million program for training in critical occupations in community colleges. This should be the first step in a steady thrust toward increased Federal support of these colleges which are of such importance to the blue-collar worker's children. These opportunities should be targeted to these people.

5. Tax policy

The Tax Reform Act will give a tax reduction to families earning \$5,000 to \$10,000. However, this does not go very far in alleviating the squeeze on this group. Revenue sharing should be emphasized since it will tend to help them by raising taxes through the progressive Federal tax system rather than through the regressive local and State systems. In addition, a review should be made of possible further ways to relieve the tax burden on this group, including possibly increasing the amount of the tax exemption for older children, since budget costs for them are greater.

6. Higher status for blue-collar work

Efforts should be made to enhance the status of blue-collar work. Public relations work would help, as would more effective guidance and placement in blue-collar jobs by secondary schools (including more visits by workers to the schools). Other possibilities are National awards for outstanding craftsmen; portrayal of various skilled trades on postage stamps; a series of vocational guidance films for youth, on skilled trades; programs for school teachers to visit plants and officers; training for foremen and supervisors; Federal standards for decent working conditions and/or establishing a Job Environment Subcommittee of the Environmental Quality Council, to investigate oppressive noise, heat, air pollution, and the like.

7. Recreation facilities

Recreation and vacations, a major problem for the blue-collar worker and his family, might be made more available through vest-pocket parks, more development of public lands near metropolitan areas, and mortgage guarantees for low-income recreation facilities.

8. Transportation

Automobile expenses are a major expense item to the blue-collar worker. Moderate budget costs for the U.S. automobile owner are more than \$900 yearly for replacement, insurance, and maintenance. More mass transit is part of the answer. If "no-blame" auto insurance would reduce costs as much as has been claimed, it might also be helpful.

9. Housing

Action has been taken to pump more mortgage money into the housing market which should increase the houses available to low-income workers and reduce their cost. The most significant potential for reducing housing costs is probably in Operation Breakthrough and other efforts to increase productivity in construction. HUD and the Domestic Council are obvious focal points for policy direction.

10. Disability protection

On the job and off the job accidents are still a major hazard for the working population. New attempts should be made to develop modern temporary disability insurance and workmen's compensation systems.

11. The Federal Government as a model employer of blue-collar workers

The Federal Government should continue its policy of wages comparable with private employment. But it could go beyond this on non-wage matters. It could become a model employer by careful attention to such things as upgrading possibilities, subsidized child care, part-time employment for women, and partially subsidized recreation and vacation facilities for low-income Federal workers.

The White House working group under your chairmanship could develop feasible ways by which to meet the needs of blue-collar workers in some or all of these areas.

JEROME M. ROSOW,
Assistant Secretary for Policy, Evaluation and Research.

RESOLUTION APPROVED

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was unanimously approved at the 1970 New Mexico Republican Platform Convention at Las Cruces, N. Mex., on June 27, 1970:

Whereas, this convention recognizes that the people of New Mexico and the United States want peace and withdrawal from the present hostilities in Indo-China, and

Whereas, it is essential that withdrawal be effected so as to give every possible protection to the lives of our servicemen and the lives of Americans who are prisoners of the communists, and

Whereas, we have an abiding faith in the Constitution of the United States, and in the wisdom of its provision for the separation of the powers of government among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, and

Whereas, we are convinced that the majority of Americans do support the general policies of the present administration in its efforts to withdraw from the present hostilities in Indo-China as soon as feasible and with the least possible cost of human life and suffering,

Now, therefore, be it resolved: That this convention go on record as supporting the efforts of the present administration to withdraw from the present hostilities in Indo-China as soon as feasible, giving priority in this regard to the ultimate saving of life of

both our servicemen and Americans who are prisoners of the communists, the alleviation of further suffering and the achievement of an honorable and just resolution of these unfortunate hostilities.

Be it further resolved that this convention call upon the Congress of the United States to carefully consider and faithfully discharge its constitutional responsibilities in aiding the administration in achieving the above objectives.

BRIDGING THE GENERATION GAP

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, not long ago I had the good fortune of attending the commencement exercises at Ursuline Academy, a girls' school in suburban Bethesda, Md. I say good fortune, because our colleague, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN, delivered a noteworthy commencement address.

We all have the familiar experience of the generation gap which is supposed to be a bridgeless chasm. Yet anyone who was present at this ceremony could have felt the past joyfully joined to the present with each word of the address. In my discussions with parents, teachers, and students I saw little evidence of the so-called generation gap. Moreover, in my discussions with students after the ceremony, I noticed an acumen that could only come from cooperation with teachers.

But the highlight of the commencement ceremony was Congressman MONAGAN's inspiring address. There was no preaching and yet there was something to be learned. There was good humor, and yet prudence and good judgment prevailed. The address was delivered with a deep affection that did not detract from an objective assessment.

In speaking to the graduation class, Mr. MONAGAN was also speaking to his daughter, Parthy. The beautiful feeling and warmth pervaded the entire class, and no doubt made them feel as if he were their own father.

I felt privileged to attend the commencement, and stimulated by the warmth of Mr. MONAGAN's refreshing and beautiful message, I want to take this opportunity to commend his affectionate and yet effective remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY
JOHN S. MONAGAN

It is a brave man or a very foolish one who has the temerity to make a commencement speech today.

This is particularly true of a Member of Congress who is the epitome of an Establishment figure. In addition, a Congressman in today's folklore is presented as a figure of fun and a cross between Groucho Marx and Sir Toby Belch. At any rate we are used to dealing with the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune and so for this reason if no other, we may be the only people qualified to make commencement speeches in this year of 1970.

In some ways however, I am in envious position. I have a captive audience, I have a polite audience. I have an audience schooled in Christian virtues. At least to this point

there has been no invasion by Black Panthers or the SDS, nor has anyone grabbed the microphone for a revolutionary tirade.

Yet, one is puzzled to know exactly what note to strike. I have a natural desire to be brilliant because of the presence in this distinguished Class of my talented and lovely daughter, and for her sake alone I would hope to utter winged words that might be classed with those of Ralph Waldo Emerson or at least, Spiro T. Agnew, but the achievement of this goal is difficult indeed in today's climate.

Dean Acheson, in his recent book said that "commencement speeches are a ritual to be endured without hearing." If this were so you could relax and think of more pleasant things but even the elegant Dean was not exact in his comparison since he was introducing a discussion of the famous Harvard speech of General Marshall which sparked the revival of Western Europe and changed the tide of history.

I cannot help think how commencements have changed since I first started attending them. Somehow I always carry memories of potted palms, the smell of fresh varnish and graded files of girls in white dresses, white shoes, white stockings and white hair ribbons and boys in blue serge Knickerbocker suits marching two by two with a tinkling piano playing the "Soldiers March" and "Faust" and a chorus later singing the Barcarole from the "Tales of Hoffman" in two parts.

In those days it was not difficult to select a theme for a commencement speech. Then the road ahead stretched placidly forward into a rosy future. The class motto in Latin might easily have been and doubtless was "per aspera ad astra" and even though it suggested struggle and difficulties, nevertheless the stars of achievement always beckoned their invitation in the attainable distance.

Horatio Alger, the apostle of the Puritan ethic—was no longer a best seller, but his influence lingered on and one might hear in the commencement addresses of those days the echoes of his tales of the clean-living shoe shine boy or the industrious newsie who stopped the runaway horse, saved the life of the little girl with golden hair and was placed on the first rung of the ladder to success by her grateful, bank-executive father.

Some of the titles of his books will give you an idea of what I mean. They were:

Luck and Pluck.
From Farm Boy to Senator.
From Rags to Riches.
Strong and Steady—or Paddle Your Own Canoe.
Tattered Tom—or The Story of A Street Arab.
Ben, the Luggage Boy—or Among the Wharves.

This was the time also of "Frank Merriwell at Yale" a Yale which would not even have known what Black Panthers were—much less have given them aid and comfort.

Those days have long gone.
Today it is noteworthy for a school to have a commencement. Undoubtedly many will not have any ceremonies this year.

The affluent society, instant communications, the omnipresence of overwhelming national and international problems all join to raise questions as to the relevance of our traditional attitudes and our customary observances, and to make difficult the task of one who would pontificate or dogmatize.

No area of our social organization is free today from the thrust of searching questions. All the foundations upon which we have built are being reexamined and tested for their soundness and permanence. Many of our cherished beliefs have been exploded and our prejudgments have been swept away.

Much of this winnowing has been good. Renovation can be profitable if it forces us to sweep out the rubbish and the useless ac-

cumulations and make judgments as to what is necessary to retain and what is surplusage.

This revolution in thinking has left no traditional social unit untouched. Our schools, our universities, our corporations, our legislatures, our military services, our social service institutions and our churches have all felt the winds of change.

We have eliminated much cant and prejudice. We have learned to look through the appearance of things to matters of substance. We have opened up new areas of opportunity. We have abandoned many catch phrases and phony labels. We have discovered new sympathies between people of different races and forged new bonds between different sects with similar religious traditions. We have discovered the dross in material things and have concluded that these alone cannot bring satisfaction of our yearning for heaven.

The revolution which has taken place in the liturgy of our Roman Church may perhaps be taken as a symbol of this all-pervasive change of which I speak.

We have nearly abandoned the Latin service. We have shortened our observances. We have eliminated duplication and unnecessary ceremonial. We have tried to substitute the participant for the passive and even somnolent observer.

And yet.

There are moments when the over thirty (that is the magic line of demarcation) traditionalist has qualms as he sees the bulldozer methodically pressing on its levelling course.

Shall we never again thrill to those majestic hymns of St. Thomas Aquinas—the *Tantum Ergo*—or the *Pange Lingua*? Is Palestine consigned forever to outer darkness? Can the guitar Mass fill the void left by the removal of Hayden or Mozart or William Byrd?

Which is preferable? the traditional Rheims version:

"Consider the lilies of the field how they grow. They labour not neither do they spin and yet I say to you that not even Solomon, in all his glory, was arrayed as one of these," or (the improved version)

"As for clothes, why be concerned: Learn a lesson from the way the wild flowers grow. They do not work. They do not spin. Yet I assure you not even Solomon in all his splendor was arrayed like one of these."

One feels that the revisionists barely avoided saying, "Man, look at them lilies."

The point I make in this connection and in our examination of all the changes that are thrust upon us today is that there is a compelling need for judgment, for discrimination and for the exercise of a sense of historical perspective in deciding where we are heading.

Let us eliminate the shoddy and the superfluous and the second-rate, but let us, for Heaven's sake and our own, retain the sound, the valuable, the tried and the good. Granted that these are value judgments, nevertheless, let us look at our own history and that of the world. Let us profit by our experience and by the tragic fate of other nations.

Let us recall the long, slow climb from barbarism and slavery to a system of laws that protects human freedom and not abandon our hard-won gains in a surge of emotion or a momentary passion.

Perhaps there was some good in the Puritan ethic. Perhaps the Ten Commandments and the seven deadly sins had some validity. Perhaps the Constitution with its Bill of Rights still shines as a beacon to Czechs and Poles and Russians. At least it is worth thinking about before we toss out the whole works.

Renewal SII Demolition No!

What I am suggesting is that one can easily go over the line from freedom to excess and from change to destruction—without the balance which is provided by history and experience.

The danger, of course, is that we shall come to a time of confrontation if large segments of our population continue to move in contrary directions. The recent parades of the hard-hatted construction workers evidence an aroused conservative reaction.

I also suggest that some bounds be set to criticism as destruction and that, recognizing human frailties and defects, we seek to recreate the consensus which once obtained concerning the worth and relevance of our public institutions.

It may be that we are coming to a time of revulsion against the excuses which have been permitted—as they have never been permitted in responsible societies before (can one imagine the New Haven debacle being allowed in England or in France?)

Students can take over dormitories and can burn banks, but can they run an educational organization or a financial system?

Black Panthers can disrupt court sessions and bring the administration of justice to a standstill, but given their liberty, would they provide a jury system, habeas corpus, appeals, the discovery of evidence and the other guarantees which are now guaranteed to all our citizens.

We can strike down the barriers to the erotic and the sensual in print and on the stage—but can we provide a firm and consistent statement of human goals that will compel admiration and agreement.

These are the real questions which we must face as we struggle to find our way among the contending forces of contemporary life.

In the old days, one would have closed a commencement speech with a series of admonitions or exhortations depending on the cast of mind of the speaker.

This would not do today. General propositions are suspect—and calls to virtue are subject to the pejorative designation of "Victorian morality".

So I shall confine myself to thanking the faculty and students of Ursuline for the pleasure which Rosemary and I have derived from being associated with this School, and to expressing appreciation for the friendships which Parthy has made and for the experiences which she has shared and the knowledge and maturity which she has gained. There has been a tolerance, an inspiration and an understanding on the part of the Ursuline Faculty which are truly noteworthy. There has been a friendliness, a warmth, an enthusiasm and what I might term a "zaniness" about the girls in this school which I find wholly admirable—and I must confess that there have been times when I have wished that I were in the late teen group myself.

Our hope for you, then, is that you will retain permanently something of the special character that is yours today, that this warmth, this enthusiasm, this tolerance, this friendliness, this respect for tradition, and yes, this zaniness of which I have spoken will not be lost—but will be treasured and will be transmitted to others as you go through life.

You have today an idealism, a balance, a self-respect and a reverence that are unique in today's world. May you retain these qualities and may the world regain an appreciation of their value. Perhaps it might not be too much to hope that you could lead the way to such a renovation by your example. Good luck and God bless you all!

BATTLING JUNK SLAVERY

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor's worthwhile

exposé on drug addiction has turned to the domestic ramifications and I am pleased to insert the following article in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. This article makes one appreciate the difficulties faced by the customs agents in trying to stem the flow of narcotics into the country and also the enormity of the task facing the narcotics officers who work in every city trying to break the drug rings. The tone of the article is not hopeful, but then neither are the lives of those who live in the shadow of addiction; but perhaps the realism of the article will help us find the key to successfully stopping the narcotic traffic.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 15, 1970]

AMERICA'S DRUG STRUGGLE: II—FREEDOM FROM HEROIN: BATTLING JUNK SLAVERY

(By Gil Scott)

NEW YORK.—They languish in a world of unfaithful enchantment, indifference to the society from which they have become alienated, indifferent to the abuse they have heaped upon their minds and their bodies.

Street corners, doorways, abandoned tenements are some of the communes they inhabit in shared despair.

A boy wrestled in slow motion to keep his body upright as he leaned against a parked car, fighting off the nod, that irresistible inclination to sleep. A short distance away, a man ambled across the street as he jabbed his left hand in one direction and poked his right hand in another, boxing an imaginary opponent while his eyes waged a losing struggle to remain open.

These are heroin addicts, and you can see them huddled in small knots in Harlem or any other ghetto. Here the United States heroin traffic made its first stop. Here heroin addiction is already a third-generation problem.

The craving for heroin takes up practically the whole of an addict's life. In his endless scramble for another "fix" the addict's job, friends, and family become neglected. He often resorts to crime to support his habit, which could cost as much as \$75 to \$100 a day. This amount is about one-fourth of the value of the goods he has stolen and sold.

When stealing becomes too much for a hassle, many addicts end up as small-time pushers in the traffic as well as its victims.

A longtime Harlem resident called drug trafficking the community's "No. 1 industry."

Many bars and beauty parlors give tacit support to the addict by buying his stolen goods.

"It's the vice that turns people against each other," the Harlemite said. "The tenant upstairs buys the television off the tenant downstairs after it has been stolen by the junkie."

"I'm a dope fiend . . . been using it for 17 years," says a 33-year-old addict, who has spent 11 of those years in prison. "I don't like doing it, because I know it's a thing that places me in the penitentiary yearly. I go to jail every year steady. I'm one of the best thieves out here by everybody's say-so."

SECURITY JOB ASSAILED

He has a wife and four children and says he had to steal about \$200 a day to support his family and his habit. He specialized in men's suits.

"If whitey knew what it was costing him, he wouldn't put dope in Harlem," the addict argues. "We get dope from the Mafia, and we pay for it by stealing from the Jewish guys downtown. The thing is continuous."

None of the addicts interviewed believed that the federal, state, or city governments are making serious efforts to stop the heroin traffic.

They were equally critical of the police de-

partment, accusing some of the police of not only doing little or nothing about the drug business, but actually engaging in it themselves.

"A cop will give you two bundles [that he allegedly took from another addict] and tell you to sell it for \$200 and the time you are to bring the money back to him," an addict said. "And you'd better be there with the money or he'll get you later! That's why we have no respect for the rogue."

"It's a game," said an addict in Brooklyn's Bedford-Stuyvesant section. "They [the police] know what's happening. They make a lot of money on it themselves."

INVOLVEMENT CALLED ISOLATED

Deputy Chief Inspector John McCahey, commanding officer of New York City's narcotics division, says the addicts' allegations are not supported by facts. "Let's face it. They can't like us. We're depriving them. The only thing the addict looks for is his next fix."

There have been instances of individual police involvement in pushing drugs, but Chief McCahey says they were "exceptions to the rule," adding that "we take steps to prevent that from happening."

But police officials are quick to admit their failure to halt the heroin traffic in this nation's drug capital. Harlem now harbors an estimated 100,000 heroin users.

Police Commissioner Howard R. Leary said that "while arrests have been increasing, the illegal drug trade . . . continues unabated, and we must, as always, face up to realities."

The department has attempted to meet the problem by increasing its narcotics squad from 300 to 700 members within the past year.

Chief McCahey said his unit makes about 3,000 arrests a month, half of which result from an agent's actually purchasing drugs from a seller. The unit also raids and closes down 30 to 40 drug "factories." "And yet, the flow seems to continue," Chief McCahey said.

Part of the problem, says one ex-addict who was on heroin 17 years, is that the police only get to the small-time street pushers. "These guys can't even afford a pair of shoes—they're really just little bums like I turned out to be," he said.

DEALER SOPHISTICATED REPORTED

Chief McCahey said big dealers of heroin and other drugs are sophisticated people with a keen business sense.

He explained that only those persons considered trusted and reliable, in the underworld lexicon, have the connections and are able to buy pure heroin in large quantities from whoever smuggles it into the United States.

If the price for a kilo (2.2 pounds) is \$5,000 to \$6,000, a dealer can sell it for \$11,000 to \$14,000 for a quick profit. He has ended his part of a transaction and does not want to have anything to do with street sales, which, according to Mr. McCahey, are the "most vulnerable" point of the operation in terms of chances of being arrested.

Big dealers stay away from the "factories," too, where pure heroin is diluted with milk sugar or quinine, thereby making several kilos of adulterated heroin from the original package.

Instead the "pros" pay others to take the risks.

"I used to get \$200 for working three afternoons a week cutting drugs in a Harlem hotel room," said a 15-year-old Puerto Rican girl who has been on heroin since she was 12.

"This business is very fluid," Chief McCahey comments. "An awful lot of people are getting in. On a regular basis, a person gets a good income from it and his chances of being arrested are almost nil."

"There is a tremendous amount of trust at the upper levels and you don't get them to inform. Otherwise our job would be much easier," he added.

"You want to know who's behind the drug traffic? asked a white addict in Brooklyn. "It goes up to big business people . . . people you can't touch in a million years. Ain't nobody, even the president of the United States, going to get close to them. There are so many channels. Dope goes through 10 or 15 people. You cannot stop it."

MAFIA RULE QUESTIONED

William H. Tandy, chief of the narcotics unit of the U.S. attorney's office for the southern district of New York, told a House committee on crime recently that 15 Mafia members control nearly all of this country's dope traffic.

But Chief McCahey said he does not believe that the Mafia is involved directly in narcotics. Its role, he said, is to provide loans for persons engaging in the illegal traffic.

In Harlem, one resident, who has been an outspoken critic of the dope pushers in that community, said a "black and Cuban Mafia" has emerged to reap its profits.

"Heroin is coming into this country in greater quantities than ever before," Chief McCahey said. "Increasing narcotics arrests in this city cannot curb drug abuse as long as tons of heroin are smuggled across our nation's borders each year."

"Large numbers of pushers and dealers are being arrested after painstaking investigations, but these efforts are frustrated by the continued illegal import of drugs which flow endlessly through the organized criminal market and into the bloodstream of a growing addict population."

Nearly 400 persons have perished from drug abuse since the beginning of the year, according to the chief medical examiner's office. And the number of known heroin users in the city's high schools increased 400 percent during a 1968-69 period.

The use of heroin has not only increased, it has spread beyond the black enclaves to the city's white high schools, city colleges, and even Columbia University—whose students have access to the same dealers as do Harlem's pusher-addicts.

Some Harlemites point to the spread of heroin to the white community with a sad but ironic hopefulness. "The best way to cure the dope problem is to have some son of a senator or judge get hooked," said an ex-addict working in one of the city's drug treatment centers.

Black community leaders are beginning to mount their own antidrug campaigns. New York State Sen. Waldaba Stewart (D) of Brooklyn is supporting male citizen-action groups that make it their business to approach known pushers and tell them to move out. The Black Panther Party in Queens announced recently that it is prepared to use whatever means necessary to force out "the pusher man."

GROUP PURSUES INFORMATION

A year-old group called Mothers Against Drugs (MAD) urges community residents to record the names, addresses, and license-plate numbers of known traffickers, suppliers, and pushers. MAD then turns this information over to the district attorney's office.

These groups are trying to make a dent in the flow of heroin into their own communities. But they also appeal to federal officials to increase efforts to prevent the drugs from entering the country in the first place.

The Bureau of Customs, a branch of the Treasury Department, has the seemingly insurmountable task of blocking illegal drugs at port of entry. With millions of persons traveling to and from the United States an-

nually by air or ship, every person is a potential smuggler of an illegal narcotic drug.

The Congress recently provided \$9 million in a supplemental appropriation which helped increase the customs service and strengthened its investigative powers.

Under what is called the department's accelerated inspection system, which began in early June, customs inspectors at Kennedy Airport, after primary questioning, select 20 percent of the passengers entering the country for secondary examinations and thorough inspections of all their baggage.

CUSTOMS AGENT'S SEARCH POWERS

There are about 300 customs inspectors at Kennedy Airport, which is acknowledged as a major distribution center for drugs.

Customs agents, who belong to the service's enforcement branch, have unusual authority to make a complete search of a person's baggage, personal effects, and his body.

This unit makes wide use of paid informers, some of whom are entitled to 25 percent of the value of the contraband recovered by the government. The amount paid is not to exceed \$50,000 for any one case.

"We've had cases where an individual informer, as a result of information furnished to us, has received several hundred thousand dollars," the customs spokesman said.

The department is also conducting experiments on methods of detecting heroin or cocaine, both of which are almost odorless.

But according to Commissioner of Customs Myles J. Ambrose, the results of these efforts are still negligible. Testifying recently before a congressional committee, he said that the stepped-up baggage inspection system has so far failed to make any "significant" gains in curbing heroin smuggling. And tips from informers account for only about 5 percent of the seizures of drugs at customs, the bureau says.

FEDERAL CRACKDOWN CHALKED UP

The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, a branch of the Justice Department, is the other major federal agency attempting to curb the illegal drug traffic.

Recently, federal agents made raids in New York and nine other cities, arrested 135 persons, and seized heroin and cocaine valued at \$2.5 million on the retail market.

The target, said Attorney General John N. Mitchell, was a nationwide ring handling about 30 percent of all heroin sales and about 75 to 80 percent of cocaine sales in the United States.

But heroin is still very much available. "The raid wasn't even felt out on the street," said John Maxwell, an ex-addict who helps at Phoenix House, one of the city's drug treatment centers. "I can see the fellows out on the street copping just as big as life."

According to Justice Department officials, much of the evidence on which the raids were based came about through wiretapping. Mr. Mitchell is seeking new legislation which would allow the searching of dwellings without notice: the so-called "no-knock" law.

USE OF EXISTING LAWS URGED

Some black community leaders say that even without the support of such legislation, local police could effectively harass suspected big dealers.

"Right next door to this drug treatment center is the biggest dope drop in Brooklyn," said Dr. Barry Primm, director of the Addiction Research and Treatment Center in Bedford-Stuyvesant. "Maybe the police can't catch 'Brooklyn Slim' with the drug. But they could get him on something else—the pile of garbage in his backyard."

According to John E. Ingersoll, director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, his department is hoping for stronger

narcotics laws that would impose stiffer penalties on sellers and stress leniency for youngsters who buy drugs for their own use. Mr. Ingersoll says that the bureau is also "working very hard to get rid of the source in Turkey and France particularly."

But in the end Mr. Ingersoll and other law-enforcement officials suggest that the only way to stop the heroin traffic is to stop the demand for heroin. He stressed the need for more educational programs to deter drug use.

"You've got to get inside the skin of people and turn them off drugs and turn them on to something else—something constructive. People are going to have to resolve their problems without the use of drugs. It's a very, very difficult and frustrating kind of undertaking, but I think we'd better get on with it."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1970

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago this month the 89th Congress during the administration of the late Dwight D. Eisenhower, designated the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. This year, from July 12 through July 18, the people of the United States and 17 other free nations will again mark that anniversary.

As is pointed out in the Captive Nations Week manifesto of 1970, this week's observance falls just 2 months after the 25th anniversary of one of the most poignant anniversaries ever marked in our time. For it was 25 years ago in May, as World War II drew to a victorious close, that the 100 million people from east and central Europe began to be drawn into the Communist domination of Russia. Even as these once free and independent people were celebrating their liberation from the Nazi tyranny, they were being absorbed by the Communists.

Living in freedom we often forget what a priceless possession freedom is, and that even as we enjoy our freedom much of the world still knows only Communist oppression. Yet the revolts of Hungary and Poland in 1956, and more recently the tragic crushing of liberalizing movements in Czechoslovakia should remind us how much those people held under Communist domination for nearly a generation desire freedom. They show us the sacrifices those brave people held captive will make to possess something we take for granted.

Therefore, this week-long observance of Captive Nations Week should give us all an opportunity to reaffirm, not only our efforts on behalf of all repressed people, but give us also the chance to ponder the danger and suffering that can occur through freedom's loss. Let us this week rededicate ourselves to the principal that all men should be free, and strengthen our spirits with that love for freedom that has marked us as a nation from our birth.

THE MOD CORPS

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 9 the Washington Post reported the formation of a national sports committee to help fight drug abuse among America's youngsters. To be known as the MOD Corps, with MOD signifying March on Drugs, five professional athletes were the first recruits in a group expected to reach several hundred. These athletes will make speeches, meet youngsters and explain the dangers of narcotics.

The establishment and growth of drug subcultures among this Nation's youngsters spreads daily. As John Schmitt, center of the New York Jets, stated "when the Jets asked me to talk to some young people a few months ago I was amazed at what I heard. Kids in the early grades, even kindergarten, knew more about drugs than we did—and we thought we were well briefed."

I applaud creation of this committee and hope that more and more athletes will participate in the fight against drug abuse.

For my colleagues' information, I am including the story by Steve Snider into the RECORD:

ATHLETES JOIN MARCH ON DRUGS

(By Steve Snider)

NEW YORK, July 9.—A national sports committee to help fight drug abuse among America's youngsters began forming today under the direction of the MOD Corps—the March on Drugs.

Five professional athletes were the first recruits in a group expected to reach several hundred who will make speeches, meet youngsters and explain the dangers of narcotics:

Rickie Harris, defensive halfback, Washington Redskins—"I went to high school at the edge of the Watts section in Los Angeles and the problem was terrific even then. I escaped because I was busy being an athlete. Yes, I have taken pep pills from a licensed physician to get me through a football game but that's far different than from a pusher on the street. I don't take pep pills any more. And no pain-killers with a needle, either."

Ron Woods, outfielder, New York Yankees—"About 40 percent of the kids in my school at Compton, Calif., were taking drugs. Like Rickie, I stayed away because of sports. The way things are today, with so much around, I don't know whether I could avoid it again without some help."

John Schmitt, center, New York Jets—"I went to a private school on Long Island and the biggest deal was sneaking off for a beer. But when the Jets asked me to talk to some young people a few months ago I was amazed at what I heard. Kids in the early grades, even kindergarten, knew more about drugs than we did—and we thought we were well briefed."

Tom Nieporte, professional golfer—"I have nine children ranging from one to 14 years. I'll do anything I can to protect them. Already I'm amazed at some of the things my 5-year-old son repeats from conversations with older boys."

Mike Bass, defensive halfback, Washington Redskins—"I went to high school in Ypsi-

lanti, Mich., a comparative small, conservative town. Drugs were not a problem. But as Rickie and I went around the country this summer as consultants to the Office of Economic Opportunity, I found that something has been lost by the youngsters. The adults are partly to blame. Between them, they have to find the happy medium."

Norman King, a New York advertising man and chairman of the March on Drugs, said the committee will be expanded to include chapters in all sections of the nation with star athletes being sought for the speakers' bureau.

"The athletes are young," said King. "Kids can relate to them better than they can to adults."

Harris and Bass were winding up a 30-city tour, mostly together but occasionally apart, to explain the new program drawn up by the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington.

"The OEO is certain that just throwing out a bat and ball for the kids in the summer time isn't going to do much good," Bass said. "We explained the OEO's program on job education to officials and talked to kids. One thing we did was to explain to the youngsters that being a plumber or an electrician or something like that may not be glamorous but it sure can pay off."

Today's youngsters, on the average, are a long way from being biased about sports and athletes, Harris said.

"They still send us lots of fan mail and they're down there after a game for autographs," he said. "If they weren't looking up to us a little bit they wouldn't be wasting their time."

"I think we can do a lot of good in the MOD Corps."

PLANNING FOR MORE PEOPLE

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, of which I am chairman, released its final report on July 8, entitled "Earth Resources and Population—Problems and Directions." I have been delighted to see the positive response that this report has already received. Of particular satisfaction to me was the editorial in the Houston Chronicle last week entitled "Planning for More People." I offer this editorial for the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

PLANNING FOR MORE PEOPLE

The United States may be moving to meet the demands of its rapidly expanding population. But is it moving fast enough?

The House Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population has urged the federal government to give emphasis to research and development of potential reservoirs of food and minerals equal to the effort on our space exploration program.

We are exhausting our great stores of natural resources and fuels. Presently we must look elsewhere for more raw materials, for the "potential reservoirs." The sea is one such possible source.

In its final report on the problems of a growing population and its needs, the Task Force, headed by Republican Cong. George Bush of Houston, has stressed the effect of overpopulation on America:

Our cities are overcrowded. They have been

termed "sick" because of it. The resulting friction causes social problems and unrest. Our transportation facilities cannot handle the demands of urbanization.

Fortunately, the United States does not have population problems as severe as many other countries. It can support itself. It produces enough food for its citizens and will continue to do so for many years to come. Yet the increased productivity has been achieved only with fertilizers and pesticides. And they can cause ecological damage.

As we gear our technology to the increase in numbers, we severely strain the environment. How much longer can the earth cleanse itself? No one knows. But at the rate the population has been growing (scientists forecast the world's population will double by 2009) we may find out all too soon.

**ROSE L. STURDYVIN, WINNER OF
VA'S DISTINGUISHED SERVICE
AWARD: MODEL FOR THE NATION**

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, rendering assistance to disabled veterans is a delicate matter.

According to Rose L. Sturdyvin, who has been supplying such assistance in Hawaii for 21 years, the disabled veteran needs help, but may resent overt sympathy. Says Mrs. Sturdyvin:

You have to be sympathetic without appearing to be, and help them to help themselves.

For over two decades, Rose Sturdyvin has been helping disabled veterans help themselves, for most of that time as National Service Officer of the Disabled American Veterans in Hawaii.

She was recently honored by the Veterans' Administration as a recipient of their Distinguished Service Award, the highest honor bestowed by the agency.

Mrs. Sturdyvin's story was warmly told in a recent article in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, and I submit that article for inclusion in the RECORD because I believe she stands as a model for the entire Nation:

**SHE HELPS VETERANS GET WHAT THEY
DESERVE**

(By Kathy Gautier)

If your job title is "national service officer" you have some explaining to do at cocktail parties. It isn't like saying, "I'm a doctor," (or teacher or secretary or high wire acrobat.) Everyone knows what they do.

But being a national service officer for the Disabled American Veterans is something else. Not to mention being the only female national service officer in charge of a DAV office in the United States.

"Basically my job is to counsel veterans, their widows and dependents on the benefits available to them," said Mrs. Rose L. Sturdyvin, who is the only woman to fill this position in the States. She is in charge of the Hawaii DAV office at 680 Ala Moana Blvd.

"I represent them before the rating board of the Veterans' Administration in matters concerning their claims," Mrs. Sturdyvin continued. "That is my job, supposedly, but I usually end up getting involved in their personal problems too. First they come in for their disability claim, then they tell you, their troubles, anything from their children's education to 'My wife left me and I don't know what to do.'"

Mrs. Sturdyvin last month received the highest honor bestowed by the agency, the Distinguished Service Award, for continuing service in 21 years with Hawaii DAV. She has been head of the office for the last 15.

"I came to this office in 1949 as a part-time secretary," the Honolulu born Mrs. Sturdyvin said. "I never intended to stay but somehow the contacts I made, the people—you get engrossed in helping people and you must stay and stay, so here I am."

Besides helping veterans and widows of veterans, there is another aspect of her job which she considers very important—helping the wives of veterans to help their husbands—tactfully.

"Disabled veterans need help," she said, "and the wives are generally understanding and sympathetic. The problem is that the disabled man—even if he's an amputee—resents help and sympathy. You have to be sympathetic without appearing to be, and help them to help themselves."

As a national service officer, Mrs. Sturdyvin is accredited by the Veterans' Administration to bring cases before the VA rating board in the manner of a lawyer before a court. Accreditation also gives her access to the confidential records of the VA.

Mrs. Sturdyvin emphasized that the DAV is not part of the VA, but a separate organization (chartered by the U.S. Congress in 1920) working out of the VA office.

It is not necessary to go through the DAV to obtain veterans' benefits—application can be made through the VA office directly—but Mrs. Sturdyvin feels the DAV performs a necessary function in making families aware of what is available to them and acting as intermediary.

"Some veterans and widows are unaware of the benefits they can get," Mrs. Sturdyvin said, "such as education through the G.I. bill, job training, education for their children. Also, they don't always know their limitations. A widow of a veteran who dies of a service-connected disability is entitled to full death compensation, but if a veteran dies of a heart condition 20 years later, she cannot receive compensation unless she's below a certain income criterion."

Not knowing this frequently causes problems and panic for widows in the following manner, the service officer said:

A widow who is working receives compensation checks regularly from the VA. She doesn't realize that she is not entitled to the full amount she is receiving. At the end of the year the VA sends her an income questionnaire which she fills out. Then it happens—she gets a letter from the VA office telling her she has received an overpayment of \$4,000, and asking her to return the money.

"By then of course she has spent it," said Mrs. Sturdyvin. "And usually she is unable to pay."

At this point, if the widow has contact with the DAV office, Mrs. Sturdyvin steps in and takes her case before the board.

"Usually I've been successful in getting a waiver of overpayment so she doesn't have to pay back the money," she said. "In most cases she can't pay because she's getting so little anyway. Some widows don't know about the service and they borrow, beg or try to get the money somehow."

Cases like this are frequent, she said, although most of them run only to sums in the hundreds, not thousands. Most such problems she thinks could be avoided if the widow consulted the DAV office about her rights, obligations and benefits in the first place.

"Some of them have the attitude that because they have lost a husband or son they are entitled to anything the government gives them," she said.

Twice a widow herself, although not a military widow, Mrs. Sturdyvin finds it easy to sympathize with their problems. Since the

death of her second husband, Earl Sturdyvin, former deputy tax director for the State, in 1965, she has lived by herself in a condominium at the Kapiolani Bel-Aire. She has no children.

"I keep busy with organization work," she said, "most of it connected with veterans."

She is a member of the State Executive Committee for the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Hawaii, and has served on the DAV's fund raising drive. She is a member of the DAV Auxiliary, Oahu No. 1, a past president and current member of the VFW Ladies' Auxiliary, a member of the Zonta Club of Honolulu, and former president of the same club's Wahiawa chapter.

She lived in Wahiawa when Sturdyvin operated the Town and Country Lodge, a Wahiawa restaurant now out of business.

"I didn't have anything to do with the restaurant," she said. "I was too busy here, but I do love to cook. I don't do as much now that I'm alone—occasionally I bake pies and things."

The service officer also knits (she has made several dresses for herself) and loves fashion. Before she was first married she operated her own dress shop.

"But I don't have much time for knitting or much else now," she said. "My job is from 7:30 to 4 supposedly, but really from 7:30 until I'm done."

SOVIET NUCLEAR SUPERIORITY

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday, June 28, 1970, edition of the San Diego Union carried an informative editorial reviewing the conflicting views surrounding our position of superiority to the Soviet Union in strategic nuclear arms. This editorial does much to place in perspective the overriding need to support the bolstering of our nuclear arms. The author, Adm. Ruthven E. Libby, USN, retired, attempts to turn the public on to the pressing situation and I feel this commendable effort should be brought to the attention of my House colleagues:

**SOVIET UNION GAINING NUCLEAR SUPERIORITY,
SAYS WRITER**

(By Ruthven E. Libby)

Aesop is probably too square to be read by the youngsters of today, but the oldsters will remember his fable of the race between the hare and the tortoise.

The tortoise won by proceeding steadily, albeit slowly, while the hare rushed ahead and then doped off.

This famous fable would have been hard put to construct a tale illustrative either of the rise of the Soviet Union to a position of superiority in strategic nuclear arms, or of the mental state of the American public which let this happen. He probably would have likened us somehow to the lemmings.

But, as the House Armed Service Committee said in a report released in late April, "There has not been an arms race; the Soviets have been running at full speed by themselves."

The American public, government officials and our allies have been warned repeatedly of the present situation and informed succinctly of the rapidity with which Soviet superiority is growing. Because of the sources and the number of these warnings, the public cannot possibly plead ignorance. Our refusal so far to act must be ascribed to other reasons.

President Nixon repeatedly has demonstrated his trust and confidence in the members of the armed forces, men and women who have devoted their lives—and often sacrificed them—to defend this nation. As commander-in-chief, he has demonstrated "loyalty down" which is the wellspring of "loyalty up" and the keystone of military morale.

He is unhappy about the tendency of many Americans to view patriotism with scorn, their desire to cut back on national defense, to regard military forces and military spending as inherently evil.

He recognizes the high motives of those who wish to reduce the defense budget in order to improve the domestic environment—but he warns that unless the country has adequate defenses, there may be no environment to worry about. And, he gives us chapter and verse to prove that our defenses, already woefully inadequate, are steadily becoming less so in the face of burgeoning Soviet power.

Both he and Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird have told us that we are now at the point—or very close to it—where we must decide whether we are to continue as a first-class power or settle for a state of subservience to Russia.

Laird has revealed many detailed statistics about the Russians' steadily increasing preponderance in intercontinental ballistic missiles, in SS-9 missiles explicitly designed to knock out our Minuteman silos, in missile-launching submarines, in fractional orbital bombardment systems, in undersea long-range missile systems—in the entire spectrum of offensive first-strike nuclear arms—and in antiballistic missile systems designed to protect themselves against our attack capability.

He has warned us, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, that the Soviet momentum in arms development is a grave danger to the survival of the West.

He has warned that if no progress occurs in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks in Vienna, hard, tough decisions on nuclear arms must be made by the United States, decisions which will require the European members of NATO to shoulder more and more of the burden of their own defense. In return, the NATO defense ministers recognize and are concerned about the continuing growth of the armed forces of Russia.

The House Armed Services Report of April 27 said, "In the last five years the Soviets have increased their strategic offensive missiles from around 300 to 1,500 and have achieved a fourfold increase in the megatonnage of their strategic arsenal.

"The United States, by contrast, is proceeding on a strategic offensive force level that was determined in the mid-'60s and in which no essential change has been made despite a change in the nature of the threat. In the comparable time frame, the United States has reduced its nuclear megatonnage by more than 40 per cent.

"It should be kept in mind that the decision to make MIRV (multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles) a part of the U.S. Minuteman force was made in the 1965 to 1967 time frame. Since this step was considered . . . necessary against the then projected threat, it should be apparent that the continuation of the MIRV and ABM programs are but the continuation of deployment for a deterrent policy adequate to meet the threat as it then existed."

Since this decision was made, the threat has increased many times over. Yet we have done nothing to increase our capability to meet the new threat.

On the contrary, even the continuation of the present limited Safeguard and MIRV programs is in danger from the Senate anti-war coalition.

Last August a 50-50 Senate vote just barely failed to defeat the deployment of even the limited Safeguard program.

This coalition now enjoys a majority in the Senate, and seems increasingly able to

convince the public that funding for correction of domestic woes should take precedence over funding for defense, and that money spent on new weapons systems does not really increase our security anyway. Some of the coalition seem convinced that if we bug out of Southeast Asia and unilaterally disarm, peace will automatically descend upon the world.

Perhaps they should be reminded once again of the Communists' dogma that "peace" exists when the Communist takeover of the world is proceeding on schedule, and "lasting peace" will prevail when it has been accomplished.

They also would do well to consider that whatever human frailties may afflict the rulers of the Soviet Union, compassion and failure to take advantage of opportunities to further Communist aims are not included.

Now that the Supreme Court has relieved our young men of any obligation to fight to defend the liberties they have inherited from their forebears who fought to establish and maintain them, our destruction in short order is assured if we fail to bolster our nuclear deterrent to the point that we are not vulnerable to nuclear blackmail.

CONGRESSMAN WYDLER'S 1970 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, it has become a tradition in the "Fabulous Fourth" Congressional District to send reports of my activities to constituents and, once each year, to ask for their views on important current national issues, by means of a questionnaire. The questionnaire is now in its seventh consecutive year.

I send the questionnaire to every resident who lives in the Fabulous Fourth Congressional District, regardless of party. In this way, I can truly test the prevailing opinion on great national issues.

Once again, many thousands of people of the Fourth Congressional District have answered the questionnaire. The results have been carefully tabulated and I am still busy answering the many comments that have been made to me on the questionnaire returns. The enthusiastic response proves, once again, that people do care about their Government.

I am now sending a copy of the questionnaire results to each home in the Fourth Congressional District. These results show the prevailing opinions in the district.

As for the results, which were obtained mainly in the early spring, three out of every four persons approved the way President Nixon was handling the situation in Vietnam.

More than 90 percent approved a Federal agency to enforce environmental standards, and to make it a Federal offense to send obscene materials through the mails to individuals under 16 years of age. I have sponsored legislation to accomplish both these ends.

Finally, people have rated the control of violence as the No. 1 domestic problem, with pollution and race relations as Nos. 2 and 3.

The complete questionnaire results follow:

RESULTS OF THE SEVENTH ANNUAL "FABULOUS FOURTH" QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, NASSAU COUNTY, N.Y.

[In percent]

1. The Vietnamese conflict: Do you approve or disapprove of the way President Nixon is handling the situation in Vietnam?

Approve ----- 68.58
Disapprove ----- 20.26
Undecided ----- 11.16

2. The inflationary spiral: Do you approve or disapprove of stronger government controls on consumer spending such as restrictions on the distribution of unsolicited credit cards?

Approve ----- 86.80
Disapprove ----- 9.26
Undecided ----- 3.94

3. The rights of consumers: Do you approve or disapprove of increased budgetary appropriations for the governmental agencies concerned with enforcing food and drug regulations?

Approve ----- 84.72
Disapprove ----- 8.60
Undecided ----- 6.68

Do you approve or disapprove of more stringent regulations with regard to food additives or substitutes?

Approve ----- 88.38
Disapprove ----- 4.38
Undecided ----- 7.24

4. The natural environment: Do you approve or disapprove of specific federal standards for keeping our environment unpolluted with an agency designated to enforce these standards?

Approve ----- 94.80
Disapprove ----- 2.18
Undecided ----- 3.02

5. The welfare reform: Do you approve or disapprove of the President's "family assistance plan"—a federally supported "floor" under the income of American families, irrespective of where they live?

Approve ----- 45.96
Disapprove ----- 33.44
Undecided ----- 20.60

6. The social security system: Do you approve or disapprove of tying social security payments directly to the cost-of-living index?

Approve ----- 80.42
Disapprove ----- 11.22
Undecided ----- 8.36

7. The high cost of college: Do you approve or disapprove of allowing income tax credits for college tuition expenses?

Approve ----- 74.24
Disapprove ----- 19.86
Undecided ----- 5.90

8. The transportation setup: Do you approve or disapprove of federal subsidies to localities with major mass transportation problems?

Approve ----- 63.94
Disapprove ----- 26.68
Undecided ----- 9.38

9. The voting age: Do you approve or disapprove of amending the Constitution to permit 18-year-olds to vote?

Approve ----- 39.66
Disapprove ----- 53.66
Undecided ----- 6.68

10. The post office: Do you approve or disapprove of converting the Post Office Department to a government-owned corporation operating on a self-sustaining basis?

Approve ----- 69.38
Disapprove ----- 16.80
Undecided ----- 13.82

11. The abuse of the mails: Do you approve or disapprove of my bill making it a federal offense to send obscene or pornographic materials through the mail to individuals under 16 years of age?

Approve	93.82
Disapprove	3.34
Undecided	2.84

12. The new federalism: Do you approve or disapprove of the President's proposal for a federal-state partnership with the federal government sharing its revenues with states and localities?

Approve	66.88
Disapprove	12.94
Undecided	20.18

THE DECADE OF THE 1970'S

Please give a numerical rating to these domestic problems indicating the order of priority you feel they should have during the next ten years.

	Number
Race relations.....	3
Environmental pollution.....	2
Improved quality of education.....	4
Population explosion.....	8
Mass housing.....	7
Adequate food supply.....	9
Decay of the cities.....	6
Mass transportation.....	5
Control of violence.....	1
Other.....	10

CON SON PRISON

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to inform the House of Representatives that an important news development has been reported from Saigon—important because it reflects another step forward to a more humanitarian world. The Saigon government has announced that the notorious "tiger cages" at Con Son prison will be demolished—erased from the face of the earth.

I hope the South Vietnamese Government will now move quickly to wipe out the last vestiges of brutality and neglect which have typified many of its other prisons and interrogation centers.

At the same time, we should call upon any Americans in Vietnam who have had a role in this disgraceful picture—whether it be directly or by turning their backs—to cleanse themselves also.

Only then can we demand with a clear conscience that the North Vietnamese halt the inhumane treatment of American and South Vietnamese prisoners of war.

The International Red Cross should now be given open and full access to all prisons and detention centers in Vietnam—both North and South—to determine whether necessary reforms have been taken. They should be allowed to interview any and all prisoners they wish. Their reports should be made public so the full weight of world public opinion may be brought to bear on any remaining injustices.

TEXT OF STATEMENT BY I. L. KENEN

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent statement of I. L. Kenen on the situation in the Near East before the Subcommittee on Near East of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Mr. Kenen is the editor of the Near East Report, a biweekly newsletter on American policy in the Near East, and executive vice chairman of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, a national organization which conducts public action to strengthen United States-Israel friendship.

Si Kenen has held a responsible position in the American Jewish community over the years. Between 1943 and 1947, he was secretary of the American Jewish Conference. In 1947, when the United Nations took up the Palestine question, he was director of information for the Jewish agency's delegation, and between 1948 and 1950, he served in the same post in the first Israeli U.N. delegation.

Si Kenen has been a newspaperman both in Toronto, Canada, and Cleveland, Ohio. A founder of the American Newspaper Guild in 1933, he was the recipient of the Guild's Heywood Brown Memorial Award in 1943.

Si Kenen is to be complimented for his fine work for the security of Israel and the Israeli people and for his dedication to peace.

The statement follows:

TEXT OF STATEMENT BY I. L. KENEN

In the Near East today we are witnessing a grim spectacle.

Twenty-five years have passed since World War II revealed the destruction of some six million Jews, the degradation of the survivors of that holocaust and the desolation of the Jewish people around the world. At that time, the civilized international community reacted vigorously and, like the League of Nations after World War I, the United Nations reaffirmed the right of the Jewish people to establish its homeland in Palestine, with which it has been linked for thousands of years of recorded history.

But today that homeland is in danger and there is an incredible indifference to its fate.

Today the tiny nation of Israel, with her three million people, is defending herself from the attacks of the Arab states and the Arab terrorists who have waged war against her since her establishment in 1948.

Israel is caught up in the crossfire of three wars: the war between the Arab states and herself; the Arab-Arab conflict between the radical Soviet-supported states and the conservative Western-oriented states; the cold war between East and West, where she finds herself defending the interests of the Free World but without its active support.

The crucial Arab-Israel issue is the Arab refusal to recognize Israel's right to exist. From the beginning, the Arab states, in violation of the UN Charter and their UN obligations, have persisted in a state of war against a neighbor. In contrast, Israel has steadfastly offered to negotiate peace treaties.

The United Nations has been powerless to cope with violations and to establish peace.

There is a major reason. The Soviet Union, on the diplomatic and military fronts, backs the Arab states as part of her strategy to dominate the Near East. Whatever may be her intention—whether it is to destroy Israel or merely to exploit tensions to further her own imperialism—is a matter for speculation. What is alarming is that the Soviet Union can pursue this evil policy without effective challenge from any source.

But while the Soviet Union must bear primary responsibility for the long struggle—so costly in life and resources to both Arabs and Jews—our own Government has some share in the blame. Over the years, American policy in the Near East has been equivocal, erratic and inconsistent. We have often reversed ourselves. We have been reluctant to take a strong position. We have been immobilized by doubts and fears. As a result, the Arab states still like to believe that the United States will ultimately abandon Israel.

What explains the U.S. attitude?

First, there is fear that the Arab states may retaliate against America's economic and strategic interests. Second, there is danger that the Soviet Union may gain prestige and power in a polarized Near East. And, third, there are the pressures of special interests concerned with short-term advantage, trying to buy some space and time for themselves by offering up bits and pieces of Israel to appease the Arabs. They like to identify their own interests with those of the United States; they wrap the flag around oil derricks.

These special interests always claim that the United States favored Israel over the Arab states because of pressures exerted by Israel's friends and that we need a more "even-handed" policy.

The record refutes the myth.

The fact is that we have been less than even-handed.

In the beginning, in 1947, the United States reluctantly endorsed the UN proposal for the partition of Palestine. But we did nothing to implement that decision. We failed to help Israel to defend her right to the promised state. Instead, we imposed an arms embargo depriving Israel of military assistance from this country. Then, responding to pro-Arab lobbying in and outside the Government, we reversed ourselves; we tried to set partition aside and to substitute an unrealistic UN trusteeship plan.

Subsequently, the United States recurrently pressured Israel to abandon territories she had won in the struggle with the Arabs. While we gave generous economic assistance to both Israel and the Arab states—and Congress was primarily responsible for initiating that program—we repeatedly refused Israel's requests for arms, even after the Soviet Union began arming the Arab states. We detoured her to other countries. In lieu of arms, we offered guarantees, but these faded into scraps of paper when the time came to carry them out.

We declined to support Israel's pleas for direct Arab-Israel peace negotiations. We failed to challenge the Arab boycott. We imprudently perpetuated the Arab refugee problem by urging unrealistic repatriation proposals and by failing to insist on resettlement. And often, over the years, we seemed to be in competition with the Soviet Union for the favor of the Arab states, and certain charismatic Arab leaders, like President Nasser of Egypt.

THE ATTITUDE OF CONGRESS

Throughout this period Congress has displayed greater realism on these issues.

The restoration of the Jewish national homeland was supported by Congress in 1922 and again in 1945—and in the post-war debate, a large majority of the Senate and

House vigorously favored the same objective; they were reflecting the views of most Americans.

The State of Israel came into being with the help of Congress, which also assisted her remarkable development. It was Congress which initiated the economic aid program for Israel, which called for direct Arab-Israel talks, which advocated resettlement of the Arab refugees, which urged arms for Israel, which sought to combat the Arab boycott, which questioned our unrequited affection for Nasser.

Regrettably, its views have not always been accepted by the Executive Branch.

Congressional support for Israel is denigrated and disparaged by pro-Arab forces, which insinuate that Congressmen yield to pressures. The implication is that a minority are prejudicing America's interests and that American Congressmen sacrifice judgment and patriotism for selfish political ambitions.

Those who circulate this mischievous slander reflect on the loyalty of Israel's supporters and impugn the integrity of America's political leaders.

The best answer to this smear is that history shows that Congress actually has been right on these issues.

Support for Israel has been consistent with the highest interests of the United States from every standpoint.

ISRAEL'S ROLE

Israel has proved to be a situation of strength in the Near East, resisting the attempts of radical Arab states and the Soviet Union to dominate the region. The destruction of Israel would permit anti-democratic forces to gain control over every government, every economic resource and strategic outpost.

The first countries which might face a Soviet takeover are the so-called moderate Arab states where the United States has substantial economic interests.

There are many governments in the Near East—Arab as well as non-Arab—which regard Israel as a balancing factor checking the spread of the radical Arab states which are led by President Nasser and supported by the Kremlin. Whatever may be their public posture, they would not grieve if we strengthened our support for Israel.

But further, and of prime importance, Israel is an eloquent advocate of democracy and freedom, informing many people by its example, by its instruction and by its cooperation that independence for the state is not enough—that the individual must also be free and that men can advance to higher standards in a democratic and open society.

Men will defend their institutions from aggression and subversion if they have a stake in their society as free, equal and secure citizens.

We read in the press about the daily exchanges of fire across Israel's frontiers. What we do not read—and what may some day prove of great significance in man's struggle for freedom—is about the daily exchange of learning.

Israel's program of international cooperation today involves some 80 countries all over the world.

Each year more than 1,000 trainees arrive in Israel for courses in agriculture, labor, economics, science and technology—some 12,000 in the last 11 years.

At the same time, Israel annually sends out some 450 experts to help other peoples; 3,000 in 64 countries in the last 11 years.

The program continues despite the war, at a higher rate in 1969 than in 1968.

THE COMMITMENT

In the last few years many Americans have become more isolationist because of reaction to Viet Nam. Some American diplomats have tried to give the impression that we have no commitments to Israel. This trend toward disengagement is predicated

on the claim that what happens to Israel is not of vital interest to the United States.

That view has now been challenged by President Nixon's welcome observations on July 1.

Mr. Nixon and his aides have spoken vigorously on the dangers that now confront the Near East. They warned that the situation there is more dangerous than in Viet Nam, that we need to take action to induce the Russians to pull out their forces.

They made it clear that the United States would not permit the arms balance to be tipped against Israel. They differentiated between the aggressive intentions of the Arabs and Israel's desire for peace.

The White House pointed out that the Soviet combat base in Egypt may transform the Mediterranean into a Soviet sea, obstructing the U.S. Sixth Fleet, putting land bases and oil supplies at the disposal of the Soviet Union and endangering moderate Arab regimes, NATO countries and Iran.

WHAT WE CAN DO

The President's views justify full support for Israel at this time.

1. At the very least we should quickly end our inexplicable tactic of withholding military aid at this critical moment. Such aid should be open so that there is no misunderstanding in either the Kremlin or Cairo. If we are diffident and weak the Arab states and the Soviet Union will be emboldened to push their war further. Symbols and tokens are inadequate to block the Soviet advance.

2. The Administration and Congress should consider what can be done to help ease Israel's economic crisis. We have never given any arms to Israel, and grant economic aid to Israel ended almost a decade ago. Israel has had to pay high prices in life and resources to maintain her security and survival. If the Israel citizen is defending the interests of the United States and the Free World, we should not ask him to carry the entire burden alone.

Israel's defense expenditures have tripled since the six-day war. They will approximate \$1.2 billion in the current year—about 22 percent of Israel's gross national product, which is three times the proportionate burden borne by the United States. The foreign exchange debt will increase in 1970 by \$570 million, reaching a total of \$2.7 billion.

Israelis have heavily mortgaged their future. Israel's per capita foreign debt is the highest in the world; the Israelis are assessed extremely high taxes and forced loans.

Foreign currency reserves dropped to about \$400 million by the end of 1969—the lowest figure since 1962—and since the trade deficit has risen because of huge defense expenditures, Israel's reserves are descending to a bare working minimum.

It is obvious that Israel urgently needs large-scale economic assistance from friendly foreign governments to maintain economic stability.

I do not need to recall to this Committee that we have given \$239 million in grant military assistance to seven Arab states, and that our economic aid and military aid to Greece, Turkey and Iran has been in the billions.

In addition, we have provided billions in aid to strengthen countries which are on the Sino-Soviet periphery. Now for the first time, Soviet military personnel have moved into the Near East, along with huge quantities of sophisticated armaments.

Today Israel faces a much graver threat than ever confronted most of the countries which have enjoyed massive economic and military support from the United States. In the light of our record everywhere else, it is difficult to understand hesitation to provide Israel with assistance.

3. The direct Soviet military involvement in the Near East should be condemned by world opinion. We should mobilize other nations to join in the demand that Russian

military personnel withdraw from Egypt. How can the Soviet Union pretend to be a peacemaker in the Big Four talks in the light of her brazen military operations?

4. We should not condone Arab terrorism nor should we reward and encourage it by diplomatic gestures; we should act vigorously to condemn and to combat it. We should withhold assistance from countries which are involved in harboring or subsidizing El Fatah and other guerrilla groups. There is no glamor or heroism in a movement which "resists" Israel by shooting down passenger planes, by murdering civilians in cafeterias and supermarkets, school busses and bus stations. The international community should impose sanctions against countries which provide sanctuary for terrorists who are involved in hijacking or attacks on planes. We should not permit their planes to land at our airports, nor should our planes land at theirs.

5. Above all, we should insist on a real peace. Arabs and Israelis must negotiate treaties. We cannot be satisfied with half-way measures which fall short of a real peace. We should reconsider our involvement in procedures like the Big Four talks which enable the Soviet Union to try to dictate the terms of a settlement and to entrench itself as the dominant power in the region.

THE RECORD SINCE 1967

When the six-day war ended back in 1967, there was a real chance for an Arab-Israeli peace. Many of us believed that two measures were essential:

1. To promote peace, urge the parties to talk over their differences in direct negotiations;

2. To prevent war, keep the Israelis strong enough to deter the Arabs and the Russians from military action.

To its credit, our Government rejected Soviet pressures that we repeat our 1957 blunder. The United States refused to go along with the Soviet-Arab demand that we pressure Israel to withdraw to the 1967 lines. Instead, our Government endorsed the view that the parties themselves must reach agreement on frontiers, as part of a comprehensive peace agreement.

And it is pertinent to note that more recently, in his television interview on July 1, President Nixon rightly emphasized the need for what he called "defensible frontiers."

The resolution unanimously adopted by the United Nations in November 1967 provided for a UN envoy "to proceed to the Middle East to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in this resolution."

The resolution meant different things to the differing parties.

1. The Arab states and the Soviet Union have insisted that the resolution obligated Israel to withdraw completely and unconditionally to the 1967 armistice lines.

2. To the United States and to Israel the language and the legislative history showed that the frontiers had to be agreed upon, by the parties.

Both the Arab states and Israel insist that they have accepted the resolution. But while some Arab governments give lip service to the resolution, Syria, Iraq, Algeria and the terrorist organizations have summarily rejected the document and will have nothing to do with it. Their declared objective is the liquidation of the state of Israel as a Jewish state. Arab leaders have emphasized that they do not commit the Arab terrorists and that these organizations have the right to reject the resolution because it does not satisfy their objectives.

Thus, President Nasser told the Palestine National Council on Feb. 1, 1969:

"The UAR appreciates the resistance organizations' stand in rejecting, the Nov. 22, 1967 Security Council resolution, which the UAR has accepted. It is the Palestinian organizations' right to reject this resolution. This resolution may be adequate to eliminate the consequences of the June 1967 aggression but it is inadequate to fulfill the Palestinian destiny."

Can this double interpretation be considered as a sincere acceptance?

The United Nations' attempt to bring the parties together to implement the resolution failed.

The Arabs blamed the Israelis. They insisted that the resolution was self-executing. If the parties accepted its principles, it would then be up to Israel to withdraw completely. But the Israelis insisted that the resolution was not self-executing and that it was up to the UN envoy to bring the parties together to reach agreement.

The Russians supported the Arab position. Our Government has supported Israel's stand. This was made clear by former Under Secretary of State Eugene Rostow, who has said on a number of occasions that it was the Russians and the Arabs, not the Israelis, who were obstructing implementation.

On March 1, 1969, at San Francisco, Mr. Rostow said:

"The basic obstacle to peace has been the continuance and intensification of terrorist activities supported or condoned by some Arab governments, and the policy embodied in the Khartoum formula—'no negotiations, no recognition, no peace'."

And he went on to say that the UAR—"Bears primary responsibility at this time for the stalemate in the Jarring mission. . . . It says that it is ready to implement the Security Council resolution as a package deal. . . . But thus far, at least, it has not made clear its willingness to implement the provision of the resolution requiring it to make an agreement establishing peace, nor its acceptance of any practical procedure for reaching such an agreement with Israel."

THE BIG FOUR TALKS

The Arabs and the Russians had another objective. Because of the stalemate over interpretation, they insisted that the Great Powers draw up guidelines for the Jarring mission. In actuality, the Arabs and Russians want the Great Powers to impose a settlement. They regard the Big Four as an admirable instrument to formulate such guidelines because the United States is outnumbered and outpressured in that forum.

Long ago, in 1964, Sir Bernard Lewis wrote that the Arabs want an imposed settlement "in which, perhaps, Soviet arms would wield the knife, while Western diplomacy administered the anaesthetic."

The Israelis kept appealing for direct negotiations but Arab sympathizers in this country, mocked this demand as an insincere tactic to avoid settlement. They oppose direct negotiations for they consider that it would be a humiliation and beneath Arab dignity to sit with the Israelis.

DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS

The call for direct negotiations is not merely a bargaining tactic. Israel learned in 1949, after the successful Rhodes armistice talks, that agreements could be reached when she met directly with the Arab states.

But in 1949 and 1950 the UN Palestine Conciliation Commission yielded to the Arabs at the Lausanne talks and, as a result, the Israelis were in one hotel, the Arabs in another, the UN commission in a third. The parties never met; the negotiations were stalemated for a year and a half. Israel learned its lesson at that time.

A principle is involved. The Israelis believe that if the Arab states are not ready to meet and to negotiate the issues directly with them, they are not really ready to live in understanding and peace. What the

Israelis are looking for is more than uneasy coexistence. What they want is a full peace of sincere reconciliation which will end incitement to hate and which will open frontiers to an exchange of goods and goodwill—a cooperative effort toward security and a higher standard of living for all the peoples of the area.

Years ago I heard the leader of the American Friends of the Middle East tell an audience that our duty was to keep Arab and Jew apart—not to bring them together. This curious line drew some support from the Department of State.

In 1961 the Democratic platform called for direct Arab-Israel talks and Candidate John Kennedy announced that he would try to bring the parties to the peace table.

But in the fall of 1961 the U.S. delegation voted at the United Nations against the so-called Brazzaville resolution, which was initiated by Afro-Asian countries and which called upon the Arab states and Israel to negotiate. That negative vote was a blunder which was criticized by many Members of Congress.

We hoped that this strange opposition to direct negotiations had ended in 1967, but there was no sign of it in the diplomacy of this period.

In the summer of 1967, King Hussein could have reached an agreement with Israel if he had entered negotiations with her. But there is no evidence that the United States encouraged the Jordanians to meet with Israelis at that time.

If Hussein had moved, he might have anticipated and averted the growth of a terrorist movement which now shares control over his country, blocks a peace and incites a never-ending war against Israel. Instead of going to Jerusalem, as he might have done, the Jordanian king elected to go to Khartoum in Sudan, where he and Nasser obtained their subsidies from the oil-rich Arab states to sustain their economies and strengthen their war machines.

Early in 1969, the Administration accepted the French proposal for Four Power talks. This meant that the Arab states would no longer be under any need to negotiate directly with Israel. It also meant that the United States would be under strong pressure from the Russians to accept their interpretation of the resolution.

The United States did in fact retreat on a number of major issues. This became evident in the proposals offered by Secretary of State William P. Rogers in December 1969 for Egypt and Jordan. These proposals critically undermined Israel's position in any future negotiations.

I would like to put into the record (as appendix 1) the policy statement adopted by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee which comments on these proposals.

After the Big Four talks began in 1969, 70 Members of the Senate and 282 Members of the House joined in a declaration which insisted that there could be no half-way measures and that there was no effective substitute for direct talks.

It is no coincidence that just about the time the Big Four began to meet, Nasser was emboldened to denounce the UN cease-fire, which all the parties had accepted, and to open his war of attrition against Israel.

ISRAEL'S ARMS REQUEST

On the Suez front, the Egyptians outgun and outnumber Israel and they inflicted heavy casualties. The Israelis used their highly efficient air arm to silence the Egyptian guns and to reduce the heavy casualty toll.

At the same time, the Israelis renewed their appeal to the United States for additional planes. The French were refusing to deliver Mirage planes which Israel had already paid for. After a long delay, the United States announced in March that it believed that Israel still had a qualitative advantage

over the Arab states—even though the Arabs had a four-to-one advantage—and that it would therefore defer action on Israel's request.

This decision was taken despite the news that the Russians had already agreed to install the sophisticated SAM-3s inside Egypt. The State Department said that it had taken this into account, characterizing that new Russian initiative as merely "defensive."

Our country had several reasons:

1. It feared Arab retaliation against U.S. economic interests, specifically the flow of oil and the profits from oil.
2. It hoped that the Arabs might be more receptive to a peace settlement.
3. It hoped that the Russians might similarly curtail the flow of arms.

I do not propose to debate an issue as sacred as oil. But I do recall that both in 1956 and again in 1967, the Arab states realized they were courting economic disaster when they tried to withhold their oil from the West. Moreover, we should bear in mind that Nasser and Hussein would collapse if the oil-rich Arab states had to cut off their subsidies.

Now it is quite possible that the West might suffer short-term losses if it helped Israel, but this short-range prospect ignores the implications of a Soviet diplomatic and military victory. If the Soviet Union is permitted to weaken or destroy Israel, then every state in the Near East will be vulnerable to Egyptian-Soviet subversion and pressures for nationalization.

Israel's existence is a *priori* protection for American oil interests in the Persian Gulf—in Saudi Arabia, in Kuwait and Bahrain, in the Trucial States, and in Southern Arabia and Iran.

The plain fact is that Israel is the only stabilizing factor in the entire Near East—the only factor that keeps the area from flying apart, from becoming a scene of chaos—with the Arab states, goaded on by the Soviet Union, at each other's throats.

Without an Israel, Jordan would long ago have disappeared, swallowed up by either Syria or Egypt, probably the spoils of a war between them. And Lebanon would have gone the way of Jordan. Without an Israel, Nasser and the Soviet Union would be well on their way, through Yemen, to Saudi Arabia and the rich oil fields there and in the Persian Gulf.

Without Nasser's defeat by Israel, he and the Russians would have rushed in to fill the vacuum left by the British at Aden, exposing the oil-rich areas of the southern tip of the Arabian peninsula, such as Muscat and Oman, to their ambitions.

Our negative answer to Israel's request for planes did not produce a more receptive Arab attitude toward the U.S. peace initiative. On the contrary. When Mr. Sisco visited the Arab states, feeling was so high against the United States in Jordan that our Ambassador thought it unwise for Mr. Sisco to enter that country.

On the major issue—the arms race—the Russians soon showed that they had no intention of reducing their involvement. Twenty-five days after the Rogers press conference it was learned that the Soviet Union was sending pilots into Egypt. Obviously, the Russian action was not defensive. The new Russian technicians help in the installation and use of the new missiles which provide an air cover for offensive action along the Canal, while the pilots undertake missions against the Israel air force.

Meanwhile, in Washington, there were reports that the Administration was hesitating to say yes to Israel because there were some doubts about the attitude of Congress. There was a swift answer on Capitol Hill. In a remarkable demonstration of support for Israel, a letter was signed or endorsed by 79 Senators—and there were similar communications to the President endorsed by 239

Members of the House. These letters all urged the Administration to provide planes to Israel.

This was not the first such demonstration. Earlier this year, a declaration calling for direct negotiations and military support for Israel was endorsed by 70 Senators and 281 Representatives.

THE NEW PEACE INITIATIVE

Yet the Administration was still reluctant to grant Israel's request. And on June 25, Mr. Rogers announced a new space initiative, the reactivation of the Jarring mission and a 90-day truce period during which neither side would attempt to gain a new military advantage. In order to win acquiescence of both sides, the United States apparently will delay action on Israel's request for planes.

It has been widely reported that the United States is using Israel's application for planes as leverage. It is a carrot to be fed the Israelis if they cooperate with our peace proposals; it is a stick to flay the Arabs if they are not. Accordingly we may expect the Russians and the Arabs to stall for time. They will claim to be receptive to the Rogers peace initiative while they continue to prepare to force Israel to withdraw from the Suez Canal.

Both the Egyptians and the Russians want to reopen the Suez Canal—the Russians particularly because they want to send their fleet and shipping from Odessa in the Black Sea to the Indian Ocean, Africa, India and Viet Nam; the Egyptians because the Canal is a money maker. They can do it if they can wrest control of the air from Israel. They can do it if Israel begins to run out of planes.

Nasser said in Libya on June 25:

"The Egyptian army has completed its canal-crossing training, and once the army has acquired a balance in the air, no power in the world can stop it from crossing.

"We will be able very soon to make up for Israel's air superiority by obtaining a balance in the air because we are training hundreds of pilots and obtaining hundreds of planes."

Why must Israel hold the Suez until there is a peace settlement? Because Israel's frontiers are now much shorter and more defensible than they were in 1967. Israel now, for the first time, has defense in depth. Its front lines are far removed from its populated cities.

Today there are more Arab soldiers on Israel's frontiers than in 1967, but the Israelis do not have to mobilize as they did in 1967, paralyzing their economy, for they not only have distance from the Suez Canal front but they also have the depth of the Canal to bar the advance of Egyptian forces.

Meanwhile, there are inspired dispatches which assure us that Nasser is for a peaceful solution—that he does not really wish to drive Israel into the sea.

But on the very day that Mr. Rogers announced his peace initiative, Nasser said in Libya:

"The Arab masses know that their strength lies in their unity, . . . and unity means the end of imperialism and its collaborators and the liquidation of Israeli aggression and the Zionist entity."

All Arab calculations are predicated on their hope to intimidate the United States into standing aside.

The involvement of Soviet pilots has diminished—if not eliminated—Israel's qualitative superiority. The Israelis have begun to lose planes in their battle to defend the Suez sky—and prevent an Egyptian crossing. And their older French planes are wearing out.

There have been reports that Israel is getting some replacements for planes she has lost. I hope this is true. However, we are told that the United States will not announce the extent of any new military supplies to Israel.

But many are asking, why not? Can we deter the Arabs and the Russians from pressing their war to the finish if we do not put

them on public notice that we are standing firmly with Israel? Our past experience with the Russians has shown that they will push aggressively into every corner where they encounter no resistance, that they increase arms shipments precisely when we hold back. If we want to stop Russian penetration in the area, we must move to strengthen Israel at once. That is the most practical and most effective deterrent. If the Russians are determined on reckless military adventure, it must be made expensive for them. They must be made to realize that they will have to pay a very high price.

THE OPPOSITION PRESSURE

Unfortunately, there is a school of thought in Washington which argues the other way. They do not want to make it harder for the Russians. They seem to think that we must placate the Arabs and that we will gain popularity among them if we exercise "restraint" in our support of Israel. This, of course, would make it easier for Nasser and his Russian friends.

I know Arabists in Washington who believe that Israel's victory in 1967 was a disaster for the West, for, they argue, it enabled the Soviet Union to pick up the pieces and reinstate Nasser. Some even suggest that the Soviet Union tricked Nasser into war in 1967 in order that he might lose so that the Soviet Union might come in as his savior.

And today there are some who think that we would be better off if we stood aside and permitted the Russians a free hand in the area. They are paralyzed by an obsession with polarization.

I am not debating here with imaginary straw men. Recently, one of our ex-cryptodiplomats, an ex-CIA agent in Cairo, Miles Copeland, published a book which reveals how he and other CIA agents tried to court Nasser in Egypt.

That book is damaging to the United States because it confirms for many Arabs—as well as for Israelis—that the United States had a major objective in the Near East—to build up Nasser as its protege and agent. It is interesting to note Mr. Copeland's views on Phantoms:

In a letter to the *Paris Herald Tribune*, on June 13, 1970, Mr. Copeland reveals that in a recent visit to Washington he was assured that "the principal fear of the Executive Branch . . . unlike those Senators who are up for reelection—is not what the Soviets are doing in Egypt but of what our own Government may be forced by domestic politics to do for Israel."

Mr. Copeland believes that the Soviet Union wants us to supply Phantoms to Israel because that will enable them to win all the Arabs over to their side, to the prejudice of American interests. The implication of Mr. Copeland's thesis is that any military aid we give Israel really helps the Russians. He attributes this view to American diplomats in Washington. Would he turn this around to argue that the way to stop the Russians is to withdraw all aid from Israel and join the Russians in prayers over Israel's memory?

I believe that such arguments impede progress toward peace in the Near East, and are inimical to American interests. For they feed the flames of Arab intransigence. They encourage the Arabs to believe that ultimately a frightened United States will abandon Israel to Cairo.

THE HOPE FOR PEACE

We should not be pessimistic about the prospects of peace in the Near East. It will take a long time before the Arab states become reconciled to Israel's existence and perhaps new Arab leadership will be needed. But I like to think that eventually the people of the Arab world will come to understand that they can live at peace with Israel

and that they stand to gain more by reconciliation and peace than by hatred and war.

We need to have positive goals in the Near East. We need to reaffirm principles which offer new opportunity and hope to the peoples there.

Our current policy appears to be based on negative considerations: the avoidance of dangers, the avoidance of a nuclear confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States, the avoidance of an interruption in communication lines, the avoidance of nationalization, the avoidance of polarization. But what are we for? We seem to be on the defensive and we seem to be reacting to dangers rather than creating a new climate and environment for the acceptance of ideas and ideals cherished by America and the Free World.

There is a vast difference between Israel and the Arab states. All of them struggled and won independence from foreign domination. But the people in Israel have gained something more than independence for the state. In Israel the people achieved freedom and equality for the individual, democratic institutions to enable them to find self-expression, social security to ensure them a stake in their country. This has not been the case in the Arab world where any experimentation with democracy has been short-lived and where people are ruled by military dictatorship or by feudal and dynastic regimes.

I am not suggesting that the way to peace is for us to promote new coups to overthrow the military dictators and thus to establish democratic societies.

But I do submit that it is our task to stand firmly with those who resist totalitarian aggression and who cherish freedom for the individual and democracy for his community. When the ballot box replaces rule by rifle in the Arab Near East, we may hope for a change in the Arab attitude.

If the Arab states and the Soviet Union continue to defy the UN cease-fire and to prosecute their war of attrition against Israel, it is because they believe that they can weaken both Israel and the United States to the point where our country will feel that it must surrender to what the Soviet Union is pleased to call a political solution.

If we can make it clear that we are enlisted with Israel in the struggle for a genuine peace—and that we are enlisted for the duration and will not waver—the time may come when wiser men will come to power in the Arab lands to lead their people away from destruction and war to genuine cooperation and peace with all their neighbors.

APPENDIX II

STATEMENT OF POLICY ADOPTED AT THE ELEVENTH NATIONAL POLICY CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, MAY 11-12, 1970

The alarming intervention of Soviet pilots, soldiers and technicians in the Arab war against Israel has drastically changed the balance of power in the Near East and represents an immediate threat to Israel's existence.

The United States Government should act at once to meet this new danger and to deter the Arab states and their Russian ally from launching a fourth war against Israel.

We appeal to our Government to provide additional supersonic planes to Israel without further delay. Any postponement will weaken Israel's deterrent military position, materially and psychologically. Delay will make her more vulnerable to attack and, at the same time, fortify Arab resistance to peace negotiations.

The immediate supply of U.S. arms to Israel would serve our national interests and would honor our commitment to preserve the integrity and independence of a staunch democracy.

The people of Israel are carrying a stag-

gering economic burden of war forced upon them by the Arab states and the Soviet Union. We urge U.S. economic assistance to Israel. Israel must not be asked to stand alone and unassisted in her struggle for survival and in the defense of democracy and freedom.

The goal of the United States in the Near East is an Arab-Israeli peace. Its achievement requires direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab states leading to binding peace treaties.

Such negotiations have been retarded because Big Power talks have encouraged the Arab states to believe that the Powers would dictate a settlement responsive to Soviet-Arab demands and prejudicial to Israel's security. The militant partisanship of the Soviet Union and France has discredited them as objective participants. Our Government's withdrawal from these talks and their termination would hasten direct negotiations and serve cause of peace.

THE ISSUES

1. The Big Power talks

The Big Power talks began early in 1969 after the United Nations failed to implement the resolution of November 22, 1967, which empowered a UN envoy to work toward an agreement between Israel and the Arab states.

Israel favored direct negotiations to implement that resolution, but the Arab states rejected any talks with Israel, demanding her unconditional withdrawal from all territories occupied in the June 1967 war.

As the Big Power talks began, Egypt repudiated the UN cease-fire on the ground that Israel had refused to withdraw from all the occupied territories.

The November 22 resolution is not self-executing and does not call for total withdrawal. All attempts to make the resolution require total withdrawal were defeated. The intent of the resolution is that withdrawal must be to "secure and recognize boundaries."

For the Big Powers to draft specific proposals prior to negotiations between the parties is contrary to the intent of the resolution.

During the Big Power talks, the United States yielded to strong Soviet-Arab pressures to retreat from its positions with respect to three major issues:

A. Boundaries

In the past, our Government advocated negotiations by the parties to determine boundaries. But in the 1969 proposal for Egypt, the United States called categorically for reinstatement of the old Sinai international frontier. In the case of Jordan, it called for a return to approximately the former armistice lines—with only "insubstantial" changes.

These proposals limit Israel's ability to negotiate secure frontiers. Return to the 1967 lines means retreat to 1967 close-range exposure to terrorism and siege. These lines, far from preventing war, are conducive to war.

Moreover, the U.S. proposals on the Sinai frontier encouraged the Arab states to demand that the United States press for restoring the old international frontier with Syria. This would permit return of Syrian forces to the Golan Heights, making Israel's Galilee and Jordan Valley villages a ready target, and would enable Syria to renew schemes to divert the major sources of Israel's water supply.

B. Jerusalem

While continuing to maintain that Jerusalem should be a unified city and opposing arbitrary return to its partition, our Government now proposes that Jordan become a partner in its administration. Such binational rule is neither equitable nor practical.

Jordan merits no reward for 20 years of misrule in Jerusalem, Jordan seized the Old City in defiance of the 1947 UN resolution. Jordan closed the gates to all Jews, as well as to Christian and Moslem Israelis; Jordan desecrated synagogues and cemeteries. Jordan fired the first shots on Jerusalem in 1967—shelling the New City.

Jerusalem is the capital of Israel and must remain a united city. Israel's policy provides safeguards for universal responsibility in matters pertaining to Moslem and Christian Holy Places. Israel had restored the shrines of Jerusalem and opened the Holy Places to peoples of all faiths.

C. Refugees

The United States has proposed that Israel permit the Arab refugees to opt for repatriation to Israel or resettlement in Arab lands, and that an annual quota be fixed between Israel and Jordan.

Mass repatriation would mean the destruction of Israel by a hostile fifth column. The U.S. proposal goes beyond past UN resolutions and feeds irredentist opposition to resettlement, the only realistic solution.

The Arab war against Israel created two refugee problems.

More than 500,000 Jews were forced to leave Arab lands; where they were the victims of discrimination and oppression. Most of them were resettled in Israel.

A similar number of Arabs fled what became Israel in 1948. They fled because Arab leaders destroyed their right to self-determination by starting a war against the UN resolution that would have established an Arab Palestine. While many of these refugees have been settled in other Arab lands, the majority have been denied resettlement and have been exploited as hostages by Arab governments in their war against Israel.

Arab governments must assume their share of responsibility for solving the refugee problem. Arab refugees must be resettled in Arab lands where there is room and opportunity for them to lead useful lives. Israel has announced that she is prepared, even in advance of a general settlement, to enter into international discussions to work out a five-year plan for resolving the refugee problem with international and regional aid.

II. Jews in Arab countries

The remnant of Jews who still remain in Arab countries are victims of imprisonment, torture and murder.

We are dismayed by the refusal of the United Nations to concern itself with this violation of human rights. This indifference becomes all the more shameful in the light of UN preoccupation with unfounded Arab charges of mistreatment of Arabs inside Israel-administered areas. The Arab states must permit Jews to emigrate.

III. Self-determination

Israel's right to self-determination in the ancestral home of the Jewish people was recognized by the international community and confirmed in the decisions of the League of Nations in 1922 and the United Nations in 1947. Israel has been a member of the United Nations since 1949.

Since World War II, 14 Arab states achieved independence and became members of the UN. One of them, Jordan, was awarded a large area of Arab Palestine by the British in 1922, and Jordan seized an additional part of Palestine—the West Bank and the Old City of Jerusalem—in 1948.

The Near East is not a domain reserved exclusively for the Arabs where they may deny self-determination to other nations and veto autonomy and equal rights for minorities. It is a vast region where many peoples,

Israelis as well as Arabs, are entitled to self-determination and sovereignty.

IV. Freedom of navigation

International waterways such as the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran must be open to the shipping of all nations, including Israel, in conformity with international convention and law. There can be no compromise with this principle.

V. Terrorism

Arab terrorism has gone far beyond Israel's borders. Arab terrorists have attacked civilian aircraft of many flags, murdering and injuring innocent men, women and children. Piracy in the skies must not be tolerated. Sanctions should be imposed against countries harboring terrorists.

From the very beginning, the United Nations has been unable to cope with Arab terrorism—a major cause of the three Arab wars against Israel—which is destroying the possibility of Arab-Israeli understanding and which eventually may lead to a fourth war.

CONGRESSIONAL DECLARATIONS FOR PEACE

We call attention to a 1969 Declaration endorsed by 70 Members of the Senate and 282 Members of the House of Representatives calling for direct negotiations as a major goal of American policy.

The 1969 Declaration states:

"We believe that the issues which divide Israel and the Arab states can be resolved in the spirit and service of peace, if the leaders of the Arab states would agree to meet with Israelis in face-to-face negotiations. There is no effective substitute for the procedure. The parties to the conflict must be parties to the settlement. We oppose any attempt by outside powers to impose halfway measures not conducive to a permanent peace.

"To ensure direct negotiations and to secure a contractual peace settlement, freely and sincerely signed by the parties themselves, the United States should oppose all pressures upon Israel to withdraw prematurely and unconditionally from any of the territories which Israel now administers. . . .

"Peace will outlaw belligerence, define final boundaries, end boycotts and blockades, curb terrorism, promote disarmament, facilitate refugee resettlement, ensure freedom of navigation through international waterways, and promote economic co-operation in the interests of all people."

In 1970, Congress reaffirmed these views when a large majority—70 Senators and 281 Representatives—signed a declaration calling for direct negotiations and the provision of arms to Israel.

The American people must persist in the effort to achieve an Arab-Israeli peace, which would serve the highest interests of the United States.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

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

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

How long?

RESOLUTION REIMPOSING THE
EXCESS PROFITS TAX

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Massachusetts House of Representatives has passed a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation reimposing the excess profits tax. I support and urge my colleagues to support the re-enactment of the excess profits tax on manufacturers of war materiel.

During the last 6 years, the American economy has been suffering from an inflationary spiral. Recently, the American economy has been undergoing a serious recession. Since the inflation and subsequent recession has been a resulting outgrowth of the war in Vietnam, it seems appropriate that the economic burden of the war be shared by the manufacturers of war materiel which reap the benefits of the war. Nonmilitary manufacturers and American taxpayers have been overburdened long enough.

Emergency measures for raising revenues were enacted during World War II and the Korean war. Since the war in Vietnam is costing every American more than the war in Korea, it seems only equitable that the defense manufacturers which profit most from the war be most heavily taxed. Moreover, with no relief in sight for the continuing recession, the need for more revenue is essential. The increased revenues derived from the excess profits tax could be used for badly needed and long overdue domestic programs.

Higher taxes on consumers, taxpayers, and nonmilitary manufacturers is unacceptable despite the need for more revenue. It is unfair for Americans to assume the full economic burden of the war while some manufacturers of war materiel are allowed to accumulate enormous profits. War operations thrive while most manufacturing operations suffer from such adverse economic conditions as tighter money, less demand, and smaller profits with consequent layoffs. We must not allow this intolerable condition to prevail.

If we are to convert our economy from war to nonwar, as we must, we must divert war industries from becoming preoccupied with the potential profits of war. The interests and incentives in industry which support war must be abolished.

As we all know, military appropriations and outlays are enormous. I am concerned and troubled by poor and inefficient management of defense industries, cost overruns, and the accumulation of tremendous profits by defense industries. The excess profits tax could curtail some of the detrimental conditions which exist in our defense industries. The excess profits tax which was used during World War II and the Korean war did not tax the defense industries which were struggling or making reasonable profits. The excess profits tax,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

as its name implies, only taxes defense industries which make unreasonable or excess profits. It is for the above reasons that I wholeheartedly support the resolution and commend it to my colleagues.

MASSACHUSETTS HOUSE RESOLUTION

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation reimposing the excess profits tax

Whereas, Emergency wartime measures for raising revenues were enacted during World War II and the Korean War; and

Whereas, In view of the tremendous financial burden imposed by the Vietnam Conflict on the taxpayers of the Commonwealth and of the United States, and for the purpose of alleviating this burden, the emergency wartime measures for raising revenue by imposing the Excess Profits Tax on manufacturers of war materiel should be re-enacted for the duration of the Vietnam Conflict; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation imposing the Excess Profits Tax on manufacturers of war materiel; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted, July 7, 1970.

WALLACE C. MILLS, Clerk.

A true copy.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

JETS TO ISRAEL

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we must sell the Israelis the jets they have asked for.

I am not one of those who believes in exporting arms for the sake of our balance of payments, nor do I believe that every underdeveloped country needs a supersonic air force to protect it from communism while its people starve. In my view, it will be no loss if the Cooper-Church amendment causes the military sales bill to be held in conference forever.

Nor do I believe that the present semi-cold war in the Middle East can lead anywhere but to disaster for everyone concerned.

Nevertheless, in the short run we have no choice. If Israel cannot replace her aircraft losses, she will cease to exist. I am inserting the editorial entitled, "The Time To Help Israel Is Now," from the San Francisco Examiner of July 15, 1970, in the RECORD at this point:

THE TIME TO HELP ISRAEL IS NOW

Judging by our mail, most of our readers agree with us that the Nixon Administration should stop stalling and sell Israel those 125 jet warplanes she has been pleading to buy from the United States.

A move to spur such action now has been launched in Congress. Senators Peter H.

Dominick, of Colorado, and Henry M. Jackson, of Washington, have introduced the following self-explanatory amendment to the pending Armed Services appropriation bill:

"The Congress views with great concern the deepening involvement of the Soviet Union in the Middle East and the clear and present danger to world peace resulting from such involvement, which cannot be ignored by the United States.

"In order to restore and maintain the military balance in the Middle East, by furnishing to Israel the means of providing for its own security, the President is authorized to transfer to Israel, by sale, credit sale or guaranty, such aircraft as may be necessary to counteract any past, present, or future increased military assistance provided to other countries of the Middle East."

We would like to see this amendment passed quickly and unanimously by both houses of Congress.

If you feel the same way, you can help by clipping this editorial and mailing it to your favorite senator or representative.

DRUG IDENTIFICATION

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to correct a problem which poses a serious danger to the lives and health of all of the American people—the problem of drug identification.

I have just received a report issued by Dr. Charles G. Moertel of the Mayo Clinic. I would like to bring a portion of this report to the attention of my colleagues:

During the year 1968, approximately 100,000 patients were seen at the Mayo Clinic for general medical examinations. The drug consumption of a large random sampling of these patients was surveyed as well as our accuracy in properly identifying these drugs. These figures were then projected to our yearly patient registration. Of the total 100,000 patients, 77,000 were taking one or more oral drugs immediately prior to their clinic examination. 35,000 patients were unable to identify the drugs they were taking. Since many patients were taking more than one drug, there was a total of 51,000 individual drugs which their examining physicians had to attempt to identify. After using all the time and assistance we were able to devote to this task, there still remained 22,000 drugs which we could not identify.

In the time that might be spent identifying five drugs, a complete history could be taken and a detailed physical examination could be performed on one more patient. Consider the fact that we have 51,000 drugs to identify each year. The cost of time spent trying to identify drugs must of necessity be reflected in the medical charges assessed to our patients. But even more important that the economic factors is the influence of 22,000 drugs we could not identify on the quality of medical care we delivered to these patients. For such patients, it is possible that the drug effects may have obscured our diagnostic studies and we may fail to recognize a disease disguised by treatment, or perhaps an illness induced by the drug itself. If we withdrew the unknown drug from the patient we may be taking away vital therapy; if we prescribed therapy in addition to the unknown drug, we may produce a hazardous

compounding of drug effect. Obviously this situation is intolerably detrimental to good medical practice, and this is not a problem peculiar to us alone. It exists in every hospital, clinic, and doctor's office the country over. This situation is both tragic and absurd. It cannot be allowed to continue.

The magnitude of this problem has been recognized and corrective actions strongly urged by medical groups. Although a handful of pharmaceutical companies have voluntarily acted to properly identify their products, it is obvious that this significant hazard can only be adequately eliminated by legislative action.

The lives and health of the American people are at stake, and I believe it is imperative that we act to correct this problem.

OPERATION KEELHAUL

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress I have had numerous occasions to criticize the State Department and have recommended a complete review and overhaul of this agency's operations. My preoccupation with State and its much needed revitalization has been acquired over the years and for various reasons. Nor am I the only one by far who has appreciated the need for vast corrective measures. A number of Presidents have been severely critical to the extent that they too called for a revamping. For various reasons and over an extended period of time many others generally recognized the necessity for drastic changes in a department which handles vital international affairs for this Nation.

The case of Operation Keelhaul serves as an excellent illustration of why knowledgeable people have had grave misgivings down through the years with operations at Foggy Bottom. Although taking place in 1945, the depressing story of Operation Keelhaul emphasizes the crying need for vast changes, changes much talked about but to this date not effected.

Briefly, Operation Keelhaul was the code name for the operation which repatriated between 1 and 2 million Ukrainians and Russians, against their wishes, to Russia at the end of World War II. They were prisoners of war and civilians who had fallen into the hands of American liberating forces in Germany, having fled Russia during the war and who were at the end of the war residing in camps in Germany.

Mr. Julius Epstein, now with the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University, has for years sought to have made public the details of this wholesale repatriation but has been stymied in securing the necessary documents from the Department of Army on the basis of national security reasons. Just recently the Supreme Court

refused to review his case for release of the documents, thus ending the avenue of judicial action.

In May 1956, Mr. Epstein appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and testified as to State Department involvement in the Keelhaul operation. One can appreciate the magnitude and importance of this case when one recalls the Soviet treatment of its own people, the actual millions of human beings brutally murdered since 1917. It is not at all surprising that some of the repatriates commit suicide rather than return to certain slavery or death. History will probably never record the eventual fates of these unfortunate people, but the record should be made straight as to the sickening and pathetic role played by the United States in this tragic episode. It was for this reason that Mr. Epstein has worked for years to bring the full story to public attention.

I insert at this point excerpts from Mr. Epstein's testimony of May 16, 1956, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and a letter by him appearing in the June 25 issue of the Arizona Republic:

TESTIMONY OF JULIUS EPSTEIN

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Epstein, will you give your full name and address to the reporter?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Julius Epstein, E-p-s-t-e-i-n, 470 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Mr. MORRIS. Where were you born?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Vienna, Austria.

Mr. MORRIS. When did you come to the United States?

Mr. EPSTEIN. On March 9, 1939.

Mr. MORRIS. What is your business or profession?

Mr. EPSTEIN. I am a writer and a foreign correspondent for German newspapers.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Epstein, do you have any knowledge of the subject matter which was discussed by a man who has testified before this subcommittee as Mr. Andriyve, about people being in the United States on false papers?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us what you know about that and the sources of your knowledge?

Mr. EPSTEIN. This is a very old problem in the United States. There are now 20,000, at least, maybe thirty or forty thousand, former Soviet nationals living in the United States.

They had to falsify their identities in Europe, mostly in German refugee camps, in order to escape forced repatriation behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you explain that, please?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes; I would like to quote our President, who mentioned their case in his wonderful message to Congress, on February 8, 1956, when he said:

"A large group of refugees in this country obtained visas by the use of false identities in order to escape forcible repatriation behind the Iron Curtain; the number may run into the thousands. Under existing law, such falsification is a mandatory ground for deportation. The law should give relief to these unfortunate people."

These are the words of President Eisenhower on February 8.

I understand there is now an amendment pending in Congress which would deal with this problem. But I want to point out—

Mr. MORRIS. Who are these people; these people, I mean, that are the subject of this beneficial legislation?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Ukrainians, Russians, some Poles. You know that according to the Yalta

agreement, we had to repatriate these people. They didn't want to go back, even those who were deported by Hitler to Germany from Russia. Millions of them preferred to stay in Germany.

But we repatriated between 1 and 2 million of those people, prisoners of war as well as civilians, against their wishes.

Now, many who are afraid of this tried to save themselves by falsifying their identities.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you explain that? They wanted to conceal the fact that they were Soviet citizens; is that right? Because if they were Soviet citizens, they would have been forced to return to the Soviet Union.

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes; without any regard to their individual wishes.

Mr. MORRIS. You say there were more than a million people forced to return?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes.

Senator JENNER. On what basis were they caused to return?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Well, on the basis of the Yalta agreement on the exchange of prisoners of war and liberated civilians—it was signed under the protest of our Acting Secretary of State, Joseph C. Grew, who, wired our Secretary of State Stettinius, then in Yalta, and warned him against a conclusion of any agreement which could enforce repatriation of prisoners and civilians.

Mr. MORRIS. How do you know that?

Mr. EPSTEIN. I studied very carefully the Yalta documents and I came across a little note, "not printed." A certain document, surprisingly, does not appear in the Yalta papers. So I asked Secretary Dulles to release this diplomatic note to me.

A few days later, I got a letter signed by the Chief of the State Department of Historical Division, Bernard Noble, dated April 28, 1955:

"DEAR MR. EPSTEIN: Enclosed is a copy of the Department's note of February 1, 1945, to the Soviet Embassy relating to prisoners of war. You requested this in your letter of April 11, 1955.

"You also requested a copy of any answer to the message of February 9, 1945, from the Secretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., to Acting Secretary Joseph C. Grew. No record of such an answer has been found."

Now, this note, which was presented to the Washington representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Novikoff, on February 1, 1945, exactly 3 days before the beginning of the Yalta Conference, explained to the Soviet Government which wanted repatriation of Soviet prisoners then in the United States, captured in German uniforms.

Now the State Department, over our Acting Secretary Grew's signature, told the Soviet Government that—

"We will never return these people. We cannot repatriate these people, because this would be a gross violation of the Geneva Convention. They were captured in German uniforms, and the Geneva Convention does not permit us to look behind the uniform."

Mr. MORRIS. What is the date of the Grew letter?

Mr. EPSTEIN. The note was presented to Mr. Nicolai V. Novikoff on February 1, 1945.

Mr. MORRIS. And you say that note was a protest that we would never return these people because a repatriation would be a violation of the Geneva Convention, and that was dated February 1, 1945?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes, I quote:

"I would like to outline to you the reasons why, in the opinion of the American authorities, these persons cannot, without presenting serious difficulties, be delivered for shipment to the Soviet Union. It appears to the appropriate American authorities, who have given most careful consideration to this situation, that the clear intention of the Convention," meaning the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929, "is that prisoners of

war shall be treated on the basis of the uniforms they are wearing when captured, and since the containing power shall not look behind the uniforms to question the citizenships."

Senator JENNER. So our State Department then was aware that returning these refugees by force after 1945 was a violation of the Geneva Convention.

Mr. EPSTEIN. Absolutely. This was not only a violation of the Geneva Convention, but also a complete reversal of the old American tradition of ready asylum for political exiles, because we also repatriated by force hundreds of thousands of civilians.

If you will permit me to read a very illustrative letter which American Ambassador Grew wrote me on September 19, 1955, I will do that.

"I appreciate very much the facts you have set forth about the part I tried to play in the forced repatriation issue. I remember one occasion when as Acting Secretary of State I learned that a ship had already sailed from one of our ports carrying prisoners for forced repatriation. I gave immediate orders which resulted in the ship being held up and returned to port for a thorough screening of those sailors who wanted to return and those who wanted to stay. The figures of the result of such episode are not now before me."

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Epstein, you read a while ago in the first letter from Mr. Dulles that such a note is not in existence?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes; but it doesn't appear in the Yalta papers although the Yalta papers contain about 64 documents which were issued before the beginning of the Yalta Conference. There is a reference in one of the cables to this note. Since there is a little footnote "not printed," I had a feeling that might be an important document which proves in official State Department terms that the forced repatriation of about 2 million anti-Communists, prisoners, and civilians, was a violation of the Geneva Convention.

We do not know who overruled at Yalta this well-established State Department policy.

Senator JENNER. When did you get this letter from Secretary Dulles? Would you read the date of that again?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes; on April 28, 1955.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Epstein, in other words, may I be sure I understand your position?

You have learned now of the existence of a letter from Mr. Grew dated February 1, 1945, in which he unqualifiedly stated the position of the United States Government to be that they would never permit the return of these 2 million people back to the Soviet Union.

Mr. EPSTEIN. This is not quite correct, Judge Morris. This note deals with the Soviet prisoners of war captured in German uniforms fighting on the west front.

Now, for instance, a lot of people, many other Soviet nationals enlisted in the German Army in the hope that they would get the opportunity to fight against the Soviet Union.

Mr. MORRIS. Were there 2 million of those people?

Mr. EPSTEIN. There were about 1 million of those people, 900,000 to 1 million.

Mr. MORRIS. And Mr. Grew made the point that the United States cannot return them because it would be a violation of the Geneva Convention.

Mr. EPSTEIN. It would be a violation of the Geneva Convention, and also jeopardize our own people. We had many foreign nationals in our own Army who were in fact in exactly the same position. They fought in American uniforms, but they were Germans. We did not want to jeopardize their fate.

Mr. MORRIS. The Yalta Conference was held a few days after that?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes; the Yalta Conference opened on February 4, 1945.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know what happened at the Yalta Conference to overrule the United States position on this matter?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes. When it became clear that the British and Soviet were going to sign the agreement on the exchange of prisoners, Grew sent a telegram to Stettinius and told him:

"We cannot sign this; we just delivered an official diplomatic note to the Soviets which explains that we cannot forcibly repatriate Soviet nationals captured in German uniforms."

"In addition to that, we have many prisoners who were not citizens of the Soviet Union on September 1, 1939."

This is the essence of Grew's telegram of February 7, 1945.

Two days later, Stettinius wired back and informed Grew that we have to sign it because we want our boys, who are now in prisoner-of-war camps in Germany in the Soviet Union, back as soon as possible; that we cannot deal with the intricacies of the Geneva Convention; that we cannot deal with these considerations of humanitarian principles in the Geneva Convention.

Mr. MORRIS. In other words, we acquiesced in yielding up the terms of the convention?

Mr. EPSTEIN. Yes. General Dean signed for the Americans and General Grizlov signed for the Soviets the now famous Yalta agreement on the exchange of prisoners of war and liberated civilians.

Mr. MORRIS. How many people were sent back?

Mr. EPSTEIN. That is a very difficult question, Judge Morris. Nobody knows the exact figure. Maybe the Pentagon knows. But everything concerning the repatriation is highly classified, even now.

I had a lengthy correspondence with the Secretary of the Army and the people in G-2 and so forth, and I couldn't get one paper because they told me they are all highly classified.

In one letter they wrote me, they said that a representative of the Department of the Army will confer with Senator Eastland about the declassification of the key paper. This is a paper called Operation Keelhaul.

Senator JENNER. At this point I want to direct our staff to communicate with the proper officials to ascertain what are the true facts in the position of the United States Government in the breakdown of the Geneva Convention.

Mr. MORRIS. It shall be done, Senator.

Mr. EPSTEIN. May I give you the exact number and title of this document? This is a highly classified document. The number is 383.7-14.1, Forcible Repatriation of Displaced Soviet Citizens, Operation Keelhaul.

This document was issued for internal use only, and is now deposited—at least I hope so—in the Historical Records Section of the Army in Alexandria, Va.

Mr. MORRIS. Is that Keelhaul?

Mr. EPSTEIN. That is right. It was named for one of the most barbaric punishments in the old British and Dutch Navies.

According to Webster, it means:

"To haul under the keel of a ship, either athwartships or from bow to stern, by ropes attached to the yardarms on each side. It was formerly a punishment in the Dutch and British Navies, and a method of torture used by pirates."

[From the Arizona Republic, June 25, 1970]

"TOP SECRET" CLASSIFICATION UNWARRANTED
EDITOR, THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC:

The denial by the Supreme Court to review my legal action "Epstein vs. Resor," as reported in the press June 15, makes the miscarriage of justice in the lower courts final.

By this denial, the Supreme Court declared the "Freedom of Information Act" a dead letter.

The Supreme Court's denial raises the question: "What is the American Congress going to do?"

"Human Events" of May 30 carried an article, "Is the 'Freedom of Information Act' really working?" by Carol D. Bauman. The writer of this article lists "Epstein vs. Resor" among the key lawsuits based upon the "Freedom of Information Act."

Miss Bauman writes: "The appellate court upheld the decision of a lower court denying release of the document. However, Freedom of Information specialists say that the case was significant since it was the first time the appellate court clarified its authority to determine whether information is being 'secret' legitimately."

"Some congressmen are calling for a congressional investigation into the continued classification of the Operation Keelhaul files."

The two lower courts found that non-disclosure was warranted in the interest of foreign policy and national security. They miraculously found so without ever having seen and examined a single document of the three volumes comprising "Operation Keelhaul" (whereby refugees from communism were forcibly returned at the end of World War II).

Material classified on the ground of protecting foreign policy and national security is indeed exempted from disclosure but only if disclosure would really harm American foreign policy or national security, in other words, only if the documents in question were rightfully and properly classified.

According to the "Freedom of Information Act" and a sworn affidavit submitted in court by the act's sponsor and author, Congressman John E. Moss of Sacramento, the intent of Congress was to give the courts the "widest latitude" to examine classified documents—in camera—in order to find out whether they had been properly or improperly classified.

The army itself proved beyond the shadow of reasonable doubt that it was improperly classifying "Operation Keelhaul" documents when the Secretary of the Army, Stanley Resor, the defendant in my lawsuit, suddenly released four documents from "Operation Keelhaul."

Not a single one of these documents warranted a Top Secret classification. In one of these documents, ALCOM, Rome asked for more Russian interpreters. This purely technical document bore for more than 23 years the stamp "Top Secret!"

Why? Would its declassification have resulted in breaking of diplomatic relations, in an outbreak of war or in compromising intelligence data, the only valid reasons for Top Secret classification as laid down by President Eisenhower in his Executive Order 10501?

The American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California stated in its Brief of Amicus Curiae in Support of a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari submitted to the Supreme Court of the United States:

"Finally, the judgment (of the lower courts) makes no sense. How can judges decide important questions without having the crucial facts before them? There was no compelling national interest to be served by precluding not only disclosure but also review in camera of the file."

"A citizen's right to know, a historian's scholarly research, the open disclosure policy of Congress, and the interest, vital to our judicial process, of having an adequate record to review were all sacrificed for a false sense of security."

JULIUS EPSTEIN,
Hoover Institution,
Stanford, Calif.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE ARKANSAS
WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH
CENTER

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Aubrey E. Harvey, the director of the Water Resources Research Center of the University of Arkansas, has recently corresponded with me regarding his interest in the enactment of H.R. 15957 and S. 3553, which would amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 to increase the authorization for water resources research and institutes. I am pleased to learn that the Water and Power Resources Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, chaired by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, held a hearing on July 20 on this proposed legislation.

I would like at this time to direct to the attention of my colleagues a summary of the contributions of the Arkansas Water Resources Research Center. The center is in great need of the increased allotment proposed in H.R. 15957 and S. 3553 if it is to meet the research needs of the State of Arkansas. I hope that the Congress will give its speedy approval to this legislative measure.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the summary:

ARKANSAS WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH
CENTER

CONTRIBUTION OF CENTER TO WATER RESOURCES
TRAINING

Number of students trained with equipment and supplies purchased totally or in part with P.L. 88-379 funds—312.

Number of Master's Thesis published in water related fields—15.

Number of new courses in water related fields added to the University of Arkansas curriculum as a result of the Center's involvement in water resources research—12.

Number of reports and journal publications—26.

INVOLVEMENT OF CENTER IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS

The Director of the Center is a member of the Governor's Coordinating Committee on Water Resources under the Office of the Governor.

A member of the research staff has served as chairman of the Arkansas State Committee on Stream Preservation.

Research personnel have served as consultants to a project at the Arkansas Medical Center concerning rapid changes of oxygen level in measurements of reaction rates of flavoenzyme oxidases.

Research personnel have consulted with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in regard to the measurement and control of oxygen consumptions by fish in a controlled environment.

Research personnel have consulted with personnel at the Robert S. Kerr Water Research Center at Ada, Oklahoma, in regard to measurement of water quality parameters.

Research personnel have made presentations before the Arkansas Water Resources Planning Committee and have testified before the Parks and Recreations Sub-Committee on Senate Interior and Insular Affairs

Committee concerning the need for National Park Service protection of the Buffalo River in northern Arkansas.

Research personnel have consulted with Southwestern Research Associates regarding the study of the dispersion of chloride into Lake Catherine, Arkansas as a by-product from a vanadium mining operation and have also cooperated with Greers Ferry National Fish Hatchery in regard to controlling manganese concentration in the water supply.

Research personnel have consulted with the Water Conservation Service concerning the effect of impoundment on small watershed impoundments constructed under P.L. 566.

Research personnel have cooperated with the University of Arkansas at Little Rock in advising Arkansas Power & Light Company in their long-range study of thermal pollution in conjunction with their nuclear power plant scheduled for operation by 1972.

Research personnel have played an important role in developing water quality standards which were submitted to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration by the Arkansas Pollution Control Commission.

One publication of the Center concerning sub-surface irrigation has received considerable interest including several international inquiries.

Reports resulting from one project of the Center have been used directly by the Arkansas-Oklahoma Compact Committee. The Committee was formed with the specific purpose of apportioning the joint water resources of Arkansas and Oklahoma.

The Center co-sponsored with Ouachita Baptist University a seminar on the DeGray Reservoir, an impoundment constructed on the Caddo River by the U.S. Corps of Engineers. This seminar was attended by fourteen federal, state, and local agencies and organizations.

WILL ECONOMIC POWER WITHOUT
ARMS BE POSSIBLE?

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the wonder that is the economy of Japan since World War II may present the world with a political model as well as an economic one.

A recent editorial in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin pointed out that Japan plans to be an exception to the historical rule that no nation retains economic power without becoming a military power as well. If she can succeed at this, Japan will have lighted the way for other nations toward a path of competition in trade rather than in weapons systems, saving billions of dollars and perhaps an entire civilization.

In the hope that my colleagues and others readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will find it instructive, I include the full text of the Star-Bulletin editorial of July 4, 1970, at this point:

POWER WITHOUT ARMS

The relative calm in Japan as the government announced its intention to continue in effect its Security Pact with the U.S. is in marked contrast with the stormy demonstrations 10 years ago when the pact went into effect.

The 1960 riots were so violent, it will be recalled, that they prevented a visit to Japan by Dwight Eisenhower, then President of the United States.

A press service dispatch totalling up the number of antipact demonstrators all over Japan as approximately 750,000 conveys a wrong impression of a violently outraged minority.

The truth appears to be that the demonstrations, while substantial, fell far below the hope of their sponsors who had hoped they would be the most dramatic in history. Instead, they were somewhat mild even by contrast with last November's demonstrations over the reversion of Okinawa. They reflect the same mood as last December's elections in which the government won overwhelming support.

For a few years, at least, the U.S.-Japan Pact now seems likely to continue undisturbed. That, hopefully, will be long enough for the U.S. to get itself out of Indochina.

Implicitly, the Security Pact states the intention of Japan not to rearm itself and to rely instead on U.S. protection.

Prime Minister Sato said this week that world history shows that no nation has ever remained an economic power without also becoming a military power.

Japan intends to be the exception to that rule, he said: "It will be a stupendous task but we will do it." Japan's neighbors and the U.S. have almost as much at stake in this effort as Japan itself.

If Japan pulls it off, other nations may also see a way out of the disproportionate arms spending in which the world is now engaged.

CHEYENNE FRONTIER DAYS: THE
DADDY OF 'EM ALL

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, an estimated 150,000 people from the 50 States and many nations are journeying to Cheyenne, Wyo., for the biggest happening of the year—Cheyenne Frontier Days. It started Tuesday and runs for 6 big days.

The "daddy of 'em all," Frontier Days is the biggest, best, and oldest rodeo in the world. This is its 74th edition.

Frontier Days come on the heels of another event conspicuous in our history: the 80th anniversary of Wyoming statehood on July 10. There is such a close connection between Frontier Days and Wyoming's existence as a State that I think it would be appropriate to have an excellent article written by Pat Hall of the Wyoming Tribune-Eagle, included in my remarks. The article makes clear that statehood was celebrated with as much gusto in Cheyenne as Frontier Days is today:

GREAT DAY 80 YEARS AGO

(By Pat Hall)

"Wyoming is out of the woods," read the telegraph message from Delegate Joseph M. Carey in Washington. In a few days the world will see the new American star."

The date was June 27th, 1890 and the occasion was the passage by the Senate of the bill to admit Wyoming as the nation's 44th state.

Flamboyant editor Edward A. Slack printed

the next day's edition of his Cheyenne Sun in red and blue ink and an enormous rooster crowded on page one—"Wyoming—Ain't She a Bird?"

According to Slack's account, the day had been an unusual one for Cheyenne. Dark clouds had covered the sun and rain poured down in the early afternoon "making the superstitious think it was an omen of disappointment." Crowds had gathered downtown all day, waiting for news of the Senate's vote, the House already having passed the statehood bill on March 27.

"At exactly 3:30 p.m. the dark clouds rolled away from the heavens," Slack wrote, "and the sun shone brightly on the city as the news flashed over the wires from Washington that Wyoming had become a state."

Editors in those days couldn't resist such things as "omens". Looking back through the collection of statehood editions in the files of the Cheyenne Newspapers, it is difficult to sift the real news out of columns of type about omens, political recriminations and damnation of the opposing newspapers.

Slack's reporting of what happened in town is interesting, though. According to him, runners were dispatched from the various newspaper offices to all parts of the town to post copies of the telegram from Carey.

"Then pandemonium seemed let loose. Hundreds of men and boys could be seen running in every direction, shouting and gesticulating as though a cyclone had just struck the city, but their smiling faces soon dispelled any idea of a calamity.

"In less than five minutes, the streets were thronged with people," continued Slack. Boys and men blew bazooks and amid the din of revelry hundreds were hurrying in different directions with bundles of bunting, flags and fireworks. Soon the business portion of the city was a flowing mass of looped streamers and flags and fireworks exploded with repeated concussion."

Slack was an intelligent man who couldn't resist the opportunity to display the prowess of his vocabulary. Reading Slack is a bit like reading today's Times magazine—there are always two or three words in every issue that you've never heard of.

He tells about women and children wearing tri-colored sashes to celebrate the event. "A number of ladies looked very pretty," said Slack, "by arranging the parallel lines of red, white and blue in the form of a vichu on the bosom of their breasts and wearing miniature flags on their cuffs."

The Cheyenne Ramblers rated a mention, too. "They entwined the wheels of their machines with the national colors, eliciting universal admiration. Each member of the club carried a rifle from which they would continually fire blank cartridges like a feu-de-jole as they rode around the business streets in single file."

If you were one of the great unwashed who didn't know what a "vichu" was or what a "feu-de-jole" looked like, it really didn't matter on the statehood celebration day.

Cowboys who were in town galloped back to outlying ranches with the news, Slack reported, and the Union Pacific band started an impromptu parade while the Swedish society carried an enormous stuffed eagle. Other stuffed eagles seemed to appear from everywhere.

"At 4:40 the artillery from Fort Russell galloped up to the state capitol under the command of General Mizner . . . and quickly unlimbered near the south entrance. Forty-three rounds were fired in the direction of the city to represent the number of states in the Union."

Evidently the artillery were poor shots or they were firing blanks as Slack doesn't report that the city suffered any damage.

The exuberant editor goes on to tell about "young and middle-aged persons playing leap-frog on Ferguson Street" (Carey Ave.) and "buggies and carriages . . . burning red fire."

As the day wore on into night, a huge bonfire was started at the corner of Ferguson and 17th Sts. and a number of politicians made speeches from the balcony of T. A. Kent's bank "but it was impossible to distinctly understand what the speakers said on account of the noise."

"At the end of each short speech, the band played a patriotic air, the gun club fired a volley and rockets ascended into the sky."

Slack reported that "Mr. Madison and five or six other colored gentlemen came on the platform and sang an impromptu song about Wyoming's statehood to the tune of "Marching Through Georgia."

In the window of Rhodes & Troxell's store was displayed another stuffed eagle on which was inscribed "Wyoming—No. 43—You Bet, She's a Bird."

(The celebrants were a little premature in naming Wyoming as the 43rd state to enter the Union. A week later, President Harrison signed the bill to admit Idaho seven days before he got around to signing the Wyoming bill.)

Even the Cheyenne dogs showed their patriotism. Slack said many had sleigh bells tied to them and "in some cases their hair was dyed with a succession of red, white and blue circles."

All in all, it was a great day for Wyoming—a day that took about a month to live down.

The city was quiet on July 10, the day that President Benjamin Harrison signed the bill admitting Wyoming into the Union. They were too busy organizing the "official" celebration which came on July 23.

That was the Cheyenne of 80 years ago when the state was admitted into the Union. Though we might say it a bit differently today, the sentiment is still the same: "Wyoming—Ain't She a Bird."

In 1897, only 7 years after our achieving statehood, Frontier Days was held for the first time. Since then the Frontier Days has grown right along with Cheyenne and has helped to give our capital city a prominent place on the American map. It brings together in one arena the top rodeo performers in the business and the best animals in the world. The lure is the largest purse in rodeo and daily crowds of over 20,000 people.

Frontier Days is more than a rodeo; it is a week of thrills, chills and excitement for everyone from the youngest to the oldest. There is something for everyone, including free chuckwagon breakfasts, exhibitions, Indian dancing, parades, and concerts, and just about anything you can name. Frontier Days is a week to relive the frontier spirit which is the basis of so much of America's heritage. It is a bridge between our past and our future.

The whole community of Cheyenne pitches in to put together Frontier Days. To me this is a most significant aspect of the week—watching the whole community working together to make certain that the visitors receive the best hospitality it is possible to offer.

Despite all the other attractions, however, the rodeo is still the feature. More than any man in the West the competing cowboy has a close kinship with the pioneer who opened up this vast land of ours and won it against what seemed like impossible odds.

A rodeo event is more than just a sport; it is an individual test of a man's courage, strength, and pure cussiveness.

In many ways the cowboy of today is markedly different from his ancestor. He is as much a businessman as a horse-

man. He is as likely to use a jeep, a trail-bike or helicopter as he is to use a horse, but still he faces many of the same hardships and trials as did the cowboy during the 19th century. The genesis of the rodeo is in the real everyday workings of the cowboys of the frontier. The summer, 1970, issue of the Good Life in Wyoming contains an article entitled "Rodeo, the Last Frontier." It is an excellent summary of the origins of the rodeo:

Trail drivers were tough men and independent, living in the saddle and sleeping under the open sky. They drove their cattle through drought and dust and blizzard across some of the wildest country man has pioneered.

They knew their cattle as a craftsman knows his tools. They carried guns—to kill coyotes and other range varmints—but they worked with a rope on a horse.

Occasionally they'd hit a trail town where they blew off enough steam in the brief moment of history to keep generations of fiction writers busy ever since. A visit to town, in the long monotony of their lives, was an unexpected pleasure.

Between towns they made up their own amusements. These men created recreation that was typically tough. The hands of the different cattle outfits coming together on the trail bet their scant wages on their skill at riding rank broncs or roping long-horn steers. It was a rough sport for short stakes. The prize—the cowboys' own bets—was held in a hat.

Frontier Days has a long and glorious history. Generations of spectators, generations of riders, have participated in this annual event. I believe, however, this year's edition is going to be the biggest and the best of them all. So I urge everyone with free time and the desire to relive a bit of the Old West to hit the trail for the Daddy of 'Em All in Cheyenne, Wyo.

WHERE WE STAND—LET US LOOK AT THE RECORD

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

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

WHERE WE STAND—LET US LOOK AT THE RECORD

During my recent travels throughout New Mexico, and in reviewing the thousands of returns from my second annual legislative questionnaire, three of the most-often mentioned topics of concern are (1) inflation, (2) the war in Southeast Asia, and (3) domestic disorder. I am pleased to respond with a current review and status report on these subjects.

THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY

The efforts of this Administration, and of a good many Members of Congress from both political parties, has been to taper off inflation without the kind of recession that usually follows the type of wild spending spree our nation experienced in the Sixties.

Although unemployment has been up, close to 5%, it is considerably below the 6.7% unemployment of 1961, just prior to the build-up of troops in Vietnam, and the 5.1% average of 1960 through 1968. Noteworthy, however, is the fact that total employment has hit an all-time record high

this year—over 79 million Americans are employed—total employment is now almost 1½ million higher than it was one year ago.

Real per capita disposable income—what individuals have available to spend after allowing for taxes and inflation—was at the highest rate in history in the first half of 1970.

We are now passing through the first phase of a successful campaign against inflation in which the rate of inflation ceases to rise. As a part of this campaign, the Administration has slowed down the expansion rate of federal spending drastically, from an average rate of 12 percent a year in 1965-69 to 7 percent in 1970 and is projected at less than 4 percent in 1971. This has enabled us to keep the budget close to balance in fiscal 1970 and fiscal 1971. We have achieved this restraint on total federal spending while recognizing important new national priorities with respect to the environment, welfare, transportation and other purposes. To do this, it was necessary to keep firm control of defense spending, cutback less urgent non-defense programs and press for greater efficiency throughout government.

The Administration and Congress have not run for the superficially attractive solution of wage-price controls, which no one would want one month after they had been put into effect. The runaway spiral was set in motion by the "new economics" political doctrine of the 60's which promised lower taxes and inaugurated record federal deficits that sank the government into a 59 billion dollar hole—culminating in the record-staggering \$25 billion deficit in 1968 alone. The new Administration initiated sound, responsible economic policies that gave us a fiscal year 1969 surplus of \$3 billion, reduced the annual increase in federal spending by better than 50%, and curbed the causes of zooming prices.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

When President Nixon took office last year he inherited a full-scale war in Southeast Asia in which approximately 550,000 U.S. military personnel were engaged. Whether this was a "moral" or "legal" war was irrelevant. It existed and he had to deal with it intelligently. Since that inheritance, he has completely changed the direction, through his Vietnamization Program, from an American responsibility to a South Vietnamese responsibility. There's already been an overall reduction of 125,000 Americans who were committed in Southeast Asia, and there'll be 150,000 less by Spring of next year . . . meaning that one-half of the boys committed to the War in 8 years of the two previous Administrations will have been brought home in the first 2 years of the present Administration.

For all practical purposes, we will have withdrawn our combat troops and the forces remaining will be primarily supply and logistics units. That means we shall have disengaged and turned the fighting over to a well-trained, million-man South Vietnamese Army. Our noncombatants also can come home as rapidly as this Army develops its capability to handle the supply and logistics tasks. There is no magic button here in Washington, unfortunately, which can be pushed and accomplish all these things instantly.

The action against the North Vietnamese Communists in the Cambodian sanctuaries proved extremely crippling to their future ability to interfere with our orderly withdrawal and with the South's developing strength. In excess of 8 million rounds of small-arms ammunition have been seized and over 20,000 mortar rounds, and 2,000 land mines. This and other captured Communist war material will not be used to carry out Hanoi's orders to its troops in the sanctuaries to kill no less than 100 Americans per week to keep the political pressure

on Washington. It will not be available to keep us pinned down in a faraway place we desperately want out of.

Some people believe that passing the so-called "amendment to end the war" will make the war disappear. By withholding money, the amendment would restrict how, where, and when action is taken to get us out of this mess. Frankly, I think the idea is dangerous and counterproductive. Hamstringing the President will not make it any easier or quicker to cool off the fighting and breathe life into the Paris talks.

In expressing these views I do not feel at all omnipotent. I have a decent respect for those whose outlook differs from mine. I am prepared to change my mind if I am in error and trust that other people would do likewise. Pride is not important here—ending the war and keeping out of others is. I think it is also important in the dialog on this subject to maintain a decent respect for our country and its President and a balanced perspective on the deep responsibilities of North Vietnam for perpetuating the war.

RESTORATION OF SOCIAL ORDER

I have discussed what we've done to try to bring about order in an inflated economy, and order in a divided world. As I see it, order is not an end in itself . . . it is the only democratic way to more freedom, more justice, more change for the better. In that spirit, let's briefly examine the third great area of concern in which order is necessary . . . in the way we live with one another.

There can be no greater evidence of disorder in society than the sound of gunfire on a college campus. From Kent State to Jackson State, we have seen the citadels of reason turn into fortresses of force, and as a result the nation has witnessed the saddest semester in the history of American education.

However, let's keep the campus disruptions and student violence in the proper perspective. Out of some 2400 colleges and universities in this country, only about 400 of them experienced disruption and/or suspension of the academic program during the recent student unrest . . . and reliable research on the situation reveals that less than 10% of the students were involved in the campus disorders at the 400 affected institutions. Therefore, only 10% of 1/6th, or 1/60th . . . less than 2% are creating 100% of the havoc and doing a grave disservice to the reputation of the overwhelming majority of our fine, respectable young Americans of today.

The hope for order in our society goes far beyond the intelligent use of restraint in keeping the peace; it draws upon the natural revulsion to violence on the part of the American people, which is making itself felt now within every group and each generation.

In this regard, it is a hopeful sign that the increase in crime in this country is beginning to come under control. We are still far from our goal, but the explosive rate of increase has been cut in half. Moreover, one of the greatest contributors to crime, the drug traffic, is under an attack the likes of which it has never seen before. This attack is especially directed at the suppliers and pushers who prey most viciously on our young people.

We've established an effective, capable Department of Justice that is letting the hopheads, thieves, crooks and criminals understand that crime doesn't pay like it once did . . . and as a result of President Nixon's appointments, for the first time in 13 years, the Supreme Court is becoming independent of the activist, liberal coalition which has ruled it.

There are times when the shock of tragedy awakens a people to the futility of violent actions and reactions, and I believe we are going through such a time. This Administration is doing everything that responsive leadership and cool judgment can do, to hasten the return to the tradition of peaceful change.

Admittedly, there are still many perplexing problems and challenges, domestically and internationally, confronting us today. They can be resolved. But it won't be easy. It won't be done by negative thoughts, nor by tearing down, nor by protesting and condemning. It will be done by level-headed, strong-willed, resolute builders who constructively work to make their dreams come true. It can, and will, be done by a united, proud, patriotic nation of free people in a Great Constitutional Republic known as the United States of America.

ORDERLY MARKETING LEGISLATION AND DOMESTIC PRICES

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, some rather extreme statements have been made by free trade enthusiasts claiming that the enactment of orderly marketing legislation (the Mills bill as an example) will result in sharply increased retail consumer prices in the United States. One gross example of this has been the claim that passage of this legislation would result in a 30-percent retail price increase for shoes and shirts.

This is not only a ridiculous exaggeration but it is impossible to avoid the impression that it is designedly misleading in its origination. In this connection I commend to the review of those concerned with this legislation a reading of the following fact sheet of the American Footwear Manufacturers Association and the Tanners Council of America:

AMERICAN FOOTWEAR MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, TANNERS' COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC.

FACT SHEET ON PROPOSED IMPORT QUOTAS FOR SHOES

Why quotas? In less than ten years shoe imports into the United States have increased by 1,000%. In 1969 shoe imports reached 195,480,000 pairs and accounted for 33.7% of U.S. domestic shoe production which was the lowest in 15 years. Imports caused the closing of 72 shoe factories with the loss of more than 19,000 jobs. Shoe imports have increased in 1970 by another 20%. There is one cause and only one cause for the import flood—low wages abroad. Shoe factory workers in foreign plants earn from 1/2 to 1/10 the wages paid in the U.S. Shoe imports represent the export of jobs from U.S. labor intensive industries, jobs that are crucially needed both in urban and rural areas.

The quota principle. Would imports of foreign shoes be stopped or eliminated by the Bill which the House Ways & Means Committee approved? Nothing of the kind. It is only proposed that imports be held to the high water mark of 1967-1969. Furthermore, the House measure would actually permit further growth of imports as the domestic market grows. Foreign shoes, in other words, would remain a major competitive factor in the U.S. It is absolutely not protectionism to urge a realistic foreign trade policy for the U.S.

Import quotas and prices. It is absolutely false to imply or suggest that import quotas will raise prices to consumers. This view is false because shoes will continue to be imported in huge volume and because the domestic shoe industry is an exceedingly competitive business with more than adequate capacity.

Workers and consumers. Without payrolls there can be no consumers. Factory closings in shoes, leather, textiles or other products due to imports will mean reduced income and lower consumption. It is in the interest of the entire economic community, including retailers, newspapers and service industries, to keep production going, to maintain job opportunity in shoes and similar industries. Factory payrolls are the base for consumption. Shoe factories are the major source of payroll income in hundreds of U.S. communities. Shoe factories employ workers from groups where unemployment is greatest.

Productivity. Productivity in the U.S. shoe industry is the highest in the world, 25% to 35% greater than anywhere else abroad. But productivity cannot cross the gap of low wages and child labor in Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Italy, Spain, Greece, Brazil, and a score of other countries. Labor is a principal cost in making shoes. Therefore, wages and working conditions which are not tolerated in the United States give foreign producers a tremendous cost advantage.

Style. The claim has been made publicly that foreign shoes have more style. The fact is that every important new style in the shoe business originates in the U.S. However, new models and patterns designed in America are sent abroad to be made by cheap foreign labor. This has been publicly admitted by shoe manufacturers who assert that they are helpless unless import quotas help equalize competition.

Foreign retaliation. One of the most misleading charges against the principle of reasonable import restraints and quotas is the spectre of foreign retaliation. The truth is foreigners do not buy U.S. products from love of principle. They buy what they need in the U.S. because they cannot get it elsewhere. Therefore, to talk of retaliation or trade war is a gross deception. Furthermore, the U.S. Government has finally acknowledged that almost all other countries discriminate against the U.S. with artificial and illegal trade barriers. For years the U.S. has vainly appealed to countries such as Japan to lower obstacles against U.S. goods. Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans has pointed out that the U.S. has been the victim of one-sided trade policy and he described the U.S. as "Uncle Sucker."

Adjustment assistance. Opponents of quota legislation argue that other means of relief should be given industries and workers oppressed by imports. They have argued "adjustment assistance" and retraining programs. Question—If jobs are exported on a huge scale for what jobs will workers be retrained? There is only one answer and that is the relief rolls. It is not the answer needed by a viable economy.

The dollar. When the giveaways are deducted from U.S. exports, the U.S. foreign trade balance is in the red. Shoe imports alone added \$500 million to the deficit in 1969. If imports are not restrained through reasonable and moderate means the dollar and the U.S. economy will be in jeopardy.

NOTHING SUCCEEDS LIKE FAILURE

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD an article written by one of my favorite political humorists, Art Buchwald. In his column titled "Nothing Succeeds Like Failure" Mr. Buchwald points, in his inimitable style,

to some of the difficulties and attitudes that seemingly pervade governmental sponsorship of programs—somehow those that fail stay with us, and those that have succeeded.

Mr. Buchwald's article follows:

NOTHING SUCCEEDS LIKE FAILURE

(By Art Buchwald)

WASHINGTON.—Despite everything you hear about the government, there still is plenty of money around for projects. The only trouble is, you can't get the money if you have a plan that works. You must have one that no one is quite sure about.

A vice president of a university system in the Northeast told me about this the other day when he applied for money for a program to run summer schools for students who needed extra help to get into college. He told me the meeting went something like this:

"Now Mr. Haas, from our records it appears that you're applying for a grant of \$500,000 to run a summer school project for students hoping to keep up in college this fall."

"That's correct. We did it last year, and it was tremendously successful. We only had a drop-out rate of 6 per cent."

"Oh, dear me. Then this is not a pilot project."

"No, it's not. We know it works."

"What a shame."

"What do you mean what a shame?"

"Well, if this were a pilot project the government would be happy to finance it. We'd be very interested in knowing what could come of it. But we can't very well give money to something that's been proven, can we?"

"Why the hell not?"

"Mr. Haas, we're very willing to fund any educational program, providing it's iffy. But we can't throw money away on things that work. Congress would have a fit."

"I still don't understand why."

"I'm trying to explain it to you. The government has no trouble getting money from Congress for study programs. It doesn't matter how much it costs to study a program; we can get the funds. But once we ask for money for a program that has been proven successful, Congress will be committed to it, and nobody wants that, do they?"

"Suppose that I request the money for a study project. Could I get it then?"

"But you already told me that it had worked last summer. There's no sense having a study of it, if it works."

"I'm not trying to be difficult, but this is a very important project. We are taking in people this year who are going to find it tough sledding to keep up in the fall unless they have some remedial work."

"It's not our fault that your program worked last summer, Mr. Haas. Had it failed, we would have given you a blank check to try it a different way. But we're not here to dole out taxpayers' money for programs that have succeeded."

"Just the other day a superintendent of a public system in the Midwest tried a visual-reading program for his state which turned into a disaster. The machines didn't work, the teachers couldn't handle them and the students lost interest after the first five minutes."

"Did we cut him off? We did not. We gave him another \$10 million to find out why he failed. And we're ready to pour in another \$10 million if he doesn't come up with answers. The whole department is excited by the failure."

"Is there any possible way of getting the \$500,000, knowing what you know about my program?"

"I hardly think so, Mr. Haas. You've made a mess of things as it is. Our motto in the government is 'Nothing falls like success.'"

EXPLOITATION OF FISHERY RESOURCES

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Massachusetts House of Representatives has passed a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to request the President of the United States to convene an international conference to discuss the unrestrained exploitation of the fishery resources in international waters adjacent to our Atlantic shoreline. Since the fishing banks of our country have been seriously depleted by the unrestrained exploitation of this resource by European mobile fishing fleets, I strongly support resolutions memorializing Congress to request the President to convene an international conference.

I call this deplorable condition to the attention of my colleagues because something must be done to correct this development. Overfishing by foreign fleets has seriously threatened our fishing industry and the livelihood of the fishermen. I am concerned about the fate of our fishing industry, and I am determined to rectify the plight of our fishermen. The fishing industry and the fishermen are not the only Americans afflicted by the increasing overfishing by foreign fleets. The American consumers will also suffer because of the higher price they will have to pay for imported fish and fish by-products. By having to import more fish, our economy would suffer because we would be increasing an already massive balance-of-payments deficit.

I will use the Massachusetts fishing industry as an example of the predicament of the domestic fishing industry. Intensive overfishing by the Soviet fleet has steadily decreased the supply of haddock since 1965. Without conversion to an alternate species—the pollock—the Massachusetts fishing industry would have been destroyed and mass unemployment of fishermen would have resulted. The development of an alternate species has been expensive; however, and complications still exist. To perpetuate the fishing industry, research, promotion of the new species, and vessel conversion had to be accomplished in a short period of time. These problems are indicative of the difficulties facing our domestic fishing industry.

One of the most acute problems has been the inability of our domestic fishing operations to compete with the sophisticated and nationally supported fishing industries of Japan, Korea, and the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, I would like to reemphasize an incident several months ago when Russian ships were dumping untreated sewage and garbage off of our coast. This sewage and garbage eventually came to rest on our shoreline, polluting our beaches and scenic coast. If an international conference were con-

vened, it could study and hopefully deter such disgraceful acts.

It is for the above reasons that I strongly support the following resolution and commend it to my colleagues:

MASSACHUSETTS HOUSE RESOLUTION
Resolutions memorializing Congress to request the President of the United States to take the necessary steps to convene an international conference to discuss the unrestrained exploitation of the fishery resources in international waters adjacent to our Atlantic shoreline

Whereas, The New England fishing banks have been seriously depleted by the unrestrained exploitation of this resource by the European mobile fishing fleets; and

Whereas, The International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries has been unable to contain this exploitation; and

Whereas, The traditional employment of the Massachusetts fisherman is threatened with extinction because of this exploitation; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives urges the Congress of the United States to request the President of the United States to take the necessary steps to convene an international conference to establish the rights of its national to the fishery resources of the super-adjacent waters of the continental shelf adjacent to our shores and to establish such rules and procedures as are necessary to conserve, protect and perpetuate these fishery resources for the benefit of the citizens of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from this Commonwealth.

EPITOME OF HYPOCRISY?

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, misinterpretation in all forms is an ever-increasing problem. I have just read a fine article in the Joe Holmes Commentary in which the author, Mr. Holmes, cites examples of this common occurrence. Furthermore, some misconceptions of the city of San Diego, which I represent, are clarified. I should like to share this perceptive article with my colleagues by including it in the RECORD:

Some years ago I worked on a newspaper which had quite a campaign against drunken

driving. Always a worthy cause. The kicker in the story was that most of the editorials were written by a newsman who used to stumble into the office completely smashed every evening after he drank his dinner.

It was the epitome of hypocrisy. My newsman friend comes to mind quite clearly these days as I watch various publications take up the banner of integrity, credibility.

Last Sunday the Los Angeles Times had a lead story on Page One of the United States allegedly paying various Asian nations to send troops into South Vietnam.

The headline said the U.S. was paying mercenaries to fight the war. Obviously the headline was designed to paint the U.S. in the most unfavorable light.

Webster's Dictionary defines a mercenary as one who "serves merely for pay or gain".

If I had not read the rest of Sunday's Los Angeles Times I might have accepted that organization of the loftiest ideals and possibly felt that they had the right to criticize the U.S. Government of dollar diplomacy.

However, the Los Angeles Times has little room to be a critic of mercenary tactics.

One of the supplements to that same Sunday publication was a tabloid section listing all the honor students in Los Angeles schools. On the surface it certainly looked noble. That is, until you turned to page eighteen of the forty page section where the "A" students of such high schools as Sylmar, Taft, Temple City, University City, Torrance are listed and, you find a half page advertisement.

The copy in the advertisement reads, in part, as follows:

"Mr. Bow Herbert, managing general partner and the Employees of the Horseshoe Club and the Gardena Club congratulate the A Students in the Los Angeles area."

The Horseshoe Club and the Gardena Club are two wide open poker gambling palaces, lavishly furnished and very similar to Vegas and Reno establishments on a smaller scale.

Apparently the Gardena gambling clubs wanted to plant the seed early with Los Angeles youth and, obviously the Los Angeles Times was pleased to cooperate.

It is most difficult to believe that an advertisement of a gambling operation in a high school student section was for any reason but "merely for gain".

Who is the Los Angeles Times to accuse anyone else of being mercenary?

I am unhappy over the expenditure of seventy-five cents for the magazine San Diego, a state of mind caused by the lure of a headline.

The headline: "Union-Tribune—Zapped Again".

I read the story and now I know how the housewife purchaser of a movie magazine feels. Her headline lure was likely, "Exclusive—Jackie Kennedy's New Love"—the story on the inside, of course, was about a new puppy in the Kennedy family.

San Diego Magazine's article had about as much zap as an argument between Supervisors Walsh and Austin.

The local magazine devoted one-third of the article to reprints of somewhat ancient writings by Newsweek and Time Magazine. In the trade that would be termed "lazy writing" but since the author was the publisher, there is little likelihood he will be fired.

The remainder of the article deserves some analysis.

San Diego Magazine thought it amusing that Midnite Cowboy won the Academy Award and great acclaim while the Union-Tribune refused to admit it, or any other rated movie existed.

There is no question that production of motion pictures has taken on a new tone today. Filth, degeneracy, abnormality have taken over much of the motion picture industry and any media organization which refuses to perpetuate it is simply reflecting the will of this community.

Stripping away all of the surrounding prose, San Diego Magazine blames the Union and Tribune for:

Not publishing publicity or advertisements about "Midnite Cowboys" and X-rated movie with heavy overtones of homosexuality.

We can only presume that San Diego Magazine is in favor of that new motion picture industry which has "glamorized" abnormality and lewd behavior.

Contributing to the perpetuation of a national image of San Diego as a city dominated by right wing crackpots and the Navy.

If there is any perpetuation of this erroneous concept it is done by such publications as San Diego Magazine.

For the fact that the Navy installations here were shut down, jobs rolls slashed and big vessels of the fleet ordered to other West Coast ports.

What a fantastic distortion of facts. Maybe two Navy offices have been moved, there have not been any major San Diego Naval Installation moved or closed! The Navy payroll in San Diego today is just as great as it was one year ago and as far as major Navy ships are concerned if the writer will check the bay next week he will see the Kitty Hawk back after repairs and the aircraft carrier Ticonderoga arriving to make San Diego her new homeport. If the U-T is being held responsible for the Navy actions in San Diego, they deserve some credit.

For failing to negate the Nixon's administration anti-narcotics activity, Operation Intercept and Operation Cooperation because, in the thinking of San Diego Magazine the Union-Tribune should be dominating National Policy.

In effect what the Magazine says is that the Union-Tribune did not oppose narcotics enforcement. This is some kind of a ridiculous charge.

There are many other areas where San Diego Magazine takes the U-T to task and the points are just as thin.

As a matter of fact, bad journalistic practices, inadequate reporting, suppression, all of the charges filed by the magazine against the newspaper are rampant throughout their very attack.

SENATE—Thursday, July 23, 1970

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord most holy, our hearts, our words, and our records are open to Thee. Have mercy on us when we have failed Thee. Add Thy blessing to our work which is well done. Now give us faith to count on Thy mercy for the past and to count on Thy power for the future.

Make us Thy servants. Lead us through the crucial decisions of this day so that we may lead others into a brighter tomorrow.

In the name of Him whose life was the light of men. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication 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., July 23, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.