

York Newspaperwomen's Club, the River Club, and, in Paris, of the University Women's Club.

She is survived by her sons, Whitelaw Reid and United States Representative Ogden Reid of Westchester, and by 10 grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held Thursday at 10 A.M. at St. Thomas Episcopal Church, Fifth Avenue and 53d Street.

DEATH OF HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, OF OHIO

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on House Resolution 1161.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives (H. Res. 1161), which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Michael J. Kirwan, a Representative from the State of Ohio.

Resolved, That a committee of fifty-four Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take

such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The resolution was read, as follows:

S. RES. 434

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Michael J. Kirwan, late a Representative from the State of Ohio.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of re-

spect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 434) was considered and unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the second resolving clause, the Chair appoints the two Senators from Ohio (Messrs. YOUNG and SAXBE) as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Representative Kirwan.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, and, pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 434, as a further mark of respect to the memory of Representative Michael J. Kirwan, of Ohio, that the Senate now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 29, 1970, at 11 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AUTHORIZE CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR MERCURY POISONING

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 24, the Department of Justice announced plans to bring suits under the Refuse Act of 1899 to prohibit the discharge of mercury into navigable waters. I previously urged the Department to use the Refuse Act together with the Federal Water Quality Act to protect the public's health and safety from mercury poisoning. I commend the Department for apparently revoking its previous guideline—an indefensible position—to only utilize the 1899 Refuse Act in cases of "accidental and infrequent" pollution and to ignore cases to continuous day-to-day dumping of potentially poisonous wastes.

Interior Secretary Hickel warns that the presence of mercury in much of the Nation's waters "constituted an imminent health hazard." He now terms mercury contamination of water "an intolerable threat to health and safety of Americans." He disclosed that the polluters were requested to act voluntarily to end mercury pollution. Their failure to comply forced Mr. Hickel to recommend that the Department of Justice initiate legal proceedings. Mr. Hickel appears to have acted reasonably and constructively.

Because mercury pollution is a very serious matter, where the evidence indicates it may be threat to the health and safety of Americans, and the polluter fails to attempt to comply voluntarily after request, the Department of Justice

should authorize and seek criminal penalties as well as civil injunction proceedings under the Refuse Act of 1899 against polluters. To do otherwise is an attempt to defend the intent and strength of the 1899 Refuse Act and to possibly ignore Government responsibility for existing law.

SPECIAL DOCUMENTARY PROGRAM WILL APPEAR ON ABC

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I take special pride in calling to the attention of my colleagues in the House and Senate a special documentary program entitled "Help," which will appear on the ABC Television Network this coming Monday, August 3, 1970, at 10:30 p.m., as part of ABC's "Now" series.

This hour-long, prime-time color film will portray the phenomenal success story of AFRAM, Inc., a black owned and operated business located in the congressional district which I represent at Asheville, N.C. Asheville, incidentally, was designated earlier this year as an "All America City," due in part, the judges said, to the progress which the city has made in improving race relations.

AFRAM, which manufactures a variety of disposable paper garments, is truly an example of what can be done when people of all races in a community combine their resources to achieve a mutually beneficial goal.

The film, which I hope every Member of Congress will have an opportunity to

see, will show what the blacks in Asheville have done to help themselves in a unique and enterprising industry.

Special credit must be given to Mr. Robert V. Mathison, of Asheville, a prime mover in initiating and helping to organize AFRAM, and to Mr. Mort Cohn, vice president and general manager of WLOS-TV in Asheville, who had much to do with arranging the documentary.

Mr. Cohn recently expressed the belief that the film will serve to provide ideas for similar projects elsewhere in the Nation.

MEDICAL CARE BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, this morning I received, as did a number of other Members of Congress, a letter from W. A. "Tony" Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America.

Mr. Boyle proposes in his letter that Congress enact legislation to provide medical and hospital benefits to disabled coal miners who are too young to qualify for either medicare or their retiree's pension from the UMW Welfare and Retirement Fund.

Mr. Boyle's letter raises an issue that is becoming critical not only among coal miners but among every group of industrial workers in the Nation. This issue is: When a worker becomes disabled several years before he could draw medicare benefits, how can he cope with the enormous expense of medical and hospital care for himself and his family?

As a Senator from a major coal producing State in which many disabled coal miners and their families have experienced acute need for a program of the type proposed by Mr. Boyle, I certainly favor action to solve this problem. At the same time it must be recognized that this problem is shared by workers and their families in every State and in practically every industry. It is time that Congress began to give serious study to such a proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Boyle's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1970.

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHWEIKER: Disabled coal miners under 65 years of age face a serious problem of medical and hospital care which must be assumed by the nation. These miners have suffered disability as the result of employment under hazardous conditions in an industry vital to the nation's health, comfort and economic welfare. They richly merit assistance from the nation in their hour of need.

The United Mine Workers of America has sought to meet the hospital and medical care needs of these disabled workers through the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund which it negotiated with the coal industry. The Fund expended more than \$55 million of a total income of \$163 million, for hospital and medical care for mine workers during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970 the Fund spent over \$65 million out of a total income of \$174 million for hospital and medical care.

Because of the ever-escalating costs of medical and hospital care, the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund has been forced to limit medical and hospital benefits to one year following disability for mine workers too young to qualify for a pension. Our union fully recognizes that this is inadequate to the needs of mine workers.

The UMWA intends to win a much higher industry contribution to the Welfare and Retirement Fund in its 1971 negotiations. Even if the present forty cents per ton contribution were doubled, it would not be sufficient to provide indefinite hospital and medical benefits to disabled miners because of the need to increase pensions, survivors benefits and other benefits.

During recent weeks, mine workers who have been unemployed for more than one year because of disability have picketed and disrupted production of vitally needed coal in several mine fields. We recognize that the disabled miners' needs are urgent and very real. The UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund, however, cannot provide indefinite medical and hospital care for these disabled miners without denying benefits to other working and retired members and survivors.

The real answer to this problem, especially in the face of soaring medical and hospital costs, is a program of hospital and medical benefits for disabled miners similar to Medicare which would become applicable one year after disability. Such a program should provide uniform benefits for continuing medical and hospital care costs resulting from disability. The UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund now provides certain supplemental benefits to retired members over 65 who are enrolled in the Medicare program and would attempt to provide similar benefits under a federal program for disabled mine workers who have exhausted benefits now paid from the Fund.

In the view of the UMW, such a program would best be supported from general taxation. We urge the immediate introduction of legislation to meet the health care needs of disabled mine workers following one year of disability. We will be more than pleased to work with your office in shaping a satisfactory legislative measure.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. BOYLE,
President.

THE FLAG—JUST "A PIECE OF CLOTH"?

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this week our Nation was, for an all too brief moment, united in pride when Neil Armstrong planted the U.S. flag on the moon. The astronauts returned home from that hostile and airless foreign soil with additional flags to present to Congress as symbols of man's first great step beyond the limits of his planet. A flag remains on the moon as the sacred symbol of the freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which our country stands.

In remembrance of that glorious moment and others, such as the planting of the flag at Iwo Jima, where brave men put their lives on the line for the defense of our national symbol, we can only feel anger and grief when we see what is happening to and being done to that flag today. We only have to pick up our daily newspaper to read of new burnings and other atrocities committed against the flag and then turn inside to see hideous advertisements urging us "to show our colors" and wear starred and striped pants, flag shirts or ties, and liven the interiors of our living rooms with flag pillows. The degradation of our national emblem reached new depths when one manufacturer even offered flag toilet paper. Time magazine recently wrote with astonishment of the manner in which, what Woodrow Wilson referred to as the "emblem of our unity" has been widely abused. To quote Time:

Some . . . blow their noses on it, sleep in it, set it afire, or wear it to patch the seat of their trousers. In response, others wave it with defensive pride, crack skulls in its name, and fly it from their garbage trucks, police cars and skyscraper scaffolds. In pride or put-on, Pop or protest, Old Glory's heraldic blazons battered campus and Indianapolis 500 races, silver pins and trash bins, glittering cowboy vests and ample bikinied chests. The flag has become the emblem of America's disunity. (Time, July 6, 1970, p. 8).

It is time that Congress acted decisively to remove the flag from the political arena of flamboyant protest and from the boutique marketplace to restore it as the symbol and property of the entire Nation. Congress took a step in this direction by enacting the Federal Flag Anti-Desecration Statute in 1968. It provides a penalty of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, for any person who "knowingly casts contempt upon any flag of

the United States by publicly mutilating, defacing, defiling, burning, or trampling upon it." At the time that this bill was under consideration by the 90th Congress, I argued that the penalties provided would prove to be inadequate.

Time has proved my belief that the threat of a minimal fine or jail term would not be taken seriously by those who would take the flag from us and use it for their own narrow purposes to degrade our national honor. Typical of the flag burners is one young lady from Berkeley, Calif., who was quoted by Time as saying:

Desecrating the flag is just fun. It's burned, torn or worn for the sheer joy of doing something naughty and getting away with it. (Time, July 6, 1970, p. 21)

If we have failed to teach our youth the joy of patriotism and the meaning of our flag, we must make the burning and other forms of desecration a painful experience. To save the flag from those who would degrade it and to restore it to a place of national honor for all Americans, I am today introducing a bill to amend the present flag desecration law and provide for imposition of a maximum fine of \$2,000 with possible imprisonment for a term of up to 2 years, or both. My bill will punish not only wanton acts to desecrate the flag but also will include acts of disrespect. By using the definition already provided by the flag code, acts of disrespect will come under the penalty provisions of this bill and will be enforceable in the courts.

There will be those who will argue that the Federal Government cannot take away the flag burners' "freedom of expression" as if they could not express their twisted sense of dissatisfaction with America in any other way. Since 1905, the Supreme Court has recognized that State and Federal Governments have an interest in promoting patriotism and protecting the flag as an emblem of national power and national honor. Justice M. Harlan wrote in that first flag desecration case, *Halter against Nebraska*:

A State will be wanting in care for the well-being of its people if it ignores the fact that they regard the flag as a symbol of their country's power and prestige and will be impatient if any open disrespect is shown towards it . . . [Commercial use of the flag] tends to degrade and cheapen the flag in the estimation of the people, as well as to defeat the object of maintaining it as an emblem of National power and National honor. 205 U.S. 34, 42.

While the Supreme Court has not ruled on the question of whether flag burning or desecration is a form of symbolic speech that would come within the protection of the first amendment, recent opinions from that Court and other Federal courts give us every reason to believe that even if flag burning is a form of speech, the Government can prohibit this form of "expression" since there are other forms of protest or speech available to the desecrators with which they could express the same thoughts. Abbie Hoffman was convicted under the present Federal flag desecration law when he arrived at hearings of the then House Un-American Activities Committee wearing a flag shirt and playing with a yo-yo. The District of

Columbia Court of Appeals upheld the conviction and found that the Federal flag desecration statute is a reasonable regulation limited to prohibiting certain defined acts of conduct and does not necessarily impinge upon a citizen's right to protest. The Court found that the first amendment protects freedom of speech and not of conduct and held that a sufficiently important interest in regulating the nonspeech element, such as here, can justify incidental limitations on first amendment freedoms. *Hoffman v. United States*, 256 A. 2d 567 (1969).

The U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California has also upheld the flag desecration law. This case involved the burning of the flag in front of a Federal courthouse. The Court found that even if burning of the flag was to be considered a form of speech, prohibition of this act would not prevent the defendant from seeking an audience or reaching an audience by other means. The Federal Government's powers of sovereignty were found to include the power to select a national flag or symbol and the power to select a flag, the Court said, carries with it the power to do whatever is necessary and proper for carrying into effect this selection including the power to protect it from contemptuous destruction.

The Supreme Court found in *United States v. O'Brien*, 391 U.S. 367 (1968), that Congress has the power to punish any person who burns his draft card. The Court held that when "speech" and "nonspeech" elements are combined in the same course of conduct, a sufficiently important governmental interest in regulating the nonspeech element can justify incidental limitations on first amendment freedoms. All of the opinions that I have mentioned and others have found that protection of our national flag is a substantial and important governmental interest. Incidentally, several of the more liberal present and former Justices of the Supreme Court indicated that they agree, in their dissenting opinions in *Street v. New York*, 394 U.S. 576 (1969). This was a flag burning case under a New York State statute in which the majority of the Supreme Court side-stepped the main question of the case—whether the State could punish flag burning—because of a finding that the State might have punished the defendant's words in addition to his act. Four of the Justices condemned the Court's failure to face up to this issue, a failure which Chief Justice Warren warned "encourages others to test in the streets the powers of our States and National Government to impose criminal sanctions upon those who would desecrate the flag." 394 U.S. at 605. The former Chief Justice concluded:

I believe that the States and Federal Government do have the power to protect the flag from acts of desecration and disgrace. But because the Court has not met the issue, it would serve no purpose to delineate my reasons for this view. However, it is difficult for me to imagine that, had the Court faced this issue, it would have concluded otherwise. *Ibid.*

Another liberal, Justice Black, also found that the Government can punish the flag burners:

It passes my belief that anything in the Federal Constitution bars a State from making the deliberate burning of the American flag an offense. It is immaterial to me that words are spoken in connection with the burning. It is the burning of the flag that the State has set its face against . . . The talking that was done took place "as an integral part of conduct in violation of a valid criminal statute" against burning the American flag in public. 394 U.S. at 610.

Justice Fortas most eloquently defended the flag in his dissenting opinion and succinctly stated why desecration of it should be punished and defenses of the desecrators as dissenters dismissed:

[T]he flag is a special kind of personality. Its use is traditionally and universally subject to special rules and regulations . . . A person may "own a flag, but ownership is subject to special burdens and responsibilities. Certainly . . . these special conditions are not *per se* arbitrary or beyond governmental power under our Constitution.

One may not justify burning a house, even if it is his own, on the ground, however sincere, that he does so as a protest. One may not justify breaking the windows of a government building on that basis. Protest does not exonerate lawlessness. And the prohibition against flag burning on the public thoroughfare being valid, the misdemeanor if not excused merely because it is an act of flamboyant protest. 394 U.S. at 616-617.

Let us remember the warning that Justice Harlan issued 65 years ago in the first flag desecration case and provide penalties for flag burners as are provided to deter draft-card burners. Justice Harlan wrote:

A State will be wanting in care for the well-being of its people if it ignores the fact that they regard the flag as a symbol of their country's power and prestige and will be impatient if any open dissent is shown towards it. *Halter v. Nebraska*, 205 U.S. 34, 42.

The people are rightfully "impatient" and angered to see their national flag degraded by protester and manufacturer alike. It is time for Congress to show that it cares.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, with deep sadness and great respect, I take this opportunity to mark the passing of our honored colleague, Congressman Michael J. Kirwan of Ohio. Mr. Kirwan will long be remembered by all of us as a legislative leader whose record of 33 years in the House of Representatives is distinguished by his vigorous leadership of the Democratic Party's Campaign Committee and of the House Public Works Committee. Mr. Kirwan further served his country and his constituency as an ardent conservationist and a champion of the cause of the too often forgotten American Indian.

As the self-educated son of an immigrant coal miner, Mr. Kirwan typified the American spirit, lifting himself out of poverty to become the representative of Ohio's 19th district in Congress in 1937.

His flamboyant personality and long service to society will serve as his memorial for many years to come. Dozens of dams, powerplants, and parks can be attributed to his personal efforts. For these, and his many other accomplishments, we in the Congress and all Americans are indebted to Michael Kirwan.

AMERICAN INDIAN MAKING SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS THROUGH HIS OWN EFFORTS

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, it is common and cruel knowledge among Americans that the American Indian has been often mistreated or ignored by his fellow citizens and by his Government. Words spoken about this national disgrace would fill many volumes but a chronicle of effective action taken to rectify it would scarcely fill a notebook.

Happily, one encouraging trend is developing. Now Indian leadership is coming to the fore and significant progress is being made by the American Indian through his own efforts.

One unique situation is occurring—one that deserves special recognition. Recently, four tribes, the Potawatomi, Kickapoo, Iowa and the Sac and Fox have formed their own corporation, owned and operated by American Indians. They have opened an Employment Assistance Center at 101 West 11th Street in Kansas City, Mo.

Indians from all over the United States will be traveling to Kansas City to be interviewed and have their skills and potential skills evaluated. This employment activity will be conducted in an office staffed by 100-percent Indians. If an individual from a reservation is desirous of acquiring certain skills and desires to improve his economic status, he will be sent to school, trade school, or a service school. When he is capable of moving into a higher job classification, the Kansas City office will assist him in finding better employment.

This unique arrangement has been worked out through a new concept approved by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Several Kansas City companies, including Trans World Airlines, have already been making plans to cooperate with the Kansas City office of Indian Enterprises, Inc. One Indian girl is now in the new TWA Hostess Training Center. Others will be trained by the company in the near future.

I would like to include the remarks of Marvin L. Franklin, director of special cooperative projects, Phillips Petroleum Co., before the Kansas City

Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Franklin has been a member of the Iowa Tribal Council and executive committee for the past 10 years, a member of the Oklahoma Bar Association, and president of Indian Enterprises, Inc.

THE EMERGING AMERICAN INDIAN

I am grateful to you on behalf of Indian Enterprises for the invitation to share this great hospitality of the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce.

While Indian Enterprises is a relatively new business organization in Kansas City, it brings with it a story of progress and challenge. A story that I think you will be thrilled to hear. It is the story of the emerging American Indian!

Too often we are exposed to the sensational writer who dramatizes one-day forays to isolated reservation areas and portrays the Indian as a creature to be pitied! True, there are an unproportionate number of depriving circumstances for the Indian when considered in comparison to other ethnic groups. But this is changing—changing through progress—changing, because the Indian leadership with the assistance of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is developing a new horizon for the American Indian.

Indian Enterprises is just one of those examples.

In 1961, President Kennedy assigned a task force on Indian Affairs to make recommendations for policy changes. The Chairman of that group was W. W. Keeler, now Chairman of the Board of Phillips Petroleum Company, a most respected business leader as evident by his election as Chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers—but most of all, a cherished Indian leader, who, since the late 1940's has been the Principal Chief of the Cherokee Nation.

The Task Force made these recommendations:

1. Maximum Indian economic self-sufficiency
2. Full participation of Indians in American life
3. Equal citizenship privileges and responsibilities for Indians

Considerable progress has been made in bringing about the attainment of these objectives.

As business leaders, you are fully aware that government alone cannot marshal all the forces of economic change. To create a condition that brings about self-sufficiency, full participation and citizenship privileges and responsibilities, required the attention of our country's private business sector.

About five years ago, Phillips undertook a program as a business organization to see what might be done in cooperation with government to overcome some of the problems in economically disadvantaged areas. Experience has dictated that it has been most effective in those areas in which is provided technology and management capability to assist in developing viable business organizations which would bring job opportunities, economic self-sufficiency and individual growth to those in a local area.

One of the great privileges I enjoy is serving on the management board of the Navajo Forest Products Industries—wholly owned by the Navajo Tribe. Built with their own capital and retained earnings, the organization now operates a very modern fifteen million dollar sawmill which process some fifty million board feet of lumber per year, taken entirely from their forested mountain ranges in New Mexico and Arizona which contain about five hundred thousand acres of timbered area. But most of all—this operation provides gainful employment for approximately five hundred Navajo people and is building a modern city to provide the needs of their families. Few people know of

this gigantic undertaking by the Navajo Tribe—and still fewer people know that it has been possible only because the Bureau of Indian Affairs maintains a highly qualified and efficient staff in their Branch of Forestry—and because a handful of dedicated men from the private sector furnished without compensation, the management leadership to build a viable industry. The Navajo workman has responded well, not only in the trade classifications, but in management, and except for some thirty non-Navajo employees, he now performs all the functions of running the forest and mill operations. Other similar operations, some in partnership with commercial organizations, are evident on Indian-owned lands. But think for a moment what might be done, if you as business leaders, analyzed the potentials for growth in the light of your particular expertise as applied to the tremendous resources of Indian-owned lands. It takes not only the involvement of the Indian in the dominate society—it takes a conscientious involvement by society with the Indian in order to mutually benefit from his latent talents.

Speaking of land areas, I am told that some ninety percent of our population in the United States lives on only two percent of the lands in the continental areas. The American Indian still controls two percent of the land areas much of which contains untapped natural resources or is capable of productivity through agriculture, livestock or recreational development. I think it is safe to say, the American Indian, equipped with the proper tools can become the wealthiest ethnic group the nation has ever known.

Let us turn our attention to the most important aspect—the human resource. In spite of the popular literary trend to create a best seller based upon degrading both the so-called "establishment" and the disadvantaged in society, by ridicule, my experience with graduates of schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs is one that commands respect. Because there are limitations on Indian education enrollment based upon certain needs, far too many in society have an impression that an Indian School is a reformatory rather than an educational institution. Some have asked that same question about Haskell Institute at Lawrence and it is pleasing to note that school has been renamed Haskell Indian Junior College. Thousands of Americans of Indian derivation have graduated from our universities and colleges throughout the nation, and indeed, the world. Mr. Robert Bennett, for example, a Haskell Graduate and George Washington University, not only became the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, but is now associated with the Law School at the University of New Mexico. And my experience with loyalty, dedication and devotion on the part of the American Indian toward a job to be done or a goal to be reached, is unexcelled irrespective of his educational opportunities when guided by concerned leadership.

About a year ago, Phillips was instrumental in creating a company wholly-owned by the Cherokee Tribe of Oklahoma. It is called Cherokee Nation Industries and has its principal operation in a small Northeastern Oklahoma town situated in a county with the lowest per capita income in the entire state. A very generous company, Western Electric, shared its technology, management, and requirements for assembled communications equipment to start this manufacturing firm. On June 16, 1969, it opened its doors in a rented five thousand square foot building and began with eight employees. Today, this plant is not wholly-owned—but totally managed by Cherokee people recruited from that area, mostly, former students of schools operated by the Bureau of

Indian Affairs. Today, that plant employs almost a hundred people, has a branch operation which contracts with a major airline and is developing other operations that will serve contracts in diversified business areas.

Your next question might well be "How successfully do they manage?"

I might answer that by stating that the community in which Cherokee Nation Industries operates now enjoys—not just gainfully employed people with a steady payroll, but an economic turnover in excess of one million dollars annually. Liquid assets of the corporation have reached 600% of their initial capital investment and payrolls generated for members of the Cherokee Tribe for the past year were 700% of their invested capital. Profits for the first year have created a federal income tax liability, for the corporation alone, of approximately \$45,000. Here again, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, through its Branch of Employment Assistance was most helpful in developing a program of employment counselling and training which contributed substantially to the success of the enterprises, or consider the earnings last year for Navajo Forest Products Industries when it had a profit in excess of \$1.4 million, plus stumpage of \$840,000 and a payroll of \$2.25 million.

As a business leader, you are familiar with these indicators and can measure their management capabilities for yourselves.

This brings us to Kansas City—and the organization we call Indian Enterprises, Inc.

In October, 1969, the four Indian Tribes of Northeastern Kansas were asked what might be done by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to assist in bringing opportunities to their tribal members. Two things were described by their leaders as necessary elements—job opportunities and business ownership. The Bureau of Indian Affairs had under consideration an Employment Assistance Center in Kansas City to serve individual Indians from all areas of the nation in securing direct employment with existing business organizations and to provide a means for Adult Vocational education. The challenge was—can you as an Indian group, organize a business corporation capable of contracting with government to operate such a center. From the date of the challenge to the formation of a corporation and signing of a contract was less than thirty days. Creation of an office and staffing was accomplished promptly—and on March 1, the facility was available and in operation. The organization is in full operation, serving those referred to this area, and we are continuing our efforts to become acquainted with employers and their personnel staff as well as vocational, technical and academic schools of this area.

Here again, it took the assistance of the local community—people like Mr. Dick Chailinor, formerly associated with Chamber who gave generously of his time and valuable background of your city, Leonard Staples of H. D. Lee Company and Charles Koester of City National Bank, both long-time friends of Phillips who came to our aid in getting established.

Not unlike other projects, the most important element was the people we found to run the organization—and with the help of the Branch of Employment Assistance of the Bureau of Indian Affairs who counselled our efforts to create a viable organization. In support to my prior statement concerning the quality of education although coming from different geographical areas, have been students at Haskell. In addition to their Indian education, many on the staff have successfully attended other schools of higher learning, but it is significant to note the important role BIA schools have played in preparing the Indian to assume his position in society.

The function of Indian Enterprises, Inc., whose directors and stockholders are repre-

representatives of the four tribes of Northeastern Kansas, the Iowa, Kickapoo, Sac and Fox, and Potawatomi is to create opportunities for individual Indian entrepreneurship or tribal-owned businesses. All the earnings of the corporation are destined to be loaned or invested for building businesses and none are to be distributed as dividends. It is, however, and I think this important, that all recognize the corporation as a taxable, profit generating entity, capable of teaching people to be competitive, and yet, structured in such a manner that it does not destroy existing businesses established in our free enterprise system by seeking tax shelters.

We will grow, just as Cherokee Nation Industries has grown, because the innate "esprit de corps" of the American Indian knows how to meet challenges under controlled conditions. His fears are most apparent as an individual when confronted with those of society whose "aggressiveness" is just as natural as the Indian tendency to be reticent.

I regret time does not permit an opportunity to relate to you the successes experienced in bringing established industries at locations on or near areas of concentrated Indian population. They are varied in structure and product lines. It is a thrilling story of success—but one must fall before the public hears of the building of the staircase to the future.

Thank heavens—the Emerging American Indian is a positive, progressive, humble American with an unequalled empathy for his fellowman—and one who believes the future is filled with brightness.

AMERICAN CAN CO. EARNS RECOGNITION OF EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it was a source of satisfaction to receive the recent news release of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission announcing establishment of a program to benefit black employees of American Can Company at Bellamy and Whitfield, Ala.

This announcement represents further evidence of this enlightened industrial concern to assure its black employees that they will be provided with opportunities for self-improvement, for better jobs and for better housing.

The joint program established by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in conjunction with American Can Company will provide immediate benefit to 75 black employees of the company at Bellamy and Whitfield, Ala. The details are set forth in the news release of Sunday, July 5, 1970, as follows:

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION ANNOUNCES HOUSING FOR AMERICAN CAN COMPANY EMPLOYEES

William H. Brown III, Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission announced today the establishment of a program developed in cooperation with American Can Company that will offer 75 Black employees of the company at Bellamy and Whitfield, Alabama, an opportunity to purchase new homes that will be built for them in the area.

The joint American Can Company-Equal

Employment Opportunity Commission program could bring substantial immediate and long-range savings to the residents of the communities.

Seven Black employees have already purchased homes that were built as prototypes in the integrated community. The housing program has been under study and test since the summer of 1969.

A three bedroom home will be sold to the employee for \$7,475. The four bedroom homes will be priced at \$9,875.

Both three and four bedroom homes, which will be built by a Black contractor in the area, will be sited on 15,000 square foot lots. American Can Company will exchange 15,000 square foot lots at no cost for Black employees whose current lots fall to meet the 15,000 square foot minimum.

The Farmers Home Administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is making no-down-payment financing available to the southern families for the program, estimates that houses of similar construction are being sold in Alabama's Sumter County for at least \$2,000 more than the Bellamy and Whitfield homes.

If all 75 Black employees take advantage of the American Can Company offer, the potential savings in the initial cost of the housing alone will be substantial. Additional long-range savings can be realized because of the lower interest rate possible under FHA financing than would be available over the 33-year loan period from conventional sources.

Construction plans and schedules were developed within American Can; wood products and engineering services of the company are being used wherever possible to save money.

The three bedroom home affords 960 square feet of living area and the four bedroom, 1,120 square feet. Both have decorative landscaping. Construction includes full bath, built-in kitchen cabinets and both front and back porches. The owner has his choice of exterior color schemes and interior paneling.

In announcing the program Mr. Brown said, "These attractive, well-built and efficient homes represent a positive self-help thrust. The homes that already have been built have created a new pride in their owners and a desire by their neighbors to participate in this upgrading of the individual family and the community."

"This cooperative program has been established after months of work by representatives of the American Can Company and Andrew C. Muse, Chief of Conciliations, and Richard A. Grossman, Senior Conciliator, of EEOC, together with representatives of a number of other government agencies. We believe that its successful completion will offer valuable guidelines to other companies that have accepted the responsibility of working with their minority employees as they achieve their deserved standards of life and human equality."

American Can's program to promote employment opportunity—without regard to race, color, religion, sex or national origin—has produced new promotional opportunities for Black employees in the Bellamy plant. For example, two Black employees at the company's lumber facility have been promoted to foreman and Blacks now hold five of seven assistant foreman positions. In the Company's program that advances workers from "helper" categories into skilled positions, eight of the ten workers currently classified as helpers are Black.

The EEOC also announced that a cooperative store at Bellamy is now in successful operation. The cooperative, whose Board of Directors is composed of four Black and three white Bellamy employees, was established with the guidance and assistance of the Farmer Cooperative Service of the Agriculture Department.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was established under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This Title of the Act prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin in hiring, upgrading, and all other terms and conditions of employment.

WHAT DOES OUR FLAG AND OUR INDEPENDENCE DAY MEAN TO US?

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Independence Day ought to serve to remind us of the struggles of our Founding Fathers and the simple truths of the ideals and the traditions which those Founding Fathers and succeeding great Americans in all the four corners of our land have given to us.

A patriotic merchant in my home town of Waukesha, Wis., sponsored a full-page advertisement in the Waukesha Freeman which contains, in simple but moving Independence Day ought to serve to remind us of our American heritage.

I commend the reading of these passages to my colleagues:

WHAT DOES OUR FLAG AND OUR INDEPENDENCE DAY MEAN TO US?

What's a flag? What's the love of country for which it stands? Maybe it begins with love of the land itself. It is the fog rolling in with the tide at Eastport, or through the Golden Gate and among the towers of San Francisco. It is the sun coming up behind the White Mountains, over the Green, throwing a shining glory on Lake Champlain and above the Adirondacks. It is the storied Mississippi rolling swift and muddy past St. Louis, rolling past Cairo, pouring down past the levees of New Orleans. It is a lazy noontide in the pines of Carolina, it is a sea of wheat rippling in Western Kansas, it is the San Francisco peaks far north across the glowing nakedness of Arizona, it is the Grand Canyon and a little stream coming down out of a New England ridge, in which are trout.

It is men at work. It is the storm-tossed fishermen coming into Gloucester and Provincetown and Astoria. It is the farmer riding his great machine in the dust of harvest, the dairyman going to the barn before sunrise, the lineman mending the broken wire, the miner drilling for the blast. It is the servants of fire in the murky splendor of Pittsburgh, between the Allegheny and the Monongahela, the trucks rumbling through the night, the locomotive engineer bringing the train in on time, the pilot in the clouds, the riveter running along the beam a hundred feet in the air. It is the clerk in the office, the housewife doing the dishes and sending the children off to school. It is the teacher, doctor and parson tending and helping, body and soul, for small reward.

It is small things remembered, the little corners of the land, the houses, the people that each one loves. We love our country because there was a little tree on a hill, and grass thereon, and a sweet valley below; because the hurdy-gurdy man came along on a sunny morning in a city street; because a beach or a farm or a lane or a house that might not seem much to others were once, for each of us, made magic. It is voices that are remembered only, no longer heard. It is parents, friends, the lazy chat of street and store and office, and the ease of mind that

makes life tranquil. It is summer and winter, rain and sun and storm. These are flesh, bone of our bone, blood of our blood, a lasting part of what we are, each of us and all of us together.

It is stories told. It is the Pilgrims dying in their first dreadful winter. It is the Minuteman standing his ground at Concord Bridge, and dying there. It is the Army in rags, sick, freezing, starving at Valley Forge. It is the wagons and the men on foot going westward over Cumberland Gap, floating down the great rivers, rolling over the great plains. It is the settler hacking fiercely at the primeval forest on his new, his own lands. It is Thoreau at Walden Pond, Lincoln at Cooper Union, and Lee riding home from Appomattox. It is corruption and disgrace, answered always by men who would not let the flag lie in the dust, who have stood up in every generation to fight for the old ideals and the old rights, at risk of ruin or of life itself.

It is a great multitude of people on pilgrimage, common and ordinary people, charged with the usual human failings, yet filled with such a hope as never caught the imaginations and the hearts of any nation on earth before. The hope of liberty. The hope of justice. The hope of a land in which a man can stand straight, without fear, without rancor.

The land and the people and the flag—the land a continent, the people of every race, the flag a symbol of what humanity may aspire to when the wars are over and the barriers are down; to these each generation must be dedicated and consecrated anew, to defend with life itself, if need be, but, above all, in friendliness, in hope, in courage, to live for.

THE REAL CAUSE OF INFLATION

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has accused the Congress of profligate spending in exceeding the budget figures he set for the country's social programs. Increases the Congress has made in his budget, Mr. Nixon contends, threaten to fuel inflationary trends.

I disagree—and disagree emphatically.

The money we spend on social programs—programs for education, for health care, for housing, for job training—is piddling when matched against the staggering sums lavished on the military. The cost of the Indochina war and the Pentagon's whimsically visionary arms projects—the ABM, carrying a pricetag in the tens of billions, is a striking example—dwarf the cost of the programs we have developed to answer the country's pressing social needs. Military spending devours the lion's share of our yearly budget, leaving only scraps for social programs.

The real cause of inflation is military expenditures. Ending the Indochina war, and tightening rein on the Pentagon, will stop inflation.

The cost of social programs has only the most trivial effects on inflation. The Congress is merely honoring its social responsibilities by seeking adequate funding for such programs.

A newspaper column by William V. Shannon, published yesterday in the New York Times, eloquently discusses this issue. I insert Mr. Shannon's column in the RECORD at this point.

MR. NIXON ON SPENDING

(By William V. Shannon)

As both a politician and a football fan, President Nixon knows that an aggressive offense is the best defense. He has taken the offensive against critics of his economic strategy who believe that with high prices, high unemployment, and no economic growth, this Administration has managed simultaneously to combine several of the worst effects of inflation and deflation.

In a statement issued a week ago, President Nixon focuses on inflation and warns that prices cannot come down if Congress insists upon appropriating more money than he requested in his budget. He attacks frontally the argument that what is needed is a cut in defense expenditures and a change in national priorities. Mr. Nixon asserts: "Let's set the record straight. We have changed our national priorities."

In support of his assertion, the President points out that for the first time in twenty years, his budget provides more spending for human resources (41 per cent) than for defense (37 per cent). He compares his budget in this regard with the budget of President Kennedy in 1962 and of President Johnson in 1968.

These comparisons are significant because they at least reveal the Administration's sensitivity to the debate over national priorities. Without quibbling over these comparative statistics, two important qualifications have to be made with regard to the Kennedy budget of 1962. First, since Congress had not acted upon a long list of President Kennedy's educational and social welfare proposals, it was obviously not possible to spend money on programs that had not yet been approved. Secondly, the nation's economic performance in 1962 was decidedly unsatisfactory. The gross national product was rising but unemployment was even higher than it is now. That is why President Kennedy eventually proposed a major tax cut the following year.

JOHNSON'S RECORD

The comparison with President Johnson's record in 1968 is also instructive in a way in which Mr. Nixon did not intend. By then, Congress had approved the far-reaching social program which the Kennedy Administration had sought, as well as others formulated by Mr. Johnson. By then also, the economy had benefited for four years from the stimulating effect of the tax reduction which President Kennedy requested. Because of the enormous growth of the economy in the Kennedy-Johnson years, President Johnson could fight a sizable war in Vietnam and yet devote a smaller percentage of the national budget to defense than Mr. Kennedy had six years earlier.

THE EISENHOWER YEARS

Both the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations made errors in managing the economy, but by correctly concentrating on economic expansion, they helped bring about real increases in living standards and in educational and welfare programs. The Eisenhower Administration, preoccupied with the perils of inflation, especially during its second term, achieved a dismal record of slow growth and two recessions in its last four years.

President Johnson and the Democratic-controlled Congress of 1967-68 share the blame for inducing inflation by fighting a war without promptly imposing sharply higher taxes. Although President Nixon now talks of facing "hard figures" and possible "painful measures," his statement shows no evidence that he is any more willing than

his predecessor to choose either of the two grim options—to end the war or to run a war economy.

Vietnam and the inflated military budget are the true breeders of inflation, not only in direct budgetary costs but in the even larger invisible costs of diverted manpower and wasted resources. Niggling cuts in social programs cannot reach the source of the economy's troubles. Indeed, with the population steadily growing and unmet urban needs accumulating, the nation has to have more schools, more hospitals, more housing and more people to man the social services. These requirements grow as inexorably as interest on the national debt.

To attack Congress for spending money for schools and hospitals may be good politics if the President is only concerned with shifting the blame for inflation. But if he is interested in raising real living standards and reducing the scandalous level of unemployment, he will join Congress in approving higher social expenditures. If he is interested in reducing inflation, he will do so by stopping the war in Vietnam and materially cutting back on military programs. Wars and stable prices do not go together. Not even the most adept economic juggling or facile rhetoric can conceal that fundamental incompatibility.

NECESSITY FOR BOXCAR LEGISLATION

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I must once again stress the necessity for boxcar legislation. As an indication of the severity of the boxcar shortage in the Second Congressional District, the four major rail lines serving our section of Minnesota have just reported to the Interstate Commerce Commission that anywhere from 13 to 40 percent of available cars are now being detained on other lines. The breakdown follows:

	Number of own cars on line	Percent on own line	Percent on other lines
Burlington Northern.....	30,516	59.5	40.5
Chicago & Northwestern...	22,816	83.2	16.8
Soo Line.....	4,983	87.3	12.7
Milwaukee Road.....	12,736	78.7	21.3

The August, September and October grain harvest in the Midwest will be on its way to market soon, worsening this situation. Wheat, corn, and soybean production for this year is predicted to be 7.3 billion bushels, an increase of 145 million bushels over the last year. Much of this huge crop will move by rail, but the delay in receiving cars is certain to hamper the shipment of the grain. The elevators and other facilities will soon be filled to capacity, and the fight to get our grain to market has already begun.

In the 1968 ICC hearings on ex parte No. 252 dealing with the boxcar shortage it was pointed out that there were over 273,000 unequipped boxcars delivered after delays of 2 or more days, 36,000 of which were delivered after delays of more than 12 days. During harvest time this is too long. The grain accumulates at

the elevators. When storage space is no longer available, it is dumped outside where it is subject to damage by the elements. This situation has resulted in the loss of millions of bushels of grain, and prolonged storage charges for all concerned. For the farmer and the elevator operator, the delay in receiving needed cars to ship the grain to market can be disastrous.

In the 10-year period 1960-70, as the following table shows, the number of plain, serviceable, unequipped boxcars has dropped a total of 233,816 units.

Date and available supply of plain, unequipped, serviceable boxcars

Jan. 1, 1960.....	608, 275
Jan. 1, 1962.....	559, 588
Jan. 1, 1963.....	532, 469
Jan. 1, 1964.....	505, 273
Jan. 1, 1965.....	474, 632
Jan. 1, 1966.....	444, 485
Jan. 1, 1967.....	427, 404
Jan. 1, 1968.....	397, 501
Mar. 1, 1969.....	374, 459

The need for more unequipped boxcars is critical.

In the ICC hearings on Ex parte No. 252, the Commission arrived at a plan that is intended to give those who own boxcars an incentive above the basic per diem rate during the critical shipping period between September and February. The purposes are to stimulate the quick return of cars to the owners, the building of new cars and the rebuilding of old unequipped boxcars.

With the basic per diem rate and the incentive charge combined, the rate of return on the rolling stock of the owning companies was expected to increase to 18 percent during the time of greatest need for boxcars, compared to a 6 percent return on the cars during the off season. That would be an average return of 12 percent per annum. It was hoped that by pursuing such a policy the debtor roads, that is, those using other roads' stock, would be encouraged to return cars and through the incentive payments receiving roads would be encouraged to build more cars.

I introduced a boxcar bill, H.R. 16890, on April 9th of this year to vest in the ICC additional authority to alleviate freight car shortages. At that time I stated that "a system of compensation for the use of any type of freight car, by other roads, should contribute to sound car service practices, including utilization and distribution of cars, and encourage the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense." I am now introducing another bill to authorize acquisition of boxcars by the Department of Defense to meet its rail shipment needs.

The Department of Defense, during the period October 1968 to September 1969, the most recent figures available, utilized 120,941 unequipped boxcars. Broken down into quarters, beginning with October 1968, the use of cars was as follows:

Date and number of unequipped boxcars

Oct. 1, 1968-Dec. 31, 1968.....	28, 165
Jan. 1, 1969-Mar. 31, 1969.....	26, 214
Apr. 1, 1969-June 30, 1969.....	36, 543
July 1, 1969-Sept. 30, 1969.....	31, 019

The average requirements per month of the Department of Defense was 10,078 cars. It is the purpose of this bill to appropriate \$120 million for the purchase of not less than 10,000 boxcars by the Department of Defense to meet its car needs. After the purchase of the cars, the Department would enter into agreements with the railroads on exchanges of rolling stock between the Government and the private rail owners. The maintenance of the Government-owned stock by the rails would be at rates that would recognize the U.S. capital investment in such cars. Thus the per diem and demurrage charges would be less, saving dollars for the taxpayers.

This bill and H.R. 16890 together would represent a broad effort to alleviate the boxcar shortage. The Nation's farmers and shippers need this assistance, and by the adoption of such legislation a great step toward solving the problem will have been taken.

HEARINGS HELD BY THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION REGARDING THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, 1970, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission held regional hearings in Houston, Tex. I am submitting for the information of my colleagues a statement presented at those hearings. The statement is in support of an amendment to section 703(h) of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which provides that the professionally developed ability test should be "directly related to the determination of bona fide occupational qualifications reasonably necessary to perform the normal duties of the particular position concerned."

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON PERSONNEL TESTING AND SELECTION

(By William H. Ennels)

It is an old American belief that a person should be hired on the basis of his or her ability to do a particular job. Few people oppose that idea, and many endorse it—even though favoritism manifesting itself in a variety of forms often mocks the ideal.

A basic problem, however, is that existing employment methods and standards are rarely known to produce a better work force than might be obtained by other techniques. Only a small fraction of employers rigorously apply business principles to the operation of their personnel selection programs.

Thus, most top corporate officials do not know whether their firm's personnel practices, including those related to psychological testing, produce a financial return on their annual expenditures. It is commonly accepted in business circles that funds should not only be recovered by the activities or items for which they are allocated but that there should be a reasonable profit on whatever investment is incurred. The application of this principle is commonly demanded in the production, sales, advertising, and research and development of services and

goods. This is not the case with most employment testing programs. They are frequently installed uncritically without evidence that they will help produce a more efficient work force. Indeed, many employers not only fail to achieve a return on the cost of their testing programs but also fail to recover even their basic expenditures because the tests have no validity for employee selection. Therefore, it cannot be argued that tests are "good, economically-sound selection procedures" (as they have been represented) unless they have been proved to be so within the context of hard-nosed business and professional standards.

During the past decade, there has been a notable increase in testing procedures of doubtful utility. Some companies in Houston have even installed elaborate and expensive personality and temperament inventories for routine production jobs in the face of repeated industrial research that shows them to be completely useless for most employee selection but just dandy for psychological Peeping Toms and the personnel office that wants to reject an applicant on any phony pretense of an ostensibly "objective" nature. An official of the Atomic Energy Commission has said that "... the artificial, non-job-related entrance requirement hides more bigotry than all the white pointed hoods in the country,"¹ and he suggested that our nation would have never developed into the world power it is now if some present-day psychological testing standards of acceptability had been applied to screen persons who settled here.

Tests though are not the sole employment hurdle. Educational standards—notably, demands for a high school diploma—are often set far higher than indicated as necessary by job analyses. In its recent "Guidelines on Discrimination Because of National Origin,"² the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission said that it will "examine with particular concern" situations involving testing of English language skills and height and weight standards for employment where they are not required for the work to be performed. In these respects, the National Origin Guidelines are quite similar to the Commission's earlier "Guidelines on Employment Testing Procedures," issued August 24, 1966, in which a professionally developed ability test was interpreted as "a test which fairly measures the knowledge or skills required by the particular job or class of jobs which the applicant seeks, or which fairly affords the employer a chance to measure the applicant's ability to perform a particular job or class of jobs."

The confusion of standards of personnel selection and promotion with standards of employees' job performance has a catastrophic effect on the employment opportunities of minorities and women. The structure and content of contemporary recruiting and applicant evaluation methods result in disproportionately high rejection rates among these groups, usually without any supporting evidence of their business necessity. In the absence of validity evidence, an employer may be using a screening procedure whose only known function is rejection of minorities and women in greater proportions than of minorities and men. Disproportionately high rejection of minorities is a serious social problem by itself; and when no useful business function of the employment procedure has been demonstrated, there are many Title VII problems as well.

¹ H. T. Herrick, "Civil Rights, Gradualism, and the Established Order of Things". Speech at the AEC Industrial Relations Conference, Kansas City, Missouri, October 4, 1967.

² Federal Register, Vol. 35, No. 8, p. 421, January 13, 1970.

The vast majority of employment tests in use today are measures of achievement, usually those of an academic nature. The assumption that present achievement will predict future job performance is the basic premise for the use of most employment tests. Furthermore, the use of such achievement tests as potential predictors of job performance is based on the additional assumption that applicants have been exposed to the same general opportunities for learning, since, on the basis of the "equal exposure" concept, those persons who have the greater capacities for learning will have achieved more, as measured by tests, and may be the persons more likely to learn, for example, job skills.

Given the past and present conditions of our educational systems, this "equal exposure" or "equal opportunity" principle for learning and achieving, as measured by most employment tests, is completely false. Under these circumstances, the fact that a large segment of minority groups have not learned test-taking skills does not mean that they are unable to learn job-related skills, including those of a highly complex nature. Thus, so-called "aptitude" tests given to assess employability are often nothing more than indicators of previous opportunity to learn—not future job potential.

On the other hand, many employers say, "We cannot lower our standards," in defense of their continued low utilization of minorities. This argument is particularly frequent among employers who have experienced significant technological change. There is a widespread notion that internally complicated and sophisticated equipment must be operated by the most intelligent persons available. This belief has yet to be universally proven; and, in fact, there is quite a bit of evidence to show that as manufacturing processes become more and more automated, general intellectual requirements actually decline. Has anyone ever claimed that it requires greater intelligence, learning ability or mechanical aptitude to operate a zipper than to button up a coat? Certainly not. And everyone knows that a zipper is far more intricate than a simple button and buttonhole.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has never advocated that an employer lower productivity standards among members of his work force. However, the Commission has consistently urged that *hiring standards or qualifications* be systematically validated against employee job performance and has often insisted that applicant screening methods and test cutoff scores be changed when these selection methods result in disproportionately high rejection rates among minority applicants or present employees and have no demonstrated validity for the employer's jobs. Only in this way can the employer establish that his selection procedures serve a real business need and that the qualifying level established for hiring or promotion is one below which a greater proportion of applicants ultimately fail to meet *standards of productivity* normally expected from experienced employees. After all, if scores derived from a screening procedure are not related to employees' performance, absolutely no level of qualification for employment can be set that will result in a better work force, as determined by relevant measures of employee productivity and effectiveness.

Thus, it is high time that employers, unions, and employment agencies stop confusing tests, education, interviews, and application blanks with job requirements when they think of the "qualified" employee. Standards of employee performance are derived from job requirements and duties. They do not reside in test scores, years of schooling, and data from application blanks and interviews. In this respect, psychological tests

have been highly touted by their publishers and their users on the basis of "objectivity" and freedom from the bias or prejudice which can operate, for example, during an interview. This is a highly specious argument because, from an equal employment opportunity viewpoint, no test is objective unless results from it are known to be directly related to measures of employee effectiveness for a particular job or class of jobs.

Perhaps too much attention has been directed to employment tests as "discriminatory" and "culturally-biased" instruments. The attack on tests has tended to obscure the fact that *it is people, not tests*, that practice employment discrimination. People can discriminate; and some do. Tests do not screen out or screen in applicants for employment; people do. Tests do not exercise judgment or make personnel decisions; people do. Tests do not hire and promote; people do.

In conclusion, irrelevant and unreasonable standards for job applicants and upgrading of employees pose serious threats to our social and economic system. The results will be denial of employment to qualified and trainable minorities and women, creation of labor costs, and erection of job barriers that are incompatible with both the necessities of American industry in particular and the goals of American society in general. The commission will not stand idle in the face of this challenge. It will fight employment discrimination in whatever form it occurs. The cult of credentialism is one of our targets.

CAMPUS DISORDERS PART OF A RED PLOT?

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting article by Henry J. Taylor entitled "Campus Disorders Part of a Red Plot?" I believe it deserves wide attention.

The article follows:

CAMPUS DISORDERS PART OF A RED PLOT?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Are part of the campus disorders a Red plot? You be the judge. For a perilous feature of our day is that too many people are either too civilized, too inexperienced, too distracted or too dense to grasp the documented truth.

CENTER IN PRAGUE

We are being brainwashed whenever we are told that the thrust here is not organized. The CIA and FBI both know that the center for it is in Prague, within the shadow of the Ruzyně Airport. There the immense so called International Union of Students, financed and brain-trusted by Moscow, is supporting university anarchists here and throughout the free world.

The Kremlin departmentalizes this place into "country desks." Each section supervises a country. Cunningly, each tallors the "issues" for each country. Naturally, the IUS drums on the Vietnam issue here and "Peace! Peace! Peace!" to further a Red victory in Southeast Asia.

A Pole, Vlod Konarski, a man with a bite like a saber tooth tiger, supervises the British thrust. The IUS vehicle there is the militant Radical Student Alliance in London. Two subdivisions are supervised by Jean Bourgareau, a Frenchman, and Martin Abeln, who is Dutch.

In Erie the IUS thrust, locally called the International Movement, is based at Trinity College, Dublin. The IUS supervisor is Hardial Sinh Bains, a naturalized Canadian born in India.

A Bains sidekick is Ralph Schoenman, 34, the student shepherd of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation—the man who concocted the mock trial of President Johnson in Stockholm in protest against Vietnam ironfisted Schoenman served a "martyr" stretch in Montjoy Prison, Dublin. Britain banned Schoenman and Scotland Yard caught him. To the dismay of the CIA and FBI, Schoenman had an American passport.

In West Germany the Berlin police documented the IUS's control of Rudolph Dutschke ("Red Rudi") when Dutschke was arrested on April 11, 1968, during riots in nearly all the West German universities.

In France the IUS thrust is supervised by Daniel Cohn-Bendit ("Before you can build you must destroy"), who is not even a Frenchman. He's German. The success, typified by the March 3 Natarre campus mayhem which saw Dean Paul Ricouer kidnapped and 125 policemen injured, has all but paralyzed French education. University faculty members are brutalized and kidnapped almost daily.

The French Parliament has enacted a university reform law. In it the campuses are supposed to be autonomous. But by staging demonstrations identical with those here the continued attacks have forced Education Minister Oliver Quichard to open France's campuses to police jurisdiction by declaring university grounds to be public thoroughfares.

President Georges Pompidou himself has stated, in desperation, that "there is no security on many major campuses in France."

SITUATION IN ITALY

I had lunch in New York not long ago with Italian Foreign Minister Aldo Moro. Italy, too, has enacted a new university reform law. Moro, himself a professor, sponsored it. "But what can we do?" he asked. "In my country, as in France, your country and throughout the free world, the Reds' technique is always to up their demands with every concession they gain."

Japanese Premier Eisaku Sato spoke similarly on his visit here. He said that last year student arrests in campus disorders exceeded 14,000 (ours exceeded 3,600) and that the IUS thrust has reduced Japanese educators to a shambles. The IUS vehicle there is the immense Zengakuren student organization along with five other factions.

There's no Alfred Hitchcock mystery in what is happening here, nor the brainwashing that accompanies it. Of course, none is so blind as one who will not see. But, wake up, America!

Our enemies are promoting a civil war in the United States. "It can't happen here" is a totally dangerous philosophy. It will happen if we still refuse to wake up and call a spade a spade.

QUESTIONS REGARDING RECURRING ANNUAL GRANTS TO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES FOR RESEARCH ARE ANSWERED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, 1970, when the House was considering the conference

report on H.R. 17619, the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1971, certain questions were raised with regard to recurring annual grants reportedly made by the Department of the Interior to various colleges and universities for research.

I have brought this matter to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior, and under general leave granted to revise and extend my remarks on the conference report, I would like to place in the RECORD a letter received by me from Secretary Hickel in this connection.

It will be noted that the only annual recurring research grants made to colleges and universities are those authorized by Public Law 88-379, under the Office of Water Resources Research.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT

OF THE INTERIOR,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1970.

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. HANSEN: This will refer to your request for information concerning annual recurring grants to colleges and universities for research.

The only program that the Department administers which makes annual recurring grants to colleges and universities for research is the program authorized by Public Law 88-379, under the Office of Water Resources Research.

Under this program, which is known as "Assistance to States for Institutes," the Office of Water Resources Research makes annual grants of \$100,000 to a State university in each of the 50 States and in Puerto Rico. The request for funds to finance this program is set out as a line item under the appropriation for the Office of Water Resources Research in the President's budget and is justified annually to the Congress. Each State university receiving a grant submits to the Office of Water Resources Research for review, a list of its proposed research projects.

The appropriation items, Salaries and Expenses, Office of the Secretary, does not include grant funds for colleges and universities. The funds provided under this appropriation, as you know, are used to finance the immediate Office of the Secretary, the Under Secretary, the Assistant Secretaries and related departmental direction.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. HICKEL,
Secretary of the Interior.

REPRESENTATIVE WHALLEY PRESENTED DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL BY THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Congressman J. IRVING WHALLEY's long, distinguished service to the Nation and especially to the people of Pennsylvania, he has been honored with the Pennsylvania Department of American Legion's highest award, the Distinguished Service Medal. I certainly agree with the choice

and am happy to join in this expression of appreciation to my friend and colleague for his devoted years of service to our country. Congressman WHALLEY has spent many years representing the 12th Congressional District of Pennsylvania and has been a true friend to the causes of his district and his State. My fullest congratulations to Congressman WHALLEY for his great service in the past, and appreciation for his continued personal friendship, and best wishes for his good health in the future.

The letter informing Congressman WHALLEY of this distinctive award is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Harrisburg, Pa., July 7, 1970.

Congressman J. IRVING WHALLEY,
Windber, Pa.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHALLEY: I am very pleased to inform you that you have been selected to receive the highest award that the Department of Pennsylvania American Legion bestows to an individual, the "Distinguished Service Medal."

The selection committee has selected you to be the recipient of this award for this year because of your great service that you are rendering to mankind.

This award in past years has been given to Dr. Jonas Salk, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Richard King Mellon, Governor Edward Martin and Mrs. Clifford Heinz.

It is requested that you be present at the 52nd Annual State Convention of the Pennsylvania American Legion session on Friday, July 17, 1970 at 1:00 p.m. in the Educational Forum Building (capital complex) in Harrisburg, Pa. for the presentation of this award by State Commander Henry R. Woods.

Looking forward to seeing you at that time, I am

Sincerely,

EDWARD T. HOAK,
State Adjutant.

PARABLE FOR A DIVIDED NATION

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there are, on occasion certain public addresses which succinctly constitute profound statements on the current state of our Nation and of those who live within its borders. Such a statement, I believe, was delivered last fall during the first October anti-Vietnam war moratorium on October 15, 1969. This address has recently come to my attention and I wish to commend it to my colleagues, not because it is still another peace polemic, necessary as they may be while the war goes on, but because it is a relatively timeless statement concerning a divided Nation that very much needs to pull itself together and engage in a productive dialog which gives a fair hearing to all of the many points of view which are today present.

Warren H. Schmidt, assistant dean at the Graduate School of Business Administration of the University of Southern California, at Los Angeles, delivered this parable at a conference on adult education at Asilomar in California. Although the Vietnam war was not on the agenda, and although the parable is not

specifically concerned with the war, he felt that he wanted to discuss the shattering divisiveness within our Nation. He was rewarded with a standing ovation following his talk. I believe, since his remarks, that my colleagues will see the reason for the warm response. I include his presentation at this point in the RECORD:

IS IT ALWAYS RIGHT TO BE RIGHT?

SOME REFLECTIONS ON TENSIONS AND HOPES
(By Warren H. Schmidt)

There once was a land where men were always right, they knew it . . . and they were proud of it.

It was a land where a man was proud to say, "I am right" and "You are wrong."

For these were words of conviction, of strength and of courage.

No one was ever heard to say, "I may be wrong" or "You may be right," for these were words of weakness, uncertainty and cowardice.

When differences arose among the people of this land they sought not to re-examine and explore, but only to justify and persuade.

When differences arose between the old and the young, the older would say:

"We have worked hard to build this great and prosperous land.

We have produced cars and highways that permit us to move quickly from place to place.

We have built planes that surpass the speed of sound.

We have produced computers which solve complex problems in milliseconds.

We have even touched the moon.

We expect those who inherit this good land to appreciate what we have accomplished and to build on the heritage we have given to them."

These older people were right, of course, and they knew it and were proud of it.

But the younger people of that land would respond:

We see around us a land that has been be-fouled and exploited.

People starve where food is plentiful.

Laws and practices prevent some from having an equal chance to develop and to influence.

Noble and moral words are matched by selfish and sordid deeds.

Leaders urge us to fight wars to preserve peace—and the fighting does not end.

The whole scene is phony and polluted and inhuman and out of control.

We want no part of this money-mad Establishment.

These younger people were right, of course . . . and they knew it and were proud of it.

. . . and the gap between the generations grew wider.

When differences arose between men of different races, those from the majority race would say:

We are working steadily to build a land of justice and equality for all of our citizens.

We have made considerable progress—but social progress does not come swiftly.

Those whom we seek to help and lift can only hurt their own cause when they push and intrude and pressure us.

Let them show some patience—and let them use more fully the opportunities we have already supplied.

Then we will feel like doing even more for them.

These people of the majority were right, of course . . . and they knew it and they were proud of it.

But those from the minority group would reply:

We have been pushed around too long and we are angry.

We have been confined to a ghetto. Our children's education has been stunted in second-rate schools.

We have seen jobs go to less qualified while our people are rejected or shunted into menial tasks.

We see a thousand subtle signs that brand us and our children as second-class citizens in this land.

We will tolerate lofty promises and meagre deeds no longer.

These people from the minority were right, of course . . . and they knew it and were proud of it . . . and the gap between the races grew wider.

And so it went in this land . . .

Group after group defined the right And took their stand

And upheld their position against those who opposed them.

It happened between those who taught in the school and those who provided the funds.

It happened between those who gave priority to a strong defense and those who gave priority to better cities.

It happened between those who pleaded for peace at almost any price and those who argued for national honor at almost any cost.

Everyone was right, of course . . . and they knew it and were proud of it . . . and the gaps between the groups grew wider.

Until the day came when the rigidity of rightness caused all activity to come to a halt.

Each group stood in its solitary rightness, glaring with proud eyes at those too blind to see their truth, determined to maintain their position at all costs (For this is the responsibility of being right).

Now the quality of life in the land declined

And grew more grim

And the people became more angry

And violence increased.

People had more things, but their sense of well-being and personal fulfillment diminished.

Some measured the cost in tasks undone and energy wasted.

Others in loneliness and fear.

Most felt powerless and without hope.

But through the tense days of confusion and gaps of all kinds, some maintained their vision of a time when men would again value their differences . . .

As a source of richness

As a stimulant to learning

As a base for creativity.

Then . . .

One day a strange new sound was heard in the land.

Someone said, "I may be wrong . . . You may be right."

The people were shocked that anyone could be so weak and so confused.

But the voice persisted.

And when the people looked, they saw that it came from one who was known for his strength and wisdom.

And some people began to listen in a different way.

It now seemed safe to listen to opposing—and even "wrong"—views.

As they listened, they discovered common beliefs they had not known before.

They even began to see signs of humanity and noble purpose in those whom they once only knew as adversaries.

Here and there men expressed their common desires in deeds—and bright examples of joint action were seen in the land.

With each new effort, men's faith in one another grew . . . and their faith in the

future . . . and in their ability to shape their own destiny.

They stated these beliefs in a Declaration of Interdependence which read in part . . .

All men are created equal—but each develops in a unique way.

All men are endowed with certain inalienable rights—but each must assume certain inevitable responsibilities.

For the happiness and fulfillment of all depends on the commitment of each to accept and support equality and uniqueness, rights and responsibilities.

In this land men had learned how two rights could make a costly wrong.

That it may take less courage to point a finger than to extend a hand and less wisdom to defend a narrow right than to search for truth.

Most important of all, the people of this land had learned that the quest for truth is never over; that the challenge is always the same . . .

To stop fighting long enough to listen.

To learn from those who differ.

To try new approaches.

To seek and test new relationships.

And to keep at a task that never ends.

WHY DID DAVID HAVE TO BE KILLED?

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the story of war is replete with sadness and personal heartbreak, yet there seems always to be gallant and noble expressions of confidence and belief in our country which help to compensate for the tragedy of war. A young man from Fort Walton Beach in my district, whose name was David A. Hickman, was killed in service. Another brother Ronald, also in the service, wrote a letter to his 11-year-old sister about the death of their brother. I don't think many communications have been penned which express patriotism more clearly. How good it would be if every young man and woman could read this letter and heed its contents. I submit it for publishing in the RECORD, for indeed it is a touching letter. David Hickman was a son of retired Lt. Col. and Mrs. John E. Hickman:

[From the Playground Daily News, May 28, 1970]

WHY DID DAVID HAVE TO BE KILLED? AS EXPLAINED TO AN 11-YEAR-OLD

(EDITOR'S NOTE: A Navy petty officer, 22, from Fort Walton Beach, wrote to his 11 year old sister, explaining why their older brother was killed in Vietnam, explaining maturity.)

Dear Lori, first I will explain why I am writing this letter. I do not intend this to be a one-sided lecture, nor is it meant as advice; the only advice I can give you is "Decide for Yourself." What this is, is simply an explanation, for I believe I owe this to those whom it concerns. This concerns you, as well as each one of our family, including myself.

David was killed last December. We wondered how it happened, where it happened, when; but mostly we asked why. Why? Why did David join the Army? Why did he go to Vietnam? Why was he killed?

Perhaps, I can explain; to you and myself.

Why did David join the Army? The answer to this question is the same as the answer to the question: "What is the difference between a child and an adult?" A child is someone who wishes all the time, and wishes that his wishes come true. An adult is a person who realizes that wishes accomplish nothing, and only through productive achievement can he achieve his desires. In other words, an adult is someone who works for his own living, and refuses to "sponge" off others.

Every child, some sooner than others, comes to a point in his youth when he must decide whether he wishes to be fed, clothed, and protected by others, or whether he works to feed, clothe, and protect himself. Some never make this decision, and live their life in a state of constant dreaming or childish nightmares. They live in the world of Peter Pan and never grow up. They "hope" and "wish" and "dream" and that's all they do. In reality, this accomplishes nothing.

Those that do decide to become adults, to support their own life, no longer dream the impossible dream or reach for the unreachable star. They struggle to realize the possible dream and reach for the reachable star. For those reasons—and many more—David joined the Army.

Why did he go to Vietnam? He did not go there to sacrifice his life. A sacrifice is when you give something up and receive nothing. He went there to live and to fight for the way of life he wanted, along with those who believe the same. So he did indeed expect to gain something by going there. He sought to attain his values and to stop those who tried to destroy them. He did not sacrifice his life. It would have been a sacrifice if he was willing to live under the conditions of those whom he opposed. He was not.

He did not go there on a simple mission: destroy, kill. He went there to stop those who seek to destroy our way of life and our lives. He was trying to destroy destruction. He was fighting to keep values he believed in: freedom of thought, freedom of work, freedom of happiness, independence, of the spirit. All these ideas are exactly what Communism is opposed to. Too many people believe that while Communist methods are evil, their goals are noble. It is this belief among the men who are still free that is responsible for every Communist victory in history. Their methods are ghastly, their goals are inhuman.

We do not exist for the State's pleasure, but for our own; we do not work where and in what manner we are told to but do the work we choose; we don't buy what is dictated to us, but instead, we buy what we want. We do not shackle our minds and believe everything that is told us, but we free our minds and decide the truth by reason. This is their reason for hating us, their reason for trying to "bury" us. David chose not to let them do it.

Maybe conditions aren't as they should be in this country or as ideal as we want. But wishing will not change these conditions and tears won't stop them. When people are dying of hunger around you, your heart will be of no earthly use to them. It is only with your mind and your creative labor can you change things. This is why David was killed, because he fought to change things into the way they ought to be, and can.

But you and I look on and say "What can I do to match what he did? What can I do to equal his effort?"

By remembering what values he strived for; by remembering what he lived for; by giving yourself value to the same ideals he held as valuable. But only if you decide to, and not because "I said so."

There are many things I see and do not like. I have chosen to build as I think they ought to be and can. It takes very little

knowledge and skill to tear a building down. It takes creative thinking, determination and labor to construct the building and keep it standing.

The same holds true of any system, government organization, or way of life. It takes very little imagination to gripe about it, mock it, and destroy it. But think of the effort, creativity and purposefulness of the men who constructed that government and its ideals. Such men are responsible for all the good that has ever appeared on earth.

Yes, you may choose to remain a child, and dream of gumdrops hanging from trees, and beds of clouds, sidewalks of gold, and Peter Pan wishes, but don't be surprised when you have nightmares of Captain Hook or wicked witches of the North.

Or you may create with skill of your hands and the confidence of your mind, and feel a warmth of pride and accomplishment. In this manner, childish fears can be easily overcome, and enemies easily defeated.

Your decision may not come for many years, but when it does, don't evade the necessity of decision; it will not change the fact that there is a choice. And that choice is yours. Make the best of it.

Your brother,

Ron.

PATRIOTISM

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives a fine young person, Miss Kate Keifer. Miss Keifer is one of my constituents and quite an orator. She is presently a junior majoring in history in the school of education at Auburn University. Upon graduation, she plans a career as a teacher.

The following speech was her entry in the "Miss Patriotism Contest" sponsored by the Classified Service Clubs of Montgomery for the July 4 celebration:

PATRIOTISM

(A simulation of burning the American flag)

What if I were to actually burn this American flag? What would be your reactions to this act? First, you would probably feel hostile toward me; then you would think "why would she burn this flag, this is a symbol of my freedom, my life. Why, that is almost like burning my country." Do you know what these feelings are? They are what some people call Patriotism.

Patriotism is not a new thing—why, it's as old as man, because as long as man has been on this earth, he has had pride. Pride in himself, his home, community and now his country. Patriotism today is not as it was in 1776, even if we would like it to be that way. Yet, it is not dying, it is not twisted out of sort as some people think. Why, just the other day I was riding down a residential street and five out of ten houses I saw had American flags flying from the front of their homes. Now why in this day of no morals, drug abuse, and political conflict, why would these individuals fly this symbol of Americanism? Because this is America and only in America does a flag mean so much to a country. Only in America does your heart jump into your throat when you see Old Glory raised or hear the National Anthem. Patriotism is working, thinking, doing what is best for mankind, and when you do, you will have done it for your country.

As you know, the Pledge of Allegiance is made up of several phrases—all having a meaning that touches all mankind. They are meanings of unity, of brotherhood, of a God-fearing nation—in essence, a symbol of love. In the Bible in 1 Cor., verse 13, in part it reads:

"Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not Love, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not Love, I am nothing."

Aren't we "nothing" without pride of home, family, and country; in other words, aren't we "nothing" without Patriotism?

ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, industry is crying for technically trained manpower.

While society has the philosophy that the student must obtain a 4-year degree, only about 20 percent of any age group, although not necessarily the top 20 percent in ability, secure such a degree. What about the other 80 percent? Are they to be left with little or no preparation for today's and tomorrow's technological society in which they are expected to become productive, useful citizens? The answer, of course, must be no.

What is being done about this problem?

We support a number of remedial programs. But the National Advisory Council for Vocational Education has reported that some of these cost as much as \$12,000 for every man or woman placed in a job. This is compared to an estimated figure of \$1,000 to \$2,500 if a student were enrolled in a Federal, State, or local vocational program included in a mainstream secondary or postsecondary school system.

Mr. John Vaclavik of the office of the Governor of Texas tells of the efforts of our State to follow this less expensive—and more effective—route, which begins at the ninth grade level.

I am pleased to insert his comments in the RECORD at this time:

I am proud to report that my home state of Texas this past September initiated a demonstration project in 16 secondary schools with 1,000 students enrolled. This program will prepare the students for the "world of work." The Environmental Technology Program, as it is called, was born in 1968 when the Mechanical Contractors of Texas and allied industry groups through the medium of the Construction Industry Council conducted a manpower survey in Texas. In every category the study revealed a shortage which was expected to rapidly accelerate.

Shortly after taking the survey, the Texas Education Agency was approached by industry to assist the public schools to train students for this manpower shortage. Out of these discussions came the Environmental Technology Program which includes air/water pollution control; air/water distribution; air/water treatment; as well as the manufacturing, distribution and service re-

lated job descriptions that supplement and make the environmental control industry possible.

The curriculum for the Environmental Technology Program begins in the 9th grade where the student is introduced to the world of work through lectures, readings, and visits to plant sites. In the 10th grade, he studies, plumbing, pipe fitting, and welding. The 11th grade is devoted to heating and air conditioning, and in the 12th grade the student spends half a day in the classroom and the other half working for industry in his chosen field.

Since the courses of the Environmental Technology Program are electives, the student also takes regular academic subjects. Consequently, upon graduating from high school, he is prepared for college entry. However, if he does not go to college he can enroll in a technical school, enter an apprenticeship program, or enter the labor market. Nevertheless, wherever his educational training ceases, he will have a saleable skill and will be a taxpayer as opposed to a welfare recipient.

After reviewing the Environmental Technology Program, which has been well received by the Texas Education Agency and cooperating local schools, the United States Office of Education called a meeting on December 11, 1969 here in Washington with a cross-section of interested governmental agencies and national industry representatives. The purpose of the meeting was to gain a better understanding of how the program was originated, its potential, and possible use of the pattern by other states. As a result of the December 11 meeting, a follow-up session was held in February 1970 to explore the matter further.

I am pleased that Texas has assumed a leadership position in offering solutions to our various educational problems rather than wringing their hands and waiting for the inevitable explosion. It should be noted that the Environmental Technology Program in Texas is one of many attacks on the manpower problem and is not the only solution. However, it is one of the most interesting and innovative projects being undertaken in our state.

I commend my Governor, the Honorable Preston Smith, for his outstanding work for the improvement of technical-vocational education and support him in his objectives. Governor Smith has long been a friend of technical-vocational education.

I submit, with Mr. Vaclavik, that it is now the joint responsibility of the Congress with the several States to provide the funds and the leadership to streamline the public education system to accomplish the vital function of preparing every child to earn a wage and to find a responsible and useful place in his community. It is only through such creative activity that we can undergird our basic concept of the dignity of work and the right of every person to reach for his own destiny.

POWER (PRISONERS OF WAR EFFECTIVE RELEASE) DRIVE

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in "The Enchanted News", second quarter. This magazine is a quarterly publication of the Penitentiary of New Mexico:

POWER (PRISONERS OF WAR EFFECTIVE RELEASE) DRIVE

The stereotyped image of a convict is a variable thing. It seems to depend upon the immediate purpose of its use. The image can be frightening, comical, or even pathetic. But it remains exactly that only—an image.

In fact, convicts are people . . . human beings . . . individuals. And it may come as a surprise to find that they possess the same emotions and capacities as their free-world counterparts. Convicts think, worry and regret. They get hungry, cold, sick, happy and lonesome. They work, play, laugh, and even cry. In other words they feel every single emotion that non-convicts do. Maybe they feel some things even deeper.

Recently, Mrs. James L. Hughes met with Warden Felix Rodriguez and Deputy Warden H. R. Herrera at the Penitentiary of New Mexico to discuss the possibilities of having the penitentiary art department design and layout art work concerning release and humane treatment of prisoners of war. Mrs. Hughes' husband is a prisoner of war in North Vietnam.

Mrs. Hughes told of many fruitless efforts to find out about her husband's status and welfare, including a trip to Thailand to visit the North Vietnam Embassy in Bangkok. She heard from her husband only after purchasing a full-page ad in the BANGKOK POST to appeal her situation. She has heard nothing since.

It became apparent to Mrs. Hughes, and many other families who have men held as prisoners of war, that appeals through paid advertisements in neutral countries would be their greatest hope in securing word about their men. As a result, Rescue-Line was established toward that aim. The creation of Rescue-Line was a sort of last resort to effect the release—or at the very least, some news—of these men. The organization has been attempting to raise the funds necessary to accomplish their goal, but these efforts have not met with the success of which such a campaign is worthy. As an example, an advertisement soliciting funds was run in an Albuquerque newspaper at a cost of more than one hundred dollars. The ad drew some thirty dollars in contributions! This, and other experiences, moved Mrs. Hughes to seek assistance in other—some might say peculiar—places. With the idea of prisoners helping prisoners, Mrs. Hughes sought assistance at the Penitentiary of New Mexico. She felt that men at the penitentiary, being prisoners themselves and locked away from their families and loved ones, might be able to offer some suggestions in art and other ideas that would bring the situation concerning the men held as prisoners of war to the attention of the world.

Mrs. Hughes pointed out that some 1,406 families—including some 4,000 children—await anxiously some news, day by day, that their husbands or fathers are safe. But that word never comes. The men are held without even the privilege of communication.

Well now! What would you expect a bunch of "cons" to do? After all, they are convicts, aren't they? Well here is what they did. Are doing!

With the approval of Warden Felix Rodriguez and Deputy Warden H. R. Herrera, a committee was formed to organize ideas for a concentrated campaign. The name power drive was coined—standing for Prisoners of War Effective Release Drive—and to prevent anyone from taking part through the hope of personal gain or recognition, an agreement was made that there would be no names involved. All work would be performed anonymously. With this understanding, the planning got underway. Special art work was done and posters prepared. These have been designed for use anywhere in the world. Publicity and advertising ideas were worked out. Service clubs and other inmate groups were contacted and told the story.

Ideas for an effective campaign began to take shape. And money started to come in; money from convicts.

Needless to say, convicts aren't among the nation's high income groups, but contributions ranging from \$1.00 to \$10.00 have been received. And through the combined cooperation of the administration and officials of the blood plasma program, arrangements have been made whereby inmates without money can give blood and have \$5.00 deposited to the account of Rescue-Line. At the time of this writing well over \$300.00 has been received, and money continues to come in.

Those inmates active in power drive hope to spread the campaign from the Penitentiary of New Mexico to other penal institutions, and through inside service clubs, to the outside. It is their hope that enough money can be raised, enough publicity generated, to aid in the release of—or at least the establishment of communications with—those Americans held as Prisoners of War.

One of the interesting aspects of the power drive campaign is that personal feelings about American involvement in the Vietnam conflict seem to have little effect on the willingness of inmates to help. One of the men summed up the general feeling when he said, "No matter why a man is locked up, he should be treated like a human." That seems to be the whole idea. Humanity. And right now, at this moment, for the first and probably only time, many of the inmates of the Penitentiary of New Mexico can say, I'm proud to be a convict.

STOPPING THE SWING TOWARD PROTECTIONISM

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee's announcement of its tentative decisions on a trade bill has brought about a somewhat belated reaction by those of us who fear the overall economic impact which a return to protectionism will inflict upon the Nation.

Since 757 trade and tariff bills have been introduced in this Congress alone, it perhaps would have been appropriate if the effort to educate the public had begun sooner. Nevertheless, in an effort to stem the protectionist tide here at almost the 11th hour, I am inserting another editorial in the RECORD. This one is from the July 25, 1970, issue of Business Week. The editorial is concerned particularly with the myth that the United States is an open market and with the assumption that foreign competition is "unfair" because pay scales are lower than in the United States:

STOPPING THE SWING TOWARD PROTECTIONISM

After almost 40 years of progress toward freer international trade, the U.S. suddenly is threatening to retreat once again into protectionism. The trade bill now taking shape in the House Ways and Means Committee would mark a definite reversal of the policy the nation has pursued since the time of Cordell Hull. In fact, it would enjoy the dubious distinction of being the most restrictive trade legislation since the Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1930.

President Nixon is absolutely right to serve notice on Congress early in the game that he will veto this bill if it succeeds in getting

through the House and Senate. But it will take more than just the threat of a veto to stem the rising protectionist sentiment in Congress and among a disturbing number of U.S. businessmen. The Administration must take the lead in explaining the vital stake that the U.S. has in an expanding system of international trade. At the same time, it must take firm action to deal with the legitimate complaints of American businessmen.

Ways and Means Committee hearings revealed widespread misunderstanding—as well as some deeply cherished myths—about the role that trade plays in the U.S. economy. Underlying much of the testimony were mistaken assumptions: for example, that foreign competition is "unfair" because pay scales are lower than in the U.S.; or that the U.S. is the only "open market" on earth.

Actually, low wages abroad are associated with lower productivity. The U.S. can maintain its wage differential—and its higher standard of living—provided its workers continue to be more productive. Curbing imports of textiles, shoes, and other products would remove the spur of competition, which is one of the most important factors promoting increased productivity. Workers in the protected industries might benefit—but at the expense of consumers who would pay more for the goods.

The notion that the U.S. is an open market is pure myth. More than 20% of U.S. imports are controlled by quotas (such as those on oil and farm products); the average U.S. tariff level on industrial goods is above the Common Market average.

American businessmen, however, do have some ground for arguing that they are not getting a fair shake in world trade. While the U.S. has its own nontariff obstacles to trade, Japan bristles with a far greater array of quotas and other barriers to U.S. products and investment. These violate the rules of both the General Agreement on Tariffs & Trade (GATT) and the International Monetary Fund.

The Common Market is creating a discriminatory trading bloc through preferential trade agreements with other countries—also in violation of GATT. And Japan and European nations alike provide aids to exporters that in many cases amount to subsidies.

The U.S. can maintain its commitment to free trade and still refuse to be a patsy for nations that want to play a double game. The President has extensive powers under existing laws to retaliate against unfair practices and to protect American producers by such means as countervailing duties.

At the same time that he fights to stop the protectionist swing at home, the President should use these powers aggressively to force our trading partners to play a clean game and open their markets to U.S. goods. By making sure that U.S. producers are on equal footing with foreign competitors, the President will undermine one of the chief arguments that the protectionists have used in Congress.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN C. KUNKEL

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of sorrow and regret that I call to the attention of the House the passing of a former colleague and fellow Pennsylvanian, the Honorable John C. Kunkel, who served in this Chamber from 1939 through 1951, and

again from 1961 until his retirement in 1966.

John Kunkel descended from a family which had produced many Congressmen before him, extending back to the Continental Congress. He carried his family heritage boldly and gallantly; he was a tribute to his ancestry.

While serving in Congress, John Kunkel distinguished himself for his capabilities, and was often called upon to handle the most difficult assignments. Although serving in the minority party for most of his congressional career, he was able to command the respect and admiration of all who knew him.

John Kunkel was a scholar and a statesman. His contributions to the 16th District, which he represented, and to the State and to the Nation, will long be remembered. He was true to the American principles and gave of himself completely in all his endeavors.

Mrs. Whalley and I offer our deepest and most sincere condolences to his wife Kitty and his family. John will be sadly missed by all, but will live forever as a monument to the heritage and traditions from which he came.

"YOU'RE OLD ENOUGH TO REMEMBER THE REAL AMERICA IF YOU CAN REMEMBER . . ."

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, a letter in this morning's mail aptly summarizes the reaction of many Americans to the nightmarish events which have become a part of our daily experience. I would like at this point in the RECORD to include the statement "You're Old Enough To Remember the Real America if You Can Remember . . ." together with the letter from Mr. Ken Fitzpatrick of Bellflower, Calif., who sent it to me. The statement and letter follow:

YOU'RE OLD ENOUGH TO REMEMBER THE REAL AMERICA IF YOU CAN REMEMBER . . .

When you never dreamed our country could ever lose.

When you left the front door open.

When people knew what the Fourth of July stood for.

When you took it for granted that women, the elderly and the clergy were to be respected.

When a girl was a girl.

When a boy was a boy.

When you didn't feel embarrassed to say that this was the best darn country in the world.

When socialist was a dirty word.

When taxes were only a nuisance.

When the poor were too proud to take Charity.

When you weren't afraid to go out at night.

When ghettos were neighborhoods.

When you knew the law meant justice, and you felt a little shiver of awe at the sight of a policeman.

When young fellows tried to join the Army or the Navy.

When songs had a tune.

When criminals went to jail.

When you bragged about your home state and your home town.

When politicians proclaimed their patriotism.

When clerks and repairmen tried to please you or else.

When a Sunday drive was an adventure, not an ordeal.

When you could always find someone willing and able, whenever you wanted something done.

When riots were unthinkable.

When the clergy talked about religion.

When you took it for granted that the law would be enforced, and your safety protected.

When the flag was a sacred symbol.

When our government stood up for Americans, anywhere in the world.

When a man who went wrong was blamed, not his mother's nursing habits or his father's income.

When everyone knew the difference between right and wrong, even Harvard Professors.

When things weren't perfect, but you expected them to be.

When you weren't made to feel guilty for enjoying dialect comedy.

When people still had the capacity for indignation.

When you considered yourself lucky to have a good job.

When you were proud to have one.

When people expected less and valued when they had more.

When college kids swallowed goldfish, not acid.

When America was the land of the free, and the home of the brave.

DEAR MR. CLAWSON, I had intended to write you regarding some of the issues confronting us today, when someone handed me this piece of paper, and I found on it many of the things I really wanted to say.

The "real America" is still here, but we have to dig a little harder to find it. The news media tries desperately to hide it in many instances by attempting to make the abnormal appear normal, the "bad guys" seem like "good guys", etc., and now more than at any time we need men of national stature to make news telling the good things about our great country.

My wishes as one of your constituents are quite simple—support the President—fight for a Supreme Court which will uphold the Constitution, not re-write it—support programs which protect the would be victim, not the criminal—talk about the good things about America at every opportunity and you could have the longest filibuster ever heard in the House!

Best personal regards,

KEN FITZPATRICK.

NEWSPAPERS ARE THE MEN AND WOMEN WHO MAKE IT

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the weekly newspaper is truly a reflection of the community it serves. As such it is an important part of that community and has enormous power and responsibility. As Heywood Broun said many years ago, "A newspaper is a rule unto itself. It has a soul for salvation or damnation. The intangibles of a newspaper are the men and women who make it. A newspaper can neither rise nor fall below its staff." This statement is particularly true of those weekly newspapers which are small

businesses in our community. The dedication of their staffs makes the paper fail or succeed.

In the southwestern part of Nassau County N.Y., in what will soon be part of my Fourth Congressional district, there is an outstanding weekly newspaper called the Nassau Herald. Its publisher is Robert Richner and its editor, Leatrice S. Spanierman. It is the official newspaper for the village of Lawrence and of Hewlett Neck. This past week the paper ran a particularly interesting editorial entitled "Sounding Off." The editorial concerned jet noise, one of the real plagues of this area and one against which every level of government must be mobilized, including the local communities. This can so well be done by local newspapers. The editorial follows:

SOUNDING OFF

The Five Towns, long plagued by jet noise, must sympathize with other besieged areas and welcome a North Shore ally as well as one in the Hamptons to our long-time fight against the thundering above us.

The mayor of East Hills which is located near Roslyn has called upon his villagers to campaign against the noise of jets flying overhead. Although the village is not situated in close proximity to an airport, traffic patterns for Kennedy have affected East Hills and residents are complaining that the noise is "intolerable."

In East Hampton, a small three runway airport tucked away in 600 acres of woodland has created controversy although there are only about 30,000 take-offs and landings there per year, and certainly no commercial jets on this relatively quiet installation. However, a group has formed called the Aircraft Noise Control Council of the Hamptons, concerned about a proposed lengthening of a runway. A leader of the organization has taken a delegation to the East Hampton Village Board to ask for a ban on all flights over the village.

Well, we here, have really heard it all before. We too tried to ban flights over Hempstead Town and were unsuccessful in court. We too tried to rouse citizens to ban together to fight this menace that plagues us. We were on the noise pollution wagon long before the term "ecology" was a household word . . . to no avail.

Now, once again we have hope. Our residents cooperated with a letter of complaint campaign. The multitude of responses were then forwarded to Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz who has filed suit in State Supreme Court to force airlines and the Port of New York Authority to take immediate steps to reduce the noise of the jets.

We who are bombarded by health-affecting noise nuisances must endure the ear-splitting tumult low above our homes, our offices, hospitals, schools . . . but perhaps, in the near future . . . we will be mercifully relieved of the intensity of the jet noise . . . by the courts declaring the screaming planes a legal nuisance.

INSPIRING MESSAGE FOR YOUTH

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last month a young man with roots deep in the community of Montclair, N.J., a man who has traveled far since he graduated from his high school, and a man with a great future, returned to deliver a commencement address.

Every spring, of course, the countryside is deluged with commencement speeches. But this one was really special.

I did not have the privilege of hearing it, nor do I have a long personal acquaintance with the speaker. But after reading it, I think I know very clearly the kind of drive and determination to overcome hardships and obstacles that propelled this outstanding citizen, Mr. Aubrey C. Lewis. His message is truly an inspiring one for our youth:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS DELIVERED BY
AUBREY C. LEWIS

Rev. Gray and Friends, I believe that covers everyone here.

When I was asked to participate in today's commencement exercises, the invitation was a particularly welcomed one. It is a real privilege for me to return to Montclair high school some sixteen (16) years after I moved through these hallowed halls receiving instructions from many of the same teachers here today. In that sixteen years, many of the fundamentals grasped in the classroom and on the athletic field at Montclair High have been used and utilized in my daily life and for that specific educational discipline I am quite pleased.

You know—I consider you the luckiest graduating class of all times—anywhere—for many reasons, namely:

You were involved in a now situation. Montclair High is a microcosm of America—its people—action and events. You have had failures, demonstrations, boycotts and even a scheduling breakdown, when you finally had to put the module system in moth balls. All of us have learned a great deal from these experiences and this exposure has prepared you for the many confrontations you are apt to face in the future. The decisions you make often times will be based on the exposure you've had here at Montclair High School.

During the course of your past twelve (12) academic years I know the thoughts have occurred—why am I doing it? Where do I want to go? What is it all about? Is it worth it? But most of you, by the very nature of your presence here today have exercised intestinal fortitude or just plain guts. You realized that you just can't turn back—you must keep on moving. Work towards! Fight for! You can't cop out! You have to dedicate yourself to something!

You are lucky too because you have had the opportunity to rub elbows with the rich, the poor, the black, the white, the gifted, the concerned, the pushers and the passive. This is what it is all about!!!

There have been many academic changes at Montclair High School in the past sixteen (16) years, with the result being that approximately 80% of the graduates now attend major colleges, junior colleges or specific skill institutions. These have all been brought about as a result of a realization on the part of you, on the part of the generation sitting behind you, and because someone, somewhere, realized that there was a need. A problem existed and collectively a solution was reached.

I say again you are the luckiest graduating class of all times and I say this simply because you are faced with more challenges than any other preceding graduating class in history. Oh yes, that marvelous generation sitting out there with tears of parental joy in their eyes had challenges also, and we must recognize the fact that they, who could be considered part of the establishment or the system, have had a reasonable amount of success.

As a result of their efforts, small pox no longer exists, diphtheria, which used to destroy many children at birth, no longer is the killer. Many other medical research proj-

ects and inventions have been made from removals to transplants and thus human life has been prolonged.

Many of the people out there heard the first radio, saw the first television, of course I was among that group. Saw the tallest buildings erected, the Woolworth, the Chrysler, the Empire State and now you are seeing the Twin Towers-Port Authority Building in New York City going up. Bridges and roads, communication facilities and they even created a system which landed a 1947 Montclair High School graduate on the moon.

Yes, they have had some success. However, they leave a lot of additional challenges for each and everyone of the 499 beautiful people sitting before me. I guess we could break it right down into getting along with each other. But let's not do that—let's specifically mention "drug abuse", "air and water pollution", and yes—wars. These are problems that you will have to face and solve if the prolonged life that that generation out there so admirably established is not to have been in vain.

I suggest that starting tomorrow "you beautiful people"—get up early! Make your day longer! Because there are so many things, so many challenges, so much to be done—and now you have to respond to the call. Remember along with recognition comes responsibility.

Doors—we have all talked about closed doors from a racial standpoint, from an economic standpoint and even from a woman's opportunity standpoint. Tear down the shackles—anytime just one person is denied because of the aforementioned, then we are all being denied. Remember, you must reach out and touch somebody's hand.

We still have cancer—sickle cell anemia, and there is a great need for social and business professionals with insight. Can you bridge this gap?

Have you ever seriously thought about compromise? I can see the results of compromise here today. Many of you have shortened your hair due to the desires and wishes of those proud people behind you. You might call them "hang-ups"—but don't. Let's call it the beginning of a great understanding between two marvelous generations and also, the lighting of the candle—the realistic relevant compromise! You're never going to have your way completely. There is give! And there is take!

In just thirty years, in the United States alone, there will be approximately 330 million people, a tremendous increase—which means that a major challenge will be for you to create a system which will better utilize the talents of each person and also to better utilize the natural resources of our land. Is there a point of no return?

Communications—your ability to communicate with your fellowman, with your peers and with your associates is a vital one. The next five (5) years should be dedicated and a plan must be adopted by each person with certain intermediate objectives and ultimate goals, and in doing so, emphasize the art of communicating, of selling yourself, of selling your program, of selling your idea and sometimes selling intangible goals to concrete, practical thinking people. In order to do that, certain fundamentals, certain basics must be acquired.

You can lead me only if you are fundamentally sound. There are no instant leaders. Sound thinking and sound judgment are generally based on involvement, experiment, trial and error and access to living situations. This is where our educational system excels—but could be improved.

Imagine yourselves walking along a desert area, diseased and afflicted with leprosy and suddenly a voice appears saying "put sand in your pocket and tomorrow you will be both happy and both sad" and because you obey—tomorrow you look into your pockets

and there find miracle medicine which completely cures you from this terrible affliction along with many of your friends and associates and as the line grows longer and longer, and grains of sand which have been turned into miracle medicine diminishes until finally you have used up the last portion. What a terrible feeling to look at a line of a thousand anxious, hopeless people, waiting for the cure and there is no more because you didn't put enough sand in your pocket.

I ask you at this point "How much sand are you putting in your pockets? Have you mastered the basics? Have you acquired the fundamentals?"

To the older generation and to you beautiful people—(Whitney Young) was right when he said, "We may have traveled in different ships, but we are all in the same boat now".

"Hang in there tough".

Thank you very much.

[From the Montclair Times (N.J.), July 2, 1970]

MHS HEARS A. C. LEWIS

In a commencement address to the graduates of Montclair High School, teachers, parents and guests, Aubrey C. Lewis characterized the class of 1970 as "the luckiest graduating class of all times" citing the educational and social experiences which have crossed their lives. Mr. Lewis, assistant vice president-career development F. W. Woolworth, shared the stage of Montclair High with the Rev. William H. Gray III, pastor of Union Baptist Church who delivered the invocation.

The text of Mr. Lewis' speech given June 17 follows:

"Rev. Gray and friends, I believe that covers everyone here.

"When I was asked to participate in today's commencement exercises, the invitation was a particularly welcomed one. It is a real privilege for me to return to Montclair High School some 16 years after I moved through these hallowed halls receiving instructions from many of the same teachers here today. In that sixteen years, many of the fundamentals grasped in the classroom and on the athletic field at Montclair High have been used and utilized in my daily life and for that specific educational discipline I am quite pleased.

"You know—I consider you the luckiest graduating class of all times—anywhere—for many reasons, namely:

"You were involved in a now situation. Montclair High is a microcosm of America—its people—action and events. You have had failures, demonstrations, boycotts and even a scheduling breakdown, when you finally had to put the module system in moth balls. All of us have learned a great deal from these experiences and this exposure has prepared you for the many confrontations you are apt to face in the future. The decisions you make often times will be based on the exposure you've had here at Montclair High School.

"During the course of your past 12 academic years I know the thoughts have occurred—Why am I doing it? Where do I want to go? What is it all about? Is it worth it? But most of you, by the very nature of your presence here today have exercised intestinal fortitude or just plain guts. You realized that you just can't turn back—you must keep on moving. Work towards! Fight for! You can't cop out! You have to dedicate yourself to something!

"You are lucky too because you have had the opportunity to rub elbows with the rich, the poor, the black, the white, the gifted, the concerned, the pushers and the passive. This is what it is all about!

"There have been many academic changes at Montclair High School in the past sixteen years, with the result being that approxi-

mately 80% of the graduates now attend major colleges, junior colleges or specific skill institutions. These have all been brought about as a result of a realization on the part of you, on the part of the generation sitting behind you, and because someone, somewhere, realized that there was a need. A problem existed and collectively a solution was reached.

"I say again you are the luckiest graduating class of all times and I say this simply because you are faced with more challenges than any other preceding graduating class in history. Oh yes, that marvelous generation sitting out there with tears of parental joy in their eyes had challenges also, and we must recognize the fact that they, who could be considered part of the establishment or the system, have had a reasonable amount of success.

"As a result of their efforts. Small Pox no longer exists; Diphtheria, which used to destroy many children at birth, no longer is the killer. Many other medical research projects and inventions have been made from removals to transplants and thus human life has been prolonged.

"Many of the people out there heard the first radio, saw the first television, of course I was among that group. Saw the tallest buildings erected, the Woolworth, the Chrysler, the Empire State and now you are seeing the Twin Towers—Port Authority building in New York City going up. Bridges and roads, communication facilities and they even created a system which landed a 1947 Montclair High School graduate on the moon.

"Yes, they have had some success. However, they leave a lot of additional challenges for each and everyone of the 499 beautiful people sitting before me. I guess we could break it right down into getting along with each other. But let's not do that—let's specifically mention 'Drug Abuse,' 'Air and Water Pollution,' and yes—wars. These are problems that you will have to face and solve if the prolonged life that that generation out there so admirably established is not to have been in vain.

"I suggest that starting tomorrow 'you beautiful people'—get up early! Make your day longer! Because there are so many things so many challenges, so much to be done—and now you have to respond to the call. Remember along with recognition comes responsibility.

"Door—we have all talked about closed doors from a racial standpoint, from an economic standpoint and even from a woman's opportunity standpoint. Tear down the shackles—anytime just one person is denied because of the aforementioned, then we are all being denied. Remember, you must reach out and touch somebody's hand.

"We still have cancer—Sickle Cell Anemia, and there is a great need for social and business professionals with insight. Can you bridge this gap?

"Have you ever seriously thought about compromise? I can see the results of compromise here today. Many of you have shortened your hair due to the desires and wishes of those proud people behind you—you might call them "Hang-Ups"—but don't. Let's call it the beginning of a great understanding between two marvelous generations and also, the lighting of the candle—the realistic relevant compromise! You're never going to have your way completely. There is give! and there is take!

"In just thirty years, in the United States alone, there will be approximately 330 million people, a tremendous increase—which means that a major challenge will be for you to create a system which will better utilize the talents of each person and also to better utilize the natural resources of our land. Is there a point of no return?

"Communications—your ability to communicate with your fellowman, with your

peers and your associates is a vital one. The next five years should be dedicated and a plan must be adopted by each person with certain intermediate objectives and ultimate goals, and in doing so, emphasize the art of communicating, of selling yourself, of selling your program, of selling your idea and sometimes selling intangible goals to concrete, practical thinking people. In order to do that, certain fundamentals, certain basics must be acquired.

"You can lead me only if you are fundamentally sound. There are no instant leaders. Sound thinking and sound judgment are generally based on involvement, experiment, trial and error and access to living situations. This is where our educational system excels—but could be improved.

"Imagine yourselves walking along a desert area, diseased and afflicted with leprosy and suddenly a voice appears saying "Put Sand in Your Pocket and Tomorrow You Will Be Both Happy and Both Sad" and because you obey—tomorrow you look into your pockets and there find miracle medicine which completely cures you from this terrible affliction along with many of your friends and associates and as the line grows longer and longer, the grains of sand which have been turned into miracle medicine diminishes until finally you have used up the last portion. Hopeless people, waiting for the cure and there is no more because you didn't put enough sand in your pocket.

"I ask you at this point "how much sand are you putting in your pockets? Have you mastered the basics? Have you acquired the fundamentals?

"To the older generation and to you beautiful people—(Whitney Young) was right when he said, "we may have traveled in different ships, but we are all in the same boat now."

"Hang in there tough."

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT SENT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

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

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT

Crime—the fact of it and the fear of it—continues to erode the quality of American life. The FBI reports the rate of increase of serious crimes in the United States for the first three months of 1970 was up 13 percent over the first three months of 1969.

Throughout the Nation, nine serious crimes are committed each 60 seconds. The tragic timetable includes a murder each 36 minutes . . . a robbery every two minutes . . . a burglary every 16 seconds . . . forceable rape each 14 minutes. The annual cost of crime is estimated to be \$31 billion. Yet, the statistics measuring the frequency and cost of crime failed to indicate the extent of the tragedy, sorrow and mental anguish experienced by the victims of crime.

While the public rightfully demands action, many citizens still believe that crime in all its forms is the responsibility of the Federal government. Enforcement of criminal law is the primary responsibility of State and local governments. The Federal government's role is to supply the strongest possible support to State and local law enforcement agencies.

Congress has moved to provide this support, and Federal aid to the State and local governments is the fastest growing item in

the Federal budget. Because crime continues to be a growing menace at all levels of society, a broad-based attack must be pressed along the following lines:

1. Adequate funding—The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), created by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, provides financial and technical support for local and State police agencies. It has never received adequate funding, however. For example, Indiana, with a comparable crime rate to the National rate, received about \$1 million in LEAA funds last year. The State could have used 10 times that amount to launch an effective anti-crime effort.

The Administration has recommended \$480 million for LEAA in fiscal year 1971, an increase of \$212 million over the previous fiscal year. Given the great need to accelerate efforts by state and local anti-crime agencies, I introduced legislation authorizing \$750 million for FY 1971. Ultimately, a bill authorizing \$650 million for LEAA passed the House.

2. Reform of Court and Penal Systems—With a recidivist (or "return") rate of 70 percent among our criminal offenders, it is apparent our penology system has serious shortcomings. We must improve archaic and inadequate penal facilities and systems at State, local and Federal levels. New controls must be placed over probationers, parolees and those found not guilty by reason of insanity. I have introduced legislation to bring about these reforms.

I also have introduced legislation to require quicker trials for those charged with Federal criminal violations, and to strengthen the control over defendants with criminal records while they await trial. We need also to ease the load on over-burdened criminal court judges, and apply pressure for sound court management.

3. Juveniles—New efforts and new emphasis must be placed on controlling and preventing juvenile crime. Crime rate increases among those under 18 are nearing 10 percent each year. The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 authorizes block grants to States to combat this growing menace.

4. Dangerous Drugs—The District of Columbia Police Department reports that 45 percent of those arrested in 1969 had a history of drug use. Obviously, more education on drugs is needed across the country; trafficking in drugs has to be curtailed, both in the U.S. and internationally, and the root causes of drug abuse must be brought under increased scrutiny.

5. Organized Crime—Statistics indicate that nearly \$100 billion annually is reaped by organized crime in gambling and loan sharking alone. The Organized Crime Bill of 1969, which has passed the Senate, would do much to cut into these lucrative, but vulnerable, activities of organized crime. I support and urge its passage.

6. Social Problems—Anti-crime programs do not, in themselves, eliminate the conditions which foster crime. Continued attention must be given to the social problems which create these conditions and to a variety of actions to make crime inconvenient.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 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?

FFA "BUILDING OUR AMERICAN COMMUNITIES"

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Future Farmers of America are today embarking on a new and dynamic program for America and its future.

It is a new and innovative community action program—"Building Our American Communities."

Quite frankly, I am excited about this program and its potential. As you know, the Future Farmers of America is an organization of young men studying vocational agriculture in the schools across the Nation.

Upon its inception, the FFA took upon itself the equally challenging task of attempting to transform American agriculture. The fantastic strides which have been made in the production of our food and fiber owe a debt of gratitude to the FFA for the success which has been attained.

Now the FFA plans to do something about the problems which confront our crowded urban areas.

The program is a new national effort which has been conceived in conjunction with the Farmers Home Administration. Again, the young men of the FFA and their advisers intend to do something about the problems of modern urban living.

The overcrowding of our cities and their arteries, the urban blight, and the other problems of an urban population can be met in part, they feel, if sufficient jobs, adequate housing and municipal facilities could be secured for rural and semirural America.

In working jointly with the Farmers Home Administration, it was decided that a program involving both study and action would be the most effective method of involving the young men of the FFA in this challenging new venture. Instructional material is being made available to the 12,000 instructors of vocational agriculture across the length and breadth of our land. Beginning with the 1970-71 school year, this information will be taught in vocational agriculture classrooms in 9,000 American communities. These classes will devote a portion of their instructional period to the discussion of the problems of their local communities.

In addition to the instructional phase, FFA members will be involved in actual community improvement projects dealing with seven rural problem areas.

In my opinion this is but a beginning for I feel confident that tens of thousands of individuals will become interested because of the concern of these young peo-

ple. A useful dialogue will result, and I am equally certain that new innovations to implement the intent of the program will be rapidly forthcoming. The FFA will serve as a model for other organizations to become involved.

This is a marvelous example of constructive youth involvement in the problems of modern America.

We often use the phrase about everybody talking about the weather but not doing anything about it.

Well, the FFA is not just talking about the problems of this Nation in the seventies, they are going to do something about them.

They have my support. The 450,000 Future Farmers of America are going to make a contribution equal to that which its members have made and are making to agriculture.

ASSISTANCE PLAN

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, there is no more important task before this Congress than that of helping our poor to become productive, taxpaying citizens. The welfare reform bill which this House has passed and sent to the other body would be a major step in that direction. It would assist our poor to contribute, rather than detract, from the life of our Nation.

The New Orleans States-Item recently published an excellent editorial on this subject. I am inserting it in the RECORD and calling it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New Orleans States-Item, July 20, 1970]

ASSISTANCE PLAN

Congress should approve President Nixon's Family Assistance Plan as an alternative to the existing inadequate welfare system.

Louisiana and the South have a tremendous stake in the plan, which places a floor under incomes and gives individuals a chance to get off the dole. The act offers a chance for the breadwinner in thousands of families to become a productive part of the economy.

The South should favor the legislation for purely selfish reasons.

By increasing incomes of the poor—tripling or even quadrupling them in some cases—The Family Assistance Plan would provide a boost to the economy of the South. It is estimated that additional federal revenues totaling \$102 million annually would flow into Louisiana alone.

The South would benefit in disproportion to the balance of the country.

Accepting the Census Bureau's 17-state definition of the South, 52 per cent of the 20 million persons covered by the bill would be Southerners. Figures cited by Fortune Magazine show that a surprising one out of five persons in the South would be covered. More than half of those qualifying for the program would be white.

We believe the Family Assistance Plan offers a chance for individuals living without hope to shake loose from the tradition of miserable housing, inadequate diets, and an early termination of schooling.

It offers a chance for those living at the poverty level to get the type of job training and acquire the kind of motivation required if they are to break the poverty cycle.

The Family Assistance Plan already has been approved by the House and is now before the Senate. The Senate should not forget that the present welfare system is a national disgrace. It is both unresponsive and degrading.

ABM'S, MIRV'S, AND DETERRENCE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have argued for 2 years now that the gravest threat to our national security is being posed by our own deployment of the ABM and the MIRV. I must confess that this struggle has been at times a disheartening one, so I was especially pleased to see an editorial in yesterday's New York Times, supporting the positions I have taken and suggesting that any funds voted for these systems be placed in escrow until the administration implements the Senate resolution—passed overwhelmingly—urging the administration to propose a halt in ABM and MIRV deployment on both sides while SALT talks proceed. The blatant disregard of this resolution by the President and his subsequent deployment of the Minuteman III MIRV was equally disappointing and I frankly feel it makes his objectives at SALT suspect.

I include in the RECORD both the Times editorial and a paper on strategic policy developed recently by my office. This paper argues in somewhat more detail the position that these technological "advances" will serve our Nation poorly. Not only will they decrease strategic stability and expose us to a heightened risk of war, but they are also extremely costly.

The essential requirement that U.S. strategic forces must meet is an assured destruction capability—the capability of absorbing a Soviet first strike and inflicting a level of assured destruction on the Soviet Union defined as 20 to 25 percent of the population and at least 50 percent of Soviet industry. This is the essence of nuclear deterrence.

The United States can now deliver over 4,200 strategic nuclear warheads against the Soviet Union. Based on extremely conservative estimates, 400 warheads would destroy over 30 percent of the Soviet population and 75 percent of its industrial capacity—thus more than adequately meeting the requirements of assured destruction. The Soviet Union has a similar overkill capability with respect to the United States. In other words, we have a deliverable force of 10 times as many warheads as we need for sufficient deterrence of potential attack.

By MIRV'ing both our Minuteman and Polaris—Poseidon—missile forces we more than double the number of nuclear warheads, from 4,200 to 9,600, to achieve the same objective of delivering 400 warheads.

It is also inconceivable that, now or

at any time in the foreseeable future, any enemy will be able to destroy all our ICBM's, all our bombers, and all our Polaris—soon to be Poseidon—submarines simultaneously. Nevertheless, we are continuing to increase both in number and accuracy of our strategic weapons beyond any reasonable response to the Soviet threat.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, can our deployments be justified as bargaining "chips" for the SALT talks. To the contrary, as the Times quite properly suggests, the headlong pace with which they have been carried out seems better calculated to foreclose any meaningful agreement at all. The Congress should not allow such policies to carry the day, nor should we be scared into silence lest we weaken our SALT position. I earnestly commend this editorial and paper to my colleagues' attention.

The articles follow:

SALT AND SAFEGUARD

The Administration's claim that success in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) with Russia requires Congressional authorization of an expanded Safeguard program is the least credible of the many unconvincing arguments made for this antiballistic missile (ABM) system in the past year.

The Soviet Union has suggested that ABM's could be limited at "zero level," rather than at low or higher levels. This apparent readiness to ban missile defense entirely opens an attractive prospect. The hypothetical Pentagon thesis that the Soviet Union might clandestinely "upgrade" its thousands of anti-aircraft missiles into an effective antimissile defense is based on the theory that they would be secretly linked to the giant ABM radars. If those radars and the rest of the embryo Soviet ABM system around Moscow are dismantled, that would also demolish the argument that Russia could alter the power balance quickly by deploying secretly manufactured ABM launchers around those radars, which take five or six years to construct.

If missile defense were entirely banned, the Pentagon's argument for deploying MIRV multiple warhead missiles at this time would also collapse. MIRV (multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicle) is sought to insure penetration of a heavy Soviet missile defense if Moscow should build one. With a "zero ABM" agreement at SALT, no one could argue that the Soviet Union could deploy a missile defense in the future faster than the United States could increase its offensive capability to overcome it.

Yet the Nixon Administration, in its new Vienna proposals, reportedly has not proposed a MIRV ban; on the contrary, it has made unnecessary demands for intrusive on-site inspection, something it knows is anathema to Moscow, in discussions at SALT of a possible MIRV deployment halt. For eighteen months the Pentagon has been permitted to press ahead on testing and, more recently, deployment of the American MIRV.

The Soviet suggestion of an ABM ban evidently has not been rejected; it reportedly remains among the alternative "low level" ABM limits presented in the American proposals. But there are indications that the Administration prefers, and will seek at SALT, an ABM agreement that would permit both sides to have systems equal to or larger than the obsolete 64-missile defense the Soviet Union has deployed.

The agreement the Administration now projects at Vienna would not halt the strategic arms race, but would continue it in a seemingly controlled form. The degree of control, however, would be an illusion.

AND THE FUTURE

With ABM systems deployed on both sides, even at a low level, there would be a continuous race for qualitative improvement and, every few years, replacement of the system with a new generation of antimissiles, radars and computers. Far more dangerous, absence of limits on MIRV would permit a rapid multiplication of separately-targeted nuclear delivery vehicles in the strategic offensive missile forces of both sides. A five-fold increase is now under way in the American forces, from 1,700 to about 8,000 nuclear delivery vehicles.

Moreover, a race to improve the accuracy of MIRV warheads would also be beyond control, giving each side at some point the capability of destroying the other's fixed land-based ICBM's. Fixed land-based missiles would be made obsolete by this development and both countries would be forced to replace them with sea-based or mobile land-based ICBM's.

The tens of billions of dollars that would be devoured in this post-SALT arms race is reason enough to seek to avoid such an evolution. But even more important would be the dangerous instabilities that would be repeatedly introduced by permitting the stable nuclear balance that now exists to give way to a new kind of missile race.

The issue that confronts the Senate as it opens debate on the defense authorization bill, which includes funds both for ABM expansion and the rapidly growing MIRV deployment program, is not how to help the Administration achieve the SALT agreement it seeks. The real issue is how to influence the Administration to seek the kind of SALT agreement the country and the world needs. That would be an agreement banning both ABM and MIRV.

The Senate has already overwhelmingly voted a resolution urging the Administration to propose a halt in ABM and MIRV deployment on both sides while SALT talks proceed. The need now, in voting the defense authorization bill, is to put "in escrow" whatever funds are voted for ABM and MIRV deployment until the Administration, which has ignored the moratorium vote, implements the Senate resolution.

It may be inconvenient to permit the ABM and MIRV programs to grind to a halt pending the outcome of the SALT negotiations. But no strategic necessity requires that they go forward at this time, while every imperative of arms control demands that they be halted before it is too late.

TOWARD A STRATEGY OF DETERRENCE

U.S. nuclear strike forces are designed to be able to survive an enemy first-strike, to be missioned on command and to penetrate enemy defenses with a resulting nuclear damage, the anticipation of which should be sufficient to deter aggression.

The degree of damage that can be inflicted on Soviet targets was disclosed by Defense Secretary McNamara in a damage table published in January 1968.

SOVIET POPULATION AND INDUSTRY DESTROYED

(Assumed 1972 total population of 247,000,000; urban population of 116,000,000)

1 MT equivalent delivered warheads	Total population fatalities		Industrial capacity destroyed (percent)
	Millions	Percent	
100	37	15	59
200	52	21	72
400	74	30	76
800	96	39	77
1,200	109	44	77
1,600	116	47	77

Note: The U.S. strike forces designed to implement the policy of nuclear deterrence have been variously designated in Defense Department posture statements as follows:

	Oct. 1, 1966	Oct. 1, 1967	Sept. 1, 1968	Sept. 1, 1962
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
ICBM launchers	934	1,054	1,054	1,054
SLBM	512	656	656	656
Total	1,446	1,710	1,710	1,710
Intercontinental bombers	680	697	646	581
Total force loadings approximate number of warheads		4,500	4,200	4,200

It is not clear why column (4) does not reflect fewer than 4200 warheads since 65 fewer bombers are listed. Using a reduction factor proportionate to the decrease of 300 warheads for 51 bombers in the previous year, one would expect 3818 warheads rather than 4200.

Since it is now known that the Polaris A-3 throws a cluster of 3 warheads (multiple reentry vehicles or MRV's). Twenty eight of the total force of 41 Polaris submarines are equipped with A-3 warheads at 16 missiles per boat. This means an additional force loading of 896 on these 28 boats. It is probable that the 4200 figure understates the actual number of force loadings. A total force loading of 6,000 warheads may be attributed to the present U.S. nuclear strike force. A Minuteman II configured to throw 3 MRV's would lead to an even larger figure for total throwable warheads.

If we accept the 4200 warhead total, it is 21 times larger than a figure of 200 on-target warheads required to kill 52,000,000 Soviets in a retaliatory raid. The fewer than 70 Galosh ABM's deployed around Moscow would not materially alter this factor of overkill. Bomber defenses would be more significant possibly knocking out 50% of the heavy bombers, this would still leave more than 3,000 warheads to be targeted. Heavy bomber losses could be compensated for many times over by missioning fighter-bombers and carrier-based planes which hold up to 4,000 with a force loading of _____.

Given this assessment of the strategic retaliatory prospect, it becomes evident that the survivability of U.S. strike forces must be the rationale for such a degree of overcapacity. The Secretary of Defense maintains that the vulnerability of 1,000 land-based Minuteman ICBM is so endangered by the continued deployment of Soviet SS-9 ICBM's that it is essential to have Phase I of SAFEGUARD to provide ABM protection of the missile silos. The Congressional debate on SAFEGUARD examined the adequacy of the U.S. nuclear deterrent; it demonstrated that the Defense Department's case for the vulnerability of U.S. nuclear strike forces to a Soviet first strike focused on one component—the land-based ICBM's—of the total strategic forces. If one accepts the contention that 950 Minuteman missiles might be knocked out in a first-strike, one may still rely on the varied and widely-dispersed aircraft and missiles making up the rest of the U.S. strike forces.

The 1,000 Minuteman missiles, if each is credited with a single warhead, make up only 24% of the 4,200 warheads specified by the Posture Statement. To strike at the remaining 76% of the strategic warheads, the enemy would face an impossible strategic assignment. Given the geographic distribution of the aim points represented by these 3,200 warheads, it would be impossible to so time-phase a first strike as to impact nuclear blows simultaneously on all targets. Here one is even forced to make the far-out assumption that the enemy could somehow or other manage to know where the U.S. Polaris submarines were located—or even, more im-

plausibly, where these aim points would be at the exact time of missile launch—and, finally, where the Polaris submarines would be at the exact time of warhead impact. Soviet missile warheads could not simultaneously strike NATO aircraft bases, carriers at sea, B-52 bases, Polaris subs at sea and U.S. based ICBMs. This is simply a physical impossibility. The planning for such a coordinated attack must also remain undetected by our various intelligence networks. A consequence of this fact is that the Soviets always face the dilemma of risking return fire from those elements of the U.S. strike force unstruck by the initial wave of a first strike.

The fact is that Soviet planners could never be sure that a first strike, even if technically possible, would be effective in knocking out the Minuteman fields because of the prime uncertainty about the U.S. decision to keep Minuteman missile in silo when early warning systems signal the detection and identification of a massive attack. *This is not a matter of U.S. policy specifying launch-on-warning.* It is simply that Soviet planners could not be sure that the multidepth U.S. system of early warning would not trigger such a decision. We note, for example, that the present budget contains provision for \$219 million for "Development and Deployment of new satellite strategic surveillance system." This is in addition to existing systems; namely, BMEWS Ballistic Missile Early Warning Systems, OTH (Over the Horizon Radar) Systems, PAR (Perimeter Acquisition Radars), SLEM Warning System.

At least \$3 billion has been committed to development and deployment of five independent systems for giving early warning of ballistic missile attack.

It can rightly be argued that in a matter of such critical importance as maintaining the nuclear balance of terror, the Department of Defense is justified in erring on the side of caution. After all the nation's security is at stake. But too heavy a hand on the nuclear scales can have an adverse effect. It can motivate the enemy to respond with an ever-mounting deployment of more weapons that adds greater weights of armaments to both sides of the balance. No greater measure of security is achieved and each nation is the proorer in having diverted urgently needed funds and resources from satisfaction of domestic needs. *The radically new feature of the nuclear arms race is that more weapons do not necessarily mean more security.*

The entire issue of determining relative strategic strength on each side has been thoroughly confounded by two technical developments the ABM, antiballistic missile) and MIRV (multiple, independently targeted, reentry vehicle). Of these the ABM issue is at present of less significance in terms of balance of nuclear power than MIRV. For example, little sustained momentum. Its impact on the balance of nuclear power i.e. some 60 launchers must be reckoned as meaning the interception of perhaps 30 strategic warheads. In anticipation of the expansion of this ABM-1 system to other target complexes, the U.S. has decided to deploy its Poseidon MIRV SLBM force on 31 submarines. This represents an increase of some 3000 warheads in the U.S. offensive force—a hundred times that interceptable by the existing Moscow defense system.

MIRV's impact on the arms race is extremely destabilizing because it introduces a complex mathematics into arms control and into the exercise of judging nuclear sufficiency in the absence of adequate arms control. An arms accounting or balance becomes exceedingly difficult when one missile can no longer be counted as one unit of offensive fire-power. For example, the heavy throw weight Soviet SS-9 ICBM can hurl a single warhead of 25 megatons in power i.e. 25 million tons of TNT or more than a thousand

times the power of the Nagasaki A-bomb of 1945 vintage. If the single warhead is split up into three individual warheads each falling in a triangular pattern on closely spaced aim points (i.e. Minuteman silos) then the separate warheads can each be as much as 5 megatons in a weapon yield. Split-up of the single warhead package into six MIRVs would decrease the individual weapon yield to 1.5 megatons. Such a six-fold MIRV (sextext) weapon would have to achieve a modest 0.2 mile accuracy to knock out a missile silo of the Minuteman type. On the other hand, the Minuteman III will have far less MIRV potency because of its lower throw weight. Minuteman III has a triplet MIRV each of which has approximately 0.2 megatons of yield. Thus in any arms limitation of strategic weapons the United States and the Soviet Union are trying to bring into balance asymmetric missile systems.

Asymmetry in weapons would not preclude striking a balance for arms control provided that each side could be confident that the other lived up to the letter of the agreement. However, verification through inspection is a necessity for any SALT treaty. Here the MIRV development profoundly perturbs the situation since orbital cameras cannot look inside a silo and determine how many MIRVs are on board each SS-9 or Minuteman III. Almost continuous on-site inspection would be required to verify the MIRV quality of each missile.

The United States leveled off the deployment of strategic systems at the 1,000 level for land-based launchers and at the 656 level for sea-based launchers. However, the MIRV test program designed to alter the quality of the strike force of these launchers has proceeded to a point where the Air Force has announced plans to deploy Minuteman III (MIRV) in June, 1970. The Soviets have not as yet tested a true MIRV system. It is hardly likely that they would agree to a MIRV test ban and accept a position of MIRV-inferiority. On the other hand, in the absence of a test ban, the Soviets would have to assume that the United States will proceed to convert Minuteman I's and II's into Minuteman III's. By 1974 the U.S. plans to have 500 Minuteman III's deployed, but the Soviets might make the worst assumption that every one of the 1,000 Minuteman silos contains a Minuteman III. The U.S. Navy has eight of its Polaris submarines under conversion to a Poseidon configuration and the first of these will undergo sea trials this fall and be Poseidonized as of January 1971.

Although the MIRV weapon revolution has not yet run its course, there appears to be no way to moderate this phase of missile power escalation short of a SALT agreement to limit missiles to a non-MIRV configuration—a limitation which would have to be subject to stringent on-site inspection to be verifiable. The military zeal to embrace a new weapons technology appears to have severely compromised the possibility of reaching agreement at the SALT discussions. If so, then the Congress must conclude that the failure to perceive the significance of a new military technology constitutes a critical deficiency in the U.S. decision-making process on weapons systems.

The MIRVing of Minuteman III and Poseidon will result in the following force loadings for 1974-75:

Missiles (ICBM's plus SLBM's):	Warheads
500 Minuteman III.....	1,500
500 Minuteman II.....	500
160 Polaris A-3.....	480
496 Poseidon.....	4,960
ICBM's plus SLBM's total.....	7,440
Aircraft (heavy bombers):	
B-52 C-F 3 Sgdr = 45.....	2,160
B-52 G-H 17 Sgdr = 255.....	
FB-111 4 Sgdr = 60.....	
Total force loadings.....	9,600

In other words, the Defense Department is programing an increase of 5,400 warheads or 129% for strategic offensive weapons systems. This is the probable program but it is by no means the maximum force loading that could be achieved. For example, this ignores the force loading that could be delivered by 4,000 tactical aircraft.

The Defense Secretary states in his Posture Statement that the FY71 budget is transitional and that restraints are imposed on the present budget. Yet he requests \$4 billion in FY 1971 for development and deployment of major strategic programs. There is little evidence of restraint. Indeed, the Posture Statement contains requests for funding of major new weapons development like the AMSA (B-1) strategic bomber, the SCAD (Subsonic Cruise Armed Decoy), the ULMS (Undersea Long-range Missile System) and programs to rebase Minuteman in a mobile or superhardened silo form. It is implied that if the SALT talks do not succeed in limiting strategic weapons, then the United States will undertake a new round of armaments.

The comparative record of U.S. and Soviet missile deployments shows that the U.S. has always enjoyed both a quantitative and qualitative superiority in ICBMs and SLBMs. The U.S. initiative in fielding large numbers of Minuteman missiles may have stimulated a response by the Soviets which they might not otherwise have made. In describing the decision to make a massive missile build-up, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara later explained:

"Since we could not be sure of Soviet intentions—since we would not be sure that they would not undertake a massive build-up—we had to insure against such an eventuality by undertaking ourselves a major build-up of the Minuteman and Polaris forces."

Here we see evidence of the fact that decision-making in the Defense Department is keyed to making the worst assumptions about enemy intent and capability—patterning our future forces on estimate of what the enemy *might* do, not what he is actually doing. This is not a cycle of action-reaction, but rather a one way street for defense planners. It is a result of the closed system in which those charged with defense planning also have responsibility for interpreting and evaluating threats to our national security. The U.S. Congress has been either unwilling or unable to subject this decision-making to judgments in which some risks are taken on the side of peace-planning.

The decisions on the Minuteman force illustrates the failure of the Congress to inquire incisively into the quantity and quality of the missiles. For example, the decision to deploy missiles on U.S. soil failed to take into consideration the fact that an enemy strike at such missile sites would contribute a massive attack on U.S. population centers. Any serious attempt to first-strike the Minuteman silos would involve many thousands of megatons of warheads, the fallout from which would envelop the densely populated regions of the United States. Furthermore, fixed ICBMs bases would in time become targets attracting enemy fire once missile accuracy became adequate for this purpose. (A Congressional investigation in March 1960 did in fact raise this vulnerability issue, but it was not taken seriously by the U.S. Air Force.) The relative military worth of fixed land-bases vis-a-vis sea-bases for missiles was not properly studied by the U.S. Congress. The result is that some \$17 billion has been committed to Minuteman missile forces (research, development, test and engineering plus silo-construction and deployment of Minuteman I, II and III). If nuclear warhead costs and operations are included this adds up to over a \$20 billion national investment.

Last year the Secretary of Defense claimed it was essential to protect the Minuteman bases against a first-strike threat by deployment of Phase I and then Phase II of Safeguard. If we consider amortization of ABM research and development and Safeguard costs, this adds at least \$8 billion more to the Minuteman system costs. Costly as this Air Force program has been, perhaps even more costly is the fact that the quality of the missile system renders it hostile to strategic arms limitation. The fixed coordinates of land-based missiles serves to haunt them with the constant fear of a first-strike.

Congressional debate over the Safeguard program last year served to involve many members in the study of nuclear deterrence—a subject previously more or less left to the members of the special committees dealing with defense issues. As a result the Congress is in a better position to assess the defense choices of the Seventies. This report, in effect, symbolizes a determination on the part of some members of Congress to take an active role in making sure that these defense choices are soundly-based.

We should not expect instant agreement at the SALT discussions in Vienna nor should we be discouraged if no agreements seem possible this year. The important fact is that both the great nuclear powers are sitting down at the same table to talk over the most serious issue on the world agenda—the arresting of the nuclear arms race. The Soviets, for their part, could ease the nuclear tensions gripping the world if they would curtail deployment of their land-based missiles. For our part, we can exercise moderation in adding to our strategic weaponry. Both sides should be motivated to prevent spiraling upward the arms race in another costly cycle of weapons which will in the end assure neither of any improvement in its security posture.

Our negotiators at the SALT table must not only strive to reach an agreement on limiting arms that is militarily and technically sound, they must bring back one that will be acceptable to the American people. It is not sufficient that the Congress understand the issues involved; this comprehension must be broadly based and extend to the grass roots of America. H. G. Wells once wrote that: "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." (1920). Fifty years later we find that the forces of destruction have multiplied, seemingly out of control, while men inch along on a plateau of limited understanding.

If our strategic armaments are to be brought under control, it becomes necessary for the great issues involved to be fully examined in the public forum—that crucial intersection of national interest and public policy.

ALBERT SUPPORTS WOMEN'S RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon have before it House Joint Resolution 264, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women. I strongly support and endorse that resolution. Its passage by the House will be an important step down the road for equality for women.

In the past, some of the steps along that road such as the right to vote and

the Civil Rights Act which includes provisions against sex discrimination, were taken only after long and arduous efforts by our women. We men, on the whole, were mostly followers. We are followers today, but I think more ardent followers than in the past, because of the dogged determination of our leader on this issue, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS).

The gains already made by women are many, yet today they are still not accorded either full legal equality in the eyes of the law nor are they accepted on a fully equal basis in our society generally. There are many States with laws which still prohibit women from working in certain occupations. There are many accepted practices which prohibit women from participating fully in our educational processes. Dual pay schedules are common in schools and in private business. Discrimination still exists against women in many local, State, and Federal government jobs. Women continue to be denied simple basic legal rights in many States.

There are many arguments for approving House Joint Resolution 624, the strongest of which is that it is the right thing to do. Discrimination in any form has no place in our modern society, and we simply cannot afford to waste the vast talents of any group of citizens in these demanding times. Full equality before the law, as well as acceptance of women's full and equal rights, must be granted if we are to realize the potential of all members of our society.

Equal rights for women have been a part of the party platforms of both Democrats and Republicans for a generation. It is time that we fulfill that pledge. House Joint Resolution 264 deserves the full support of every Member who wants to erase discrimination for over half of the citizens of the United States. When it comes before this House, I urge its adoption by an overwhelming vote.

VA OBSERVES 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. FRED SCHWENGL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGL. Mr. Speaker, last week the Veterans' Administration observed its 40th anniversary of dedicated service to our veterans and their families. As stated in the quote engraved on the Veterans' Administration Building, "... for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

Donald E. Johnson, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, spoke in Des Moines on the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Veterans' Administration. I would like to share the text of his remarks with my colleagues:

TEXT BY THE HONORABLE DONALD E. JOHNSON

Today the Veterans Administration observes its 40th anniversary. Those of us ... nearly 170,000 in number ... who are privileged to work for VA ... are indeed pleased and grateful that our friends and neighbors

here in Iowa ... and VA employees from Des Moines, Iowa City and Knoxville ... are also gathered here in this birthday celebration.

Executive Order 5398 ... signed by President Hoover on July 21, 1930 ... was a very practical document ... economical ... as befitted the times ... in its use of language establishing the Veterans Administration.

It read in part ... and I quote:

"... the United States Veterans' Bureau, the Bureau of Pensions, and the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers are hereby consolidated and coordinated into an establishment to be known as the Veterans' Administration, and the duties, powers, and functions vested by law in the United States Veterans' Bureau, the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and in the Bureau of Pensions ... are hereby transferred to the Veterans' Administration."

Today it is appropriate that we review the changes that have occurred since the issuance of that Executive Order 40 years ago.

Growth ... of course ... has been the biggest change.

However ... even as we acknowledge this obvious fact ... we should also remember two fundamental truths often quoted by poets and philosophers.

All change is not growth.

And the art of progress is to preserve order amid change and to preserve change amid order.

What should these truths mean to us?

Very simply ... I think that they tell us that we should give credit where credit is due ... that we should recognize and commend the imagination and dedication and hard work of General Frank Hines ... the first Administrator of Veterans Affairs ... and the 31,576 men and women who were transferred from former bureaus to become the VA's first employees ... in serving more than 4.6 million veterans and their dependents who were living when the VA was founded.

We should also recognize and commend the ability and devotion of thousands of other VA employees who succeeded them ... and who are now retired or deceased.

To pay them this deserved tribute is not to diminish in the slightest the care we have provided ... in our time ... for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan.

For there is credit aplenty ... and more than enough challenge ... remaining for you and me ... even after we affirm that the compassionate, efficient, dedicated service which we seek to render to America's veterans, their dependents and survivors ... is a tradition we are but carrying on ... not a precedent we have established.

Obviously ... the constituency we serve today ... the number of veterans and their dependents eligible for benefits and services the Veterans Administration exists to provide ... has multiplied many times over since 1930.

But so have the resources ... in personnel ... in dollars ... in modern computer and business equipment ... and in experience ... to meet this increased need.

I give you this background ... not to minimize the magnitude of the Veterans Administration's responsibilities and operations now ... in 1970 ... but rather to emphasize that the VA is what it is ... a vital segment of American society today ... largely because of what other, earlier members of the VA family accomplished before us.

History has always fascinated me. This isn't to suggest that I am even a good student of history. But at least I fared better than the student who received consistently poor grades and tried to explain them to his irate father.

"You just can't beat the system, Dad," he said.

"Last year I decided to take basket weaving. It was a snap course and I figured I would sail through it.

"Know what happened?"

With a sigh of resignation his father said, "No, what happened?"

"Well," the boy replied, "two Navajo Indians enrolled, raised the class average, and I flunked."

"History" . . . Ellsworth Kalas reminds us . . . "is a good teacher, but in one respect inadequate. We can learn what to avoid from history's bad examples, and from her finest men we can learn what goals to seek; but we are not warned of the dangers of inactivity because history does not record the story of those who never tried."

To know the history of the Veterans Administration is to realize how hard so many dedicated and able Americans have tried during the past 40 years to redeem Abraham Lincoln's pledge for this nation . . . for all time . . . "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

Our children's generation of Americans has been born and grown to adulthood knowing only an America at war . . . hot or cold.

This generation would find it difficult . . . if not impossible . . . to believe that when the Veterans Administration became a reality in 1930 . . . America still dreamed that the World War . . . which had ended but 12 years before . . . would truly be the war to end all wars.

Let me digress for a moment to recognize that while our children's generation . . . and indeed, our generation of veterans . . . have not known peace . . . we have not abandoned hope for a just and lasting peace. As a veteran . . . but especially as Commander-in-Chief . . . President Nixon knows the cost of war . . . and the priceless value of peace. I am certain that you great and good Americans join me today in praying that the President's goal of peace with freedom . . . to which he is totally committed . . . will soon be realized.

On July 21, 1930 . . . General Hines and his first associates in VA . . . if they shared America's dream of peace . . . also had reason to dream that . . . in their time . . . with no more wars and no more war veterans . . . the medical, compensation and pension, vocational rehabilitation, and insurance needs of 4,664,000 living veterans . . . including approximately 94,000 here in Iowa . . . would be finally and fully met.

Certainly . . . they had no reason then to envision World War II, Korean, Vietnam . . . and today's America of 28 million living veterans.

You and I now know . . . of course . . . that not in our lifetime . . . not even in the lifetime of the newest and youngest VA employee . . . will the needs of veterans still living . . . let alone the widows and children eligible for VA benefits and services . . . be fully and finally met.

We can be confident . . . however . . . that the experience the VA has gained in 40 years of service to those who served . . . and to their dependents and survivors . . . will enable us to meet both the nation's obligation to our veterans and their current needs during the next 40 years.

A poet once described an anniversary as that vital moment which links the past and the future.

On this . . . the Veterans Administration's 40th anniversary . . . let us briefly, but proudly, look at the VA's past accomplishments . . . before we adjourn to face confidently the future and its challenges.

In taking this look . . . however . . . we should not compare . . . out of context . . . the budget figures, for examples, which we must consider.

Most important . . . we should never forget that the real story of the Veterans Adminis-

tration today . . . and for the past 40 years . . . is people . . . not dollars or programs or regulations.

Comparative statistics dramatically demonstrate the tremendous growth in the magnitude of the VA's responsibilities and activities between 1930 and 1970.

But we must go beyond mere figures to appreciate the reasons and the need for an increase in the VA's budget from three quarters of a billion dollars in fiscal year 1931 to almost \$9 billion for fiscal year 1971.

These reasons . . . in themselves . . . capsule and highlight the changes that have taken place in the past 40 years.

Permit me to enumerate just a few.

Our living veteran population has increased more than six-fold.

The number of hospitals operated by the VA has tripled.

Nearly three times the number of patients are being treated in our VA hospitals.

Six times as many employees now work for VA.

When the Veterans Administration was established in 1930 . . . it inherited from predecessor bureaus and agencies four major veteran benefit programs . . . hospital and medical care . . . compensation and pensions . . . vocational rehabilitation training . . .

These programs have been continued and expanded and improved during the past four decades.

To them . . . however . . . have been added other major benefits which further account for the nearly 12-fold increase in the VA budget between fiscal years 1931 and 1971.

I refer . . . of course . . . to America's \$21 billion investment in the G.I. Bill education and training of 12 million veterans.

To the \$77 billion in home loans guaranteed by VA for more than 7 million veterans.

To the nearly 4.5 million National Service Life Insurance policies valued at almost \$30 billion still held by World War II veterans.

To the education and training program for the sons and daughters, widows and wives of veterans who died or are permanently and totally disabled as the result of military service.

To "wheel chair" homes and specially equipped automobiles for severely disabled veterans.

To special coronary and intensive medical and surgical care units in almost half of our 166 VA hospitals . . . including, of course, our VA hospitals here in Des Moines.

And . . . most important . . . to the change in the VA's fundamental philosophy regarding veteran benefits.

From its beginning in 1930 until very recently . . . the Veterans Administration operated on the premise that it would provide veterans with the benefits to which they were entitled . . . but it was up to them to learn about and apply for these benefits.

Today . . . however . . . as you know . . . the VA is guided by the principle that our veterans are not only entitled to know about their benefits . . . but must know about them . . . and must be given every possible assistance in obtaining them.

I think you will agree that this change alone makes the Veterans Administration of 1970 a better vehicle than the 1930 model for delivering the benefits and services to our veterans, their dependents and survivors which a grateful nation has provided them . . . and wants them to use.

Some of my associates in our Central Office in Washington have come to the conclusion during the past year that the present Administrator of Veterans Affairs has a "thing" about statistics . . . particularly when it comes to overloading a speech with them.

They are right . . . primarily I think because . . . for all their value . . . I cannot help but remember Emil Frankel's words whenever "statistics" are mentioned.

"Statistics," he said . . . "is the art of drawing a crooked line from an unproved assumption to a foregone conclusion."

So I won't burden you with a lot of statistics today.

However . . . I would like to give you a brief mathematical history of the VA here in Iowa during the past 40 years.

Having asked some of our statistical experts in Central Office to work up these figures . . . I would not dare not use them.

Actually . . . I found this data very interesting.

In the VA's first fiscal year . . . 1931 . . . there were approximately 94,000 living veterans here in Iowa. For various benefits and services on their behalf . . . and on behalf of their dependents and the survivors of deceased veterans . . . the VA expended almost \$12 million that year.

Today . . . in fiscal year 1971 . . . there are 375,000 living veterans in Iowa . . . or four times as many as 40 years ago.

For them, their dependents and survivors . . . the VA this fiscal year will spend approximately \$115 million in benefits and services . . . or nearly 10 times as much as in fiscal year 1931.

In the past 40 years . . . VA expenditures in the Hawkeye State have totaled almost two-and-a-quarter billion dollars.

Today . . . at least in our nation's capital . . . one can't even get into a budget conference . . . let alone participate . . . it seems . . . unless he is prepared to talk in "billions."

Being a farm boy from Iowa . . . however . . . I am still amazed at such facts as these.

VA's requested fiscal year 1971 budget of approximately \$9 billion is \$1.5 billion more than the appropriation to run the entire federal government just 35 years ago.

The \$5.4 billion in compensation and pension benefits which VA will pay out this year exceeds by more than three quarters of a billion dollars the appropriation for the entire federal government for the fiscal year which ended just three weeks before the Veterans Administration was established.

One final figure.

In 1915 . . . fiscal year 1915, that is . . . the United States was still neutral. Even then . . . however . . . our ultimate involvement in World War I was foreseen by many. Certainly . . . no American questioned our potential might. To run the entire federal government of this fledgling giant of a nation . . . in fiscal 1915 . . . the Congress appropriated a sum that is \$630 million less than the requested 1 billion 752 million dollar medical care budget of the Veterans Administration this fiscal year.

Earlier I said that the real story of the Veterans Administration today . . . and for the past 40 years . . . is people . . . not dollars or programs or regulations.

Today . . . we do not commemorate the VA Center here in Des Moines . . . or the VA's other hospitals in Iowa . . . or any other concrete, steel and glass asset of the VA.

Rather . . . we are met here . . . and in other ceremonies through America . . . to honor the dedicated men and women who have devoted their lives . . . and are doing so today . . . to helping America's veterans, their dependents and survivors.

We are met here . . . and throughout America . . . to express our heartfelt gratitude to the thousands of compassionate men and women who unselfishly forewent opportunities to leave the VA for substantially higher paying jobs in private industry . . . and are doing so today . . . because the welfare of our nation's veterans was . . . and is . . . more important than their own well being.

We are met here . . . and throughout America . . . to pay tribute to . . . and express our overwhelming pride in . . . our

nation's veterans . . . who have given us such a noble purpose for being.

We are met here . . . and throughout America . . . to acknowledge gratefully the unselfish devotion to the welfare of sick and disabled veterans of tens of thousands of volunteers in the Veterans Administration Voluntary Service.

We are met here . . . and throughout America . . . to thank the Congress of the United States . . . and through the Congress . . . the American people . . . for giving practical, beneficial, dignified meaning to Abraham Lincoln's pledge to "care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

We are met here in Iowa to contribute a moment of our esteem for the great American . . . Iowa's most famous and revered citizen . . . Herbert Hoover . . . whose heart and hand brought the VA into being.

To succeeding Presidents . . . of course from Roosevelt to Truman to Eisenhower to Kennedy to Johnson, and now to Nixon . . . we owe thanks for sustaining and strengthening the VA through the years to ensure that it was always a viable, creative force equal to the challenges of the time.

Finally . . . we are met here . . . and throughout America . . . to ask God's continued blessing . . . so that we will have the wisdom and the strength to serve well for the next 40 years and more America's finest and most deserving citizens . . . our veterans, their dependents and survivors.

I am grateful for the privilege of being with you on this historic and nostalgic occasion.

And now it is my honor and pleasure to present to Mr. Thomas Thalken, director of the Herbert Hoover Library in West Branch, Iowa . . . for permanent placement in the library . . . this plaque on which is engraved the text of Executive Order 5398 . . . including President's Hoover's signature . . . establishing the Veterans Administration.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK: A SECOND LOOK

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the other week marked the 12th observance of Captive Nations Week. I was pleased to note the rising support this cause has achieved both here and in 17 foreign countries since its conception. Nevertheless, for all the heads shaken in studied and united sorrow concerning the 27 nations that have fallen under Communist domination only one of my colleagues, Congressman HOGAN, asked the most important question. Who is next? Certainly, no one here will contend that Communist Russia has discontinued its quest for world domination especially after such undaunted success in its relatively short existence.

What is the reason for their success? It is best explained by columnist Kurt Luchmann in the recent July 27 issue of U.S. World News & World Report when he said:

The Kremlin's goal is the same as ever; domination of the World by stepping into power vacuums, by exploiting rivalries among other nations and by carrying on subversion while systematically adding its own military might.

It is a familiar story for those of us who watch in disgust and anger at Red repression. We can only offer our sympathy for the millions of people whose lives are tormented and barren of any freedom. For them, the phrases, freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of religion which pass our lips so freely are not uttered openly. Keeping the plight of these people in mind, we must look to help those free nations which might fall prey to Communist aggression. In doing so, we will offer hope to those people who wish to be free and help those who are, remain so.

We do not have to look far for an area which needs our help. The Middle East is just such a place and a more perfect example of Luchmann's theory one could not find. If we act now, the Middle East need not be another sphere of Russian influence. No heads need to be shaken over the loss of the nations of the Middle East. We must restore the balance of power to Israel and also convince Communist Russia that a confrontation with the United States is both real and prohibitive. The situation now seems to have taken a turn for the better if Nasser is truly sincere. It might well be that he has heeded the unofficial demands of some of the Members of Congress. Let us not miss the opportunity for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. But, at the same time, we should remember that the Red strings attached to Nasser's mouth are not the ones attached to his hands and feet. We should not be fooled into losing the initiative by well-timed yet false murmurs for peace.

Hindsight has no redeeming qualities especially in foreign policy. Our play-it-by-ear policy has not proven to be successful against the aggressive force of Communist Russia. This point of argument is well contended by Dr. Leo E. Dobriansky, chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, in his article "Captive Nations in the 1970's," which appeared in the July 15 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 24501. I also heartily agree with him that a special House committee should be formed to investigate, record, and inform the House and the American public as to the nature and the methods of Communist aggression around the world. Communist aggression continues while we remain bickering. We must continue to support freedom wherever it flowers.

WALT WHITMAN

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, Walt Whitman was a great poet and one whose prose rang and sang with the beauty and excitement of America. In the June issue of Saturday Review, Arnold Auerbach restructures the poem, "I Hear America Singing," to reflect the unhappy environmental conditions our modern industrial society has created.

Should we not be mindful of the Amer-

ica we inherited and the one we are about to pass on as our legacy? Painful these words are as they string together, whereas the original flowing description was pure pleasure. Pride and gratitude were in the original theme where there is dismay and disaster in the threads of the reconstructed version.

Read and reflect, my colleagues:

WALT WHITMAN TODAY, OR WHAT I'M SMELLING IS DROWNING OUT WHAT I HEARD

I smell America smelling, the varied odors I smell,

Those of exhaust pipes, each one belching fumes as it should belch, blue and fierce,

The factories smelling strong as their smokestacks fill the air,

The abattoir smelling as it makes ready for work or leaves off work,

The cities smelling what belongs to them in their streets, the glue works smelling in the Jersey swamp,

The riverbed smelling as it flows to the sea, the dump heap smelling as it stands,

The brewery's smell, the garbage truck's on the way in the morning, or at noon intermission or at sundown,

The pervasive smelling of the gasworks, or of the sausage plant at work, or of the plane jetting and wooshing,

As we inhale what belongs to you and me and to none else,

Effluvium belongs to us all—we're a country of numbed noses, smog-filled, groggy.

Smelling with weary nostrils our strong malodorous smells. (Arnold M. Auerbach.)

PUBLIC POLICY IN THE 1970'S

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, developing policies which bring about significant changes in the operation of complex systems requires a great deal of planning, expertise, and good judgment. It also requires a broad encompassing of the largest possible range of phenomena and concerns. In a speech at Hendrix College on April 6, 1967, Daniel P. Moynihan, counselor to the President, stated that too often in the past we have defined public policy in forms of program and in consequence have inhibited the development of true policy. Mr. Moynihan said:

The source of the difficulty lies not in the malfeasance of individuals, but in the limitations of the program approach to issues that in fact demand the disciplined formulations and elaborations of public policy.

In other words, in our rush to solve a specific problem, we may not have taken into consideration what was good for the larger society, or for the individuals involved, or both.

Mr. Moynihan offers the example of the Federal Government establishing the Office of Economic Opportunity to help in abolishing poverty. Until this year almost a third of the expenditures of OEO were provided, in effect, by income taxes collected from the poor. Since it has been in the nature of the services strategy so much in evidence in early OEO pro-

grams to hire middle-class persons to be of assistance to poor persons, the actual income transfer effect of many of these OEO programs was to take money from farm laborers and give it to college graduates. No one intended it that way, but that was the unintended consequence of programs being operated in the absence of policy. Almost the first measure President Nixon proposed in this area upon taking office was to abolish taxes for the poor, and this was done with the completely willing cooperation of the Congress once the absurdity of the previous arrangement was pointed out.

I think that this speech makes a significant contribution in assisting the making of public policy decisions and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE CONCEPT OF PUBLIC POLICY IN THE 1970's
(By Daniel P. Moynihan, Counsellor to the President)

President Shilling, Dean Christie: I have been emboldened in my remarks today by the appearance on the Hendrix College campus just a week ago of The Honorable Wilbur D. Mills, nothing if not a man of consequence in American public life, who spoke to you of the values and purposes of a liberal arts college in terms that would have been thoroughly familiar to your grandparents, and will some of us dare to hope be not less comprehensible to your grandchildren. He cited Jerome Bruner, a friend and colleague at Harvard, who has with characteristic economy dismissed the ever more widely held view that there is a radical disjunction between means and ends in education. "The process and goal of education," Professor Bruner observes, "are one and the same thing. The goal of education is disciplined understanding; that is the process as well."

My purpose today is to speak of the concept of public policy in the 1970's, and I should like at the outset to lay down my own parallel beliefs with respect to means and ends in the conduct of public affairs. Here too the idea of dichotomous, almost unrelated worlds of action as against objective is very much in the air, indeed is near to being an intellectually dominant position. A strangely Orwellian idea: however little its practitioners would like to think, they were accurately anticipated. War is peace, and such like. In our time, on the campuses, it can take the form that coercion is persuasion. It is not, of course, it is simply coercion, a process of which it may be said that its most objectional aspect is that it works. Practices not dissimilar are diffusing into public life, and unless we are uncommonly disciplined and understanding in the face of this phenomenon we are likely to find it works with us as well. That is to say, the perpetrators of coercion, whatever their particular politics, become the principal actors in the society, leaving to others the residual role of reacting or overreacting, but in either event deprived of that measure of autonomous self-direction which we rightly associate with both intellectual and political freedom.

It is for this reason I should like to talk of the idea of policy. One of the anomalies of the 1960's is that a period of such extraordinary effort at social improvement should have concluded in a miasma, some would say a maelstrom, of social dissatisfaction.

What went wrong?

If I may be allowed first to state that I really don't know and don't expect ever to have any final views, let me say that I believe one of the reasons is that the structure of American government, and the pragmatic tradition of American politics, has too much defined public policy in forms of

program, and in consequence has inhibited the development of true policy. Certainly, in simpler times a simple programmatic approach was an efficient way to go about the public business. The problem comes with complexity. More specifically, the problem comes when society becomes ambitious and begins to seek to bring about significant changes in the operation of complex systems such as the society itself. There is nothing the least wrong with such ambitions. What is wrong is a pattern in which the ambitions are repeatedly proclaimed, and just as repeatedly not achieved. That is much of what went wrong in the 1960's. The source of the difficulty lies not in the malfeasance of individuals, but in the limitations of the program approach to issues that in fact demand the disciplined formulations and elaborations of public policy.

These are terms that rightly call for definitions. Here I think the temptation is to be too clever. As increasingly we perceive, and begin to understand the social system as just that, a system, it is possible, and for many purposes necessary, to be meticulous about classifying various forms of system intervention. My rough purpose is more readily served by a simple distinction. Programs relate to a single part of the system; policy seeks to respond to the system in its entirety.

The idea of policy is not new. We have for long been accustomed to the idea of foreign policy, including defense policy. Since 1946 Congress has mandated an employment and income policy more or less explicitly based on a "general theory" of the endlessly intricate interconnections of such matters. Yet our ways of behavior resist this: only great crises, great dangers seems to evoke the effort. Or have seemed able to do so in the past. I believe, however, that a learning process of sorts has been going on. Increasingly the idea of system-wide policies commends itself to persons of responsibility in public affairs as an approach both desirable and necessary. There is no sharp discontinuity here. One of the reasons it is seen to be desirable and necessary is that the intensely programmatic approach to social problems in the 1960's has produced so much dissatisfaction. But let us also give ourselves some credit. We have been learning from our experience, not just reacting to it. But whatever the case, it can, I believe, be said that the idea of policy is very much in the air just at this moment, and that we can expect it to be one of the formative ideas of the 1970's.

As in most times, it is the style, the approach of the incumbent administration that has most to do with such matters, and here I believe it is clear that the concept of policy has emerged as a distinguishing feature of the administration of President Nixon.

The first official act of the new President, taken his third day in office, was to establish the Urban Affairs Council, a cabinet level body presided over by him and the Vice President. The first task assigned the council was to "advise and assist" the President in the formulation of a National Urban Policy.

This was something new. It had not been done before; no one was certain it could be done. Certainly there did not exist anything like Keynes' General Theory which guided our development of national policy on employment and income. Nor were there any Admiral Mahan's or George Kennan's to provide a master theory of an urban policy comparable to previous formulations of foreign and defense policy. Even so, the process went forward with fair dispatch, such that anyone today caring to know the general outlines of the urban policy of the present administration has only to ask and will be presented a document. Not a definitive one, nor even perhaps a comprehensive one. Cer-

tainly not a fixed one. But it is against all the rules of policy formulation ever to be fixed or final. The point is that a document does exist, and anyone so disposed can make what he will of it.

It is not my purpose to discuss urban policy, but rather to suggest some of the principles which govern policy formulation, and which distinguish it from program formulation.

The rules of the latter are, I should think, fairly well laid out in the descriptive political science of our time. The defining characteristic of a program is that it is directed to a specific situation with the purpose of maintaining or changing that situation in some desirable fashion. We have programs to build roads, subsidize the growing cotton, cure cancer, retrain the unemployed. To be sure there are programs that are quite general in their outlook but here, with respect to the Federal government and to all levels and forms of government within the United States with which I am familiar, any tendency toward universality is immediately constricted by the structure of government. Doubtless there are even programs that would wish to evolve into policies, but reality is quickly enough imposed on them by the fact that one bureau in one department is responsible for performing the function involved; that one branch of one division in the Bureau of the Budget handles the appropriation request; that one super specific subcommittee of one special committee of the Congress handles the substantive legislation, and an equivalent subcommittee handles the provision of funds. These are the constituencies of the program, and also its masters. It is a wise program that knows its place, and does not aspire beyond its station.

It would be very unwise to grow disdainful of such enterprises. Burke's dictum that the law sharpens the mind by narrowing it may be usefully applied to the program approach to social problems. Social commitments are not easy to sustain, certainly not over the long span of time which most social problems require. The program approach is designed to enhance the capacity of the enterprise to survive by narrowing its range of activity and intensifying the support for it. Come hell or high water, Republicans, Democrats, or Free Silverites, the Bureau of Disabled Appalachian Urban Agronomists gets its appropriation and does next year the job it did last year. A quality, I repeat, not to be dismissed.

But for all the plain-as-a-stick practicality about such arrangements, in the end they are self-defeating. They are realistic, but they do not reflect reality. More accurately, they distort reality. This is the essence of the problem.

By contrast, a policy approach to government does at least begin by seeking to encompass the largest possible range of phenomena and concerns. This has its dangers, its difficulties. But I shall argue that increasingly there is not respectable alternative. Knowing what we do about the nature of society and of social interventions, we have no option but to seek to deal in terms of the entire society, and all the consequences of intervention. One might wish for a simpler time when such knowledge was not available, but the loss of innocence is an old experience to mankind, and not perhaps to be avoided. Certainly not to be reversed.

Let me then propose three propositions—I shall call them master propositions—that relate to a concept of government by policy, which, I shall argue, distinguish it from government by program. First is the familiar proposition that everything relates to everything.

This is the fact that defines a system. Taken too literally it can be a bit traumatizing, but as I have remarked with respect to the formulation of a national urban

policy, both the logic and the experience of co-variance analysis demonstrate that while everything relates to everything, some things relate more than others. It is usually possible to identify those components that in fact have the greatest influence.

The second master proposition is that from the fact that everything relates to everything it follows that there are no social interests about which the national government does not have some policy or other, simply by virtue of the indirect influences of programs nominally directed to other areas. These are the hidden policies of government.

This is a not so familiar proposition. The interconnections of programs directed to one area with outcomes in another are sometimes seen. Most of us have not got it fairly straight that agricultural research can lead to the migration of farm populations, which has consequences for cities. But by and large these connections need to be fairly evident for much note to be taken of them, and ability to detect them is much influenced by fashion.

Some activities are held to be interesting; others not. And if a subject is not interesting, it can have consequences all over the place and no one is likely to take much heed. I know this to be the attitude of the academy, and suspect it to be high universal.

Permit me an example. One of the receiving truths of contemporary liberal history is that no domestic initiatives of any consequence occurred during the Eisenhower Presidency. I will not contest the general point. That was a period of relatively low governmental profile, as the phrase now goes, following twenty years of the alarms and exertions of the New Deal and Fair Deal. Even so a goodly number of genuinely historic initiatives were taken by the Federal government during that period. The National Defense Education Act would be such an example. But there was one program of truly transcendent, continental consequence. This was a program which the 21st Century will almost certainly judge to have had more influence on the shape and development of American cities, the distribution of population within metropolitan areas, and across the nation as a whole, the location of industry and various kinds of employment opportunities (and in all these, immense influence on race relations and the welfare of black Americans) than any initiative of the middle third of the 20th Century. This was, of course, the Interstate and Defense Highway System. It has been, it is, the largest public works program in history. Activities such as urban renewal, public housing, community development and the like are reduced to mere digressions when compared to the extraordinary impact of the highway program. One learns that President Eisenhower regarded it as the most significant domestic achievement of his administration, and he was surely correct in doing so. The program was conceived during the New Deal, and only slowly made its way to enactment, but once approved and begun one would imagine it would have become the object of extraordinary interest, comment, and critique.

If I may be allowed to assert that nothing of the sort occurred, let me next ask why. The answer would seem evident. Highways have never been a subject of any very great interest among persons given to writing or speculating about government interest. Certainly they have rarely been associated with social welfare issues, save in the early days of "getting the farmer out of the mud." Further, the politics of getting the Interstate Highway program enacted decreed, or at least indicated, the narrowest possible definition of its purposes and impact. This was altogether agreeable to the Bureau of

Public Roads, the slightly obscure organization established as a unit of the Department of Agriculture, and shifted by degrees to the shadowy recesses of the Department of Commerce. The permanent staff of the Bureau of Public Roads had neither the inclination or training to assert that they were doing anything more than the narrow terms of their project descriptions. As bureaucrats, their instinct was faultless. Had anyone realized what they were in fact doing, the sheer magnitude of the interests they were affecting, it is high impossible to imagine that they would have won acceptance. Indeed a bare fifteen years after the Interstate program commenced, it is near impossible to get a major highway program approved in most large American cities. But it is too late: most systems have been built. In the process—such at least would be my views—quite appalling mistakes were made, but they were mistakes having to do with issues nominally altogether unrelated to the highway program itself, and so no one was responsible for them. (Perhaps I should insist that if the mistakes began under an administration of one party, they continued under that of the other. Parties come and go. Programs persist.)

Surely it is possible to hope for something more. Government must seek out its hidden policies, raising them to a level of consciousness and acceptance—or rejection—and acknowledgment of the extraordinary range of contradictions that are typically encountered. (To the frequent question "Why don't government programs work?" it is often the answer that they do work. It is just that so often the effect of a "hidden" program cancels out the avowed one.) Surely also it is possible to hope for a career civil service that is not only encouraged, but required to see their activities in the largest possible scope. To know what they are doing, even if they go on doing it anyway. There are few things that ought more to annoy us than the misuse we make of such splendidly competent organizations as the Bureau of Public Roads. It is fully capable of the most complex calculations of the effects of its programs (and increasingly does just that) but for many a long decade the word from the political world on high was to stick to building roads and to see that not too much sand was used in the concrete.

The third master proposition is clearly the least familiar of all; the one least likely of acceptance. It is not a matter that can be confidently demonstrated, or so at least would be my impression. It is rather the best available explanation for recurrent phenomena which increasingly demand such explanation. I refer to what Jay Forrester has termed the "counter-intuitive" nature of social problems. We learn to think, Forrester assures us, in simple loop systems. Social problems arise out of complex systems. The two are not alike, so it is asserted by men who ought to know. There are fundamentally different properties, such that good common sense judgment about the one will lead with fair predictability to illusions about the other. Thus Forrester: "With a high degree of confidence we can say that the intuitive solution to the problems of complex social systems will be wrong most of the time." Whatever the absolute nature of a proposition such as that, one surely can agree with Forrester that social systems have internal regulatory mechanisms that are, in effect, incentives to behave in various ways. (This would include disincentives with respect to undesired behavior.) Just as surely, changing those incentives is an extraordinarily complex job. Surely also, too many programs of social intervention in the 1960's went about this extraordinarily complex task in a fairly simple minded manner, usually adding a few counter-incentives to the system, but rarely if ever removing the previ-

ously existing ones. Stated perhaps too simply, the Federal government has typically entered a situation in which most actors manifestly had strong incentives to act in ways which were not thought good for the larger society, or for the individuals involved, or both. Incentives were offered to reverse the undesired behavior. But too commonly these incentives proved weak and ineffective when compared to the original set. They could dilute the original incentives, but rarely could they overpower them. (There will, also, be those who will reply to this general assertion with the even more general one that we did not spend enough money. The fact is that we spent a lot of money. The problem was we never identified those original incentives.)

We should be clear, I think, that if this third proposition should prove to be unavoidably the case there are contained within it rather serious implications for the democratic direction of society. It is the old—or new—question of the expert again. I have a certain suspicion of pointy-headed intellectuals myself, and I think we all should, whatever the shape of our heads. We have grown accustomed to depending on experts in science, and have developed ways of translating what it is the experts think into forms of public action. (Although not without tragedies, as in the Oppenheimer case.) But most everyone knows that he or she doesn't know much about implosion. Everyone, on the other hand, knows a lot about what makes a good school. Now men of unquestioned competence and good will are coming along with the information that what everyone knows is almost precisely what is *not* the case. What do we do about that? How do we treat that expert? What confidence are the people to have in their own judgment if such events multiply, as almost certainly they will.

I believe there is an answer to this. We must develop a public service, and a political leadership, capable of handling such information and of translating it into valid terms of public debate. But this will not be easy. I cannot imagine it happening inside a generation, and in the meantime the knowledge is unavoidable, and it implicates us. The one thing most likely to help us through the period of transition is the practice of thinking in terms of policy rather than of program. The policy-frame-of-mind may not grasp all the interrelations and surprises implicit in social problems, but it does at least start out with the expectation that there are such, and so is not only more on the alert for signals of such problems, but also is least resistant, least unbelieving in the face of the evidence. That is no small thing.

Neither is it any small thing that we should begin to try to take this large view of events. If there is a tendency in our land, as in any, to complacency about many of the conditions of our lives, there also, I would submit, is an almost equal and very nearly opposite tendency to alarm. If man is a problem solving animal, *homo Americanus* is a problem discovering one. (So much so that in the mid-1960's when Congress was turning out social programs by the yard, Meg Greenfield was moved to discourse on the "problem problem." What, she asked a nervous national capital, would happen if we solved all our problems and suddenly there were no problems. The prospect of mass unemployment in the capital was not generally thought a proper subject for irony, even in hands so deft as Miss Greenfield's.) The fact is that in our eagerness to draw attention to problems, we do frequently tend to make them seem worse than they are. In particular we tend to depict things as worsening when in fact they are improving. This tendency arises from any number of sources. Three at least come to mind. There is surely a Protes-

tant tendency to be dissatisfied with what might be called normal human behavior. On top of this we have of late had to learn to live with the burden of affluence. Robert Nisbet frequently reminds us that boredom is the most underrated force in history. Heaven protect the land whose privileged classes get bored with their privileges, as clearly ours has done. And there is also the tyranny of fashion: a mysterious force, but an open enough one. Fashions of thought get set, and for a period at least they prevail. Evidence to the contrary is treated not as information but as wrongdoing, and woe betide the bearer of such news. The more then should we welcome a policy approach to social issues, simply because it insists on setting all specifics in a general context.

An example of surpassing importance—or so it would seem to me—concerns the state of race relations in the United States at this moment. Are things getting better as most of us would define that term—namely, are we moving away from a past of racism and caste exclusion—or are they getting worse? I would believe it fair to say that the fashion of late has been to believe things are getting worse, and I can attest that it is costly to argue otherwise. And yet the data, such as they are, argue that indeed things are *not* getting worse. To the contrary. The Newsletter of the University of Michigan Institute of Social Research recently summarized the findings to this effect of the University's Survey Research Center, which we would all, I think, acknowledge as one of the four or five leading institutions of its type in the world.

The white backlash and the deterioration of white and black attitudes toward integration which have been noted by many social observers do not show up in the findings of a recent Survey Research Center nationwide survey.

"There is evidence that, in some respects, blacks and whites are in closer contact and more friendly contact than they had been four years earlier." Angus Campbell, director of SRC, reports.

The SRC data, gathered during the 1964 and 1968 election studies, represent possibly the only carefully designed academic study of national attitudes before and after the 1967 riots. They stand in marked contrast to the conclusion drawn by the Kerner Commission appointed by President Lyndon Johnson to study the riots. The Commission reported in March of 1968 that, "Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal."

In comparing racial attitudes over the four-year period, the SRC survey notes that whites favoring desegregation in 1968 outnumbered strict segregationists by a ratio of nearly two to one (31 and 16 percent respectively). Four years earlier whites had been about evenly divided on the question of desegregation or strict segregation (27 and 24 percent).

Although the doctrine of black separatism has been increasingly voiced by some members of the black community, it still has only minority support; and there has been little change in black attitudes toward desegregation over the four-year period. For example, in 1964 some 72 percent of the blacks questioned said they were in favor of desegregation (with only 6 percent favoring strict segregation) and four years later 75 percent were favoring desegregation (with only 3 percent for strict segregation).

Campbell indicates that not only were the attitudes toward desegregation more positive, actual contact between the races seems to have increased. Whites and blacks were less likely in 1968 than in 1964 to say their neighborhoods or their schools were completely segregated. And whites were less likely to work and shop in all-white areas.

Ten percent of whites who said they live in all-white neighborhoods dropped from 80 to 75 percent, while the number of blacks

living in all-black neighborhoods went from 33 percent to 25 percent.

In 1964, forty-three percent of whites reported that the high school nearest them was all white. That figure had dropped to 27 percent by 1968. Similarly, blacks reporting their nearest high school as all black dropped from 36 percent to 21 percent over the four years.

Whites who reported working in an all-white environment totaled 54 percent in 1964, but that number had dropped to 42 percent by 1968.

One might account for the reported increases in contact between the races on the grounds that they don't represent real shifts in neighborhood and school population—just more awareness of each other's presence. The increase in publicity surrounding racial issues might have changed people's perception.

Campbell doesn't think so: "People now are more sensitive than they were four years ago but it's highly unlikely that the figures represent purely imaginary increased contact."

Similarly, a policy approach to government has profound consequences on the kinds of programs which are supported and pursued. I would suggest to you that this has been the case with respect to the problem of poverty and racial isolation in the nation. During the 1960's a quite extraordinary commitment was made by the national government to put an end to poverty. Yet the effort to do so went forward in entirely too fragmented a manner. In effect a collection of programs was put together and it was hoped these would somehow add up to a policy. I don't believe they did. Nor do I believe there was any way we were likely to have found this out save by the route we did in fact follow. But after a point this became evident enough, and it became possible for the government to respond in terms of a large scale policy, and to fit programs to that policy.

The two basic networks of a modern society are the family structure and the occupational structure. A stable society attends to each. The preeminent arbiter of family stability is income. If social science has taught us anything it is that. Income typically derives from employment, but also typically there are individuals and on occasion groups in the society whose income is not sufficient either because their employment is spasmodic, or their skills insufficient to earn an adequate wage. Whatever the case, an effective war against poverty requires a strategy that deals first of all with problems of jobs and income. Once that became clear, it was relatively easy for the national government to develop programs in response.

Let me offer you an almost absurdly simple example. The Federal government has had since 1965 a formal policy of abolishing poverty. The Office of Economic Opportunity was established with that purpose in mind. But until this year almost a third of the expenditures of OEO were provided, in effect, by income taxes collected from the poor. Since it has been in the nature of the services strategy so much in evidence in early OEO programs to hire middle class persons to be of assistance to poor persons, the actual *income transfer effect* of many of these OEO programs was to take money from farm laborers and give it to graduates of Hendrix College. No one intended it that way, but that was the unintended consequence of programs being operated in the absence of policy. Almost the first measure President Nixon proposed in this area upon taking office was to abolish taxes for the poor, and this was done with the completely willing cooperation of the Congress once the absurdity of the previous arrangement was pointed out.

In a similar vein the administration has pressed forward on programs such as the Philadelphia Plan which will significantly

increase the number of minority workers in skilled construction employment. Comparable reforms in the area of manpower administration, unemployment insurance coverage, and minimum wage coverage have equally flowed naturally from the prior adoption of a jobs and income strategy.

Finally, in a list of examples, is the Family Assistance Plan which has, properly I would think, been termed the most important piece of domestic legislation to come before the Congress in four decades. The principle of the program is simple and it derives from policy. Families must have an adequate income, and this should be provided them with a minimum change in their status as stable, self-determining units in society, and with maximum incentive to earn by their own efforts as much a proportion of their needed income as they possibly can. The President has accordingly proposed to place a floor under the income of every American family with children, to provide within that context a specific incentive to work, specific opportunities for work training and placement, and the absolutely crucial provision that this assistance will not be conditioned on dependency. A family does not have to be down and out, busted and broken to get help, when often as not all that was needed was relatively little help on the margin.

Will FAP succeed? None of us could say at this moment. But there is one essential aspect to such a question directed to a program that derives from a policy. Namely that the question can be answered. Family assistance will have succeeded if over the course of the 1970's the steadily rising number of dependent families in the nation begins to level off and then to turn down in terms of actual numbers and overall proportions. It is as simple as that to define success. Yet this is the one thing that often defies efforts when applied to programs.

This is the final point I would make about the concept of national policy with respect to social outcomes. It is a concept most explicitly outlined in the President's recent message to the Congress on Elementary and Secondary Education. The test of a program is not input but output. It is interesting, and at times important to know how much money is spent on schools in a particular neighborhood or city. But the crucial question is how much do the children learn. (We can pursue the current test score mania to the point of defining learning to an absurdly narrow fashion, but we can surely also learn to define learning in broader and more relevant terms.) *Output* is what matters. Programs are for people, not for bureaucracies. This is the final, as I say, and probably also the most important policy approach to government.

It will be evident enough that we are only at the beginning of this process. Doubtless we shall in time come to view our beginning efforts as crude, and even misconceived. Still it is an important beginning. We have begun to think in important new ways about the problems of our society, and we are entitled to hope that from this new approach there will emerge a more effective and achieving society.

SP4C. OSBORNE MATTINGLY, JR.

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

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Sp4c. Osborne Mattingly, Jr., who was killed in Vietnam on June 25.

Osborne was the 113th northern Kentucky fighting man to give his life for his country in Southeast Asia.

Though the Nation is experiencing dissent over America's commitment, Osborne Mattingly answered the call to duty. He paid the supreme sacrifice for his country and for those of us whom he died defending.

He gave his life upholding his patriotic beliefs and it must be our hope and prayer that Osborne Mattingly, Jr. died so that others could live—and remain free. I know I speak for the people of the fourth district of Kentucky—and for Americans—when I convey my deep sense of loss and sympathy to the Mattingly family.

The front page story reporting Osborne's loss, which appeared in the Kentucky Post, June 29 (by Mike Farrell), and an editorial which appeared June 30 in the Kentucky Post follows:

KILLED IN WAR ON 21ST BIRTHDAY

(By Mike Farrell)

Osborne Mattingly Jr. reached the age of manhood—21—last Thursday.

But he couldn't celebrate that special occasion with his parents, family and friends. He had answered the call to arms for his country in the Southeast Asia conflict.

Today, Spec. 4 Mattingly's presents are still wrapped, his birthday cards unopened.

Army officials yesterday informed his parents that Spec. Mattingly had been killed in Vietnam . . . on his 21st birthday.

"He didn't say what he (Mattingly) was doing," his father, Osborne Mattingly Sr., said today. "Said he'd been fighting about every day. He was in a hospital for a while with bronchitis."

The senior Mattingly clutched in his hand the last letter the family received from their soldier son.

"He said they'd made a big change over there, but he couldn't tell us what it was. He said he'd be home by Christmas. He hoped everybody was well and he was worrying to get out of there and get back home . . ."

"That boy worked hard," his father said. "He didn't know when to quit working."

Osborne Mattingly Jr. quit Pendleton County High School at age 18 and went to work in Covington as a machine tender for Duro Paper Bag Co.

In May, 1969, he was drafted, and sent to New Jersey for basic training. He returned home in September and was sent to Vietnam in October, to serve in the 199th Infantry.

The family was unsure of details of their son's death.

Army officials were expected to return today with the story surrounding the event.

Mattingly said he thought his son had been in Cambodia, but he isn't sure where he had died.

Besides his parents, northern Kentucky's 113th Asian war victim is survived by three sisters, Mrs. Linda Ferrel, of California; Mrs. Betty Nagel, of Newport, and Mrs. Debora Bishop of Butler.

Also five brothers, James, of Newport; Edwin of Falmouth; John, Thomas and Rodney, all of Butler, and his maternal grandfather, Frank Harrison, California.

Mattingly Sr. is a ticket writer at Cincinnati Stockyards.

The youth is Pendleton County's fourth Vietnam casualty.

Alexandria Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.

[From the Kentucky Post and Times-Star]

BIRTH AND DEATH OF A KENTUCKIAN

The limited-objective war to which Lyndon Johnson committed the lives of thousands of

young Americans is a war that mocks its victims and those who mourn them.

Army Spec. 4 Osborne Mattingly Jr., fighting under the command of the United States armed forces in the Communist-overrun Indochina Peninsula, was killed in combat on his 21st birthday.

How utterly tragic that on the very day this brave young Pendleton County man reached his majority he was required to lay down his life with patriotism in a war this nation's leaders have never meant to win!

We who count the bloody casualties of this war at The Kentucky Post find that Osborne Mattingly was the 113th serviceman from northern Kentucky to be sacrificed in the Vietnam conflict. This is a melancholy duty that we perform with sadness and deep regret.

We salute Osborne Mattingly for the heroism with which he fought and died, uncomplaining, during the last year of his once-promising life. We offer his heartbroken parents, sisters and brothers our profoundest sympathy, inadequate though it be to comfort them in their terrible loss.

And we raise our voice once again in bitter protest to the confused and misguided leadership in Washington that permits the slaughter of American youth to continue in a political and diplomatic war that this leadership dares not even attempt to win. Yet a war that it is tragically reluctant to end.

**OMNIBUS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CRIME BILL**

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has now given final passage to the omnibus District of Columbia crime bill. This legislation directly affects only the District of Columbia, but it is of national concern in that this legislation indicates how we in the Congress will respond to the local manifestation of the national problem of crime.

Mr. Speaker, no one can deny the need for strong action by the Congress. The appalling climate of lawlessness that terrorizes this Nation's Capital is all too familiar a story. A few statistics illustrate the point: Among cities of comparable size Washington has the highest crime rate; of the 51,419 felonies reported in fiscal year 1969, arrests were made in only 11,504 cases and of these only 2,583 were indicted and 1,461 convicted. Thus, only 2½ percent of the felonies reported in fiscal year 1969 resulted in convictions. When one considers that a large proportion of felonies go unreported to police due to the despair of the victims, the percentage of convictions is sickeningly low.

Mr. Speaker, our law-enforcement officials need our strongest support, whether they work in our home States or here in Washington. This legislation gives added tools to law-enforcement agencies in the District of Columbia, but it also signals to law-enforcement officials all over the Nation that we in Congress are determined to do all within our jurisdiction to give them the tools they need and the respect they deserve to carry out their essential task.

This legislation is long and complex. It is a tribute to the great House Committee on the District of Columbia. Ninety percent of this legislation is non-controversial: for example, the court system of the District of Columbia will be reorganized, as will the bail agency and the public defender system. Other, more hotly debated provisions greatly strengthen the hand of law-enforcement officials, while still providing the necessary protective safeguards for the innocent citizen. Among these new law-enforcement tools are sections that authorize wiretaps under certain circumstances, impose mandatory prison terms in certain instances, allow under certain circumstances a 60-day preventive detention of a suspect adjudged dangerous to the community, and allow under certain circumstances the police to make entry into a building without giving notice of their identity or purpose. The last mentioned quick-entry provision has been subjected to much debate, but it merely puts into the statutes certain procedures which had already been condoned by the courts.

I have always been sensitive to the potential danger of legislation which would increase the power of government vis-a-vis the individual citizen. For this reason I have in the past opposed certain legislation which I believed constituted unwarranted intrusions by government into the day-to-day life of our citizens. In the case of this legislation I have noted the opposition to a very limited number of its provisions. However I am convinced that the appropriate constitutional safeguards have been written into this legislation. This legislation is a reasonable and realistic response to a national disgrace. It strikes the proper balance between the rights of the accused and the rights of the community to enjoy law and order. I was happy to support this legislation. I believe it will benefit law-enforcement officials, the residents of Washington, and the millions of tourists who visit the Nation's Capital each year.

ADDRESS BY AFL-CIO SECRETARY-TREASURER LANE KIRKLAND TO THE CONVENTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF BOOKBINDERS IN DETROIT, MICH.

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, 1970, Mr. Lane Kirkland, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO, delivered an excellent address to the convention of the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders in Detroit, Mich. In this address he vividly points out how the national economic policy in effect under this administration is keeping us from achieving basic goals and is creating untold hardships for workers because of widespread unemployment and inflated prices.

The text of this speech follows and I

commend it to the attention of all who are concerned for the economic welfare of our Nation:

I appreciate very much this opportunity to speak to this convention of one of the oldest and most stalwart members of the family of labor. I have been fortunate in enjoying the personal friendship of your officers for many years. I have had the privilege of working with the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders and its officers many times on many issues, and you have never failed to do your part in the advancement of the rights and interests of all working people.

I want to review, as briefly as I can, some of the major trade union events of recent months. These events show—I believe—that despite our detractors and critics, labor has lost none of its vigor or vision—and continues to be the most effective free force in a democratic society.

I want also to emphasize and underscore some of the hard tasks and some of the challenges that face us today—tasks and challenges that will require the best efforts of every element of the trade union movement.

Owing to the solid, nationwide support of brother organizations like yourselves, the unions representing the employees of the nation's fourth largest corporation—the General Electric Company—emerged from a long, bitter and costly strike with flying colors and with a historic victory.

General Electric forced those unions, joined together in an AFL-CIO Coordinated Bargaining Committee, to strike by declaring that it would never change its totally unacceptable, take-it-or-leave-it first offer. The tactics used to enforce that position have come to be defined by the term "Boulwarism".

A hundred days later that offer was changed and improved in every major area. And the strike was settled on reasonable, honorable terms through the collective bargaining process.

Boulwarism was buried by 150,000 trade unionists in 34 states who refused to be shaken by any weapon the company could use against them.

The strikers won the victory, but they could not have done it alone. They asked for—and they got—the total, unified support of all their trade union brothers and sisters. Millions of dollars and millions of man hours were poured out more freely than ever before. Labor launched—and won—the first truly national boycott of consumer products in labor's history.

And when GE admitted that it had made a mistake, on the hundredth day, the picket lines were stronger than they were on the first. American trade unionists had demonstrated their solidarity, their brotherhood and their determination more convincingly than ever before.

Let me mention some other evidence of labor's vitality—just a few of the developments since your last convention:

Both farm workers and government workers, who have been denied the right to collective bargaining, are breaking through the barriers.

Americans can now buy union-label grapes, for the first time in history. The people who pick them, aided by the rest of the labor movement, are winning their long battle for union contracts and all the improvements that go with them.

Postal workers have become the first government employees in history to win the right to bargain collectively with the federal government on their wages and working conditions.

Both of these battles will go on until they are completely won, and until farm workers everywhere, and workers in every federal, state and city agency, have the same right

to union representation that other workers have enjoyed for generations.

In the United States Congress and in state legislatures and city councils, labor is representing the interests of all the plain people of America.

There is a union label on last fall's Tax Reform Act, as there is on nearly every piece of progressive social legislation passed by Congress in the 20th Century.

Because of labor's efforts, along with those of our allies in the Civil Rights movement, Judge Haynsworth is not sitting on the Supreme Court today, and neither is Judge Carswell. The AFL-CIO accepted the duty to do its best to assure that the new associate justice of the highest court in the land would be a fair-minded man, worthy of that post, so vital to the Constitutional guarantees of the basic rights of all free men.

The labor movement will continue to fight harder than ever before for social and economic progress for all of the people of the United States.

Sooner or later, this nation is going to have a decent, comprehensive, prepaid system of National Health Insurance for all of its people—and you can bank on that. Our job is to see that it comes sooner than later.

This nation is going to have more and better education for both youngsters and adults.

This nation is going to have cleaner air and water. It is going to have equal rights and equal opportunity in every area of life for all its people, no matter what their color or origin. It is going to have a truly fair system of taxation.

These are the tasks that lie ahead. These things demand the best that is in the labor movement—the only effective People's Lobby there is. We intend to achieve them.

But there is one stark, overriding danger before us that can jeopardize everything we have done and everything we hope to do.

The health of the labor movement and of the United States is tied to the health of our national economy.

And right now the economy is sick, and it is getting sicker every day.

Unemployment is rising steadily, and so are prices. Production is steadily declining, and so are family incomes.

And the only medication the Administration has prescribed is to encourage speculation on the stock market, send interest rates even higher and increase further the already astronomical profits of the moneylenders.

The free-enterprise system is supposed to work for the benefit of all our citizens. But the bitter truth is that it is not doing so.

The present Administration undertook to halt inflation and to stabilize the economy. It undertook to do so fairly, without putting the whole burden on any one part of the American people.

But the way it set about that task, using classical economic theories that have never worked in fact, is having the opposite effect.

The theory is that inflation is caused by too much money chasing too few goods, and that the way to solve it is to reduce the supply of money and make it harder to get by raising interest rates.

That is not what was happening. There were plenty of goods, all through the 1960s. Money was being siphoned off, during those years, by the greatest profit boom in living memory. Manufacturers and merchants raised their prices steadily, charging all the market would bear, to push profits still higher. The stock market became so accustomed to higher and higher profit rates that it could not stand the shock of a slowdown in their escalation.

And all along labor was being warned not to price itself out of the market.

We tried to price ourselves back into the market. But the push for higher wages never kept up with the constantly spiraling profits.

During the last 10 years, corporate profits rose by 93 percent. And wages rose 34 percent. In terms of real buying power, wages rose during all that time by no more than 10 percent.

You don't have to be an economist to understand these things. There isn't anybody in this room, any worker in this land, who can't compare his wages and his bills and tell whether he's making it or not. There isn't anybody who can't compare today's wages and living costs with those of 10 years ago and see exactly what has happened, and where the problem lies.

We have inflation, but it's a profit-caused inflation. Wages are not a cause of this inflation; they are a victim of inflation.

The Administration did not make that crucial distinction. It simply closed its eyes and fired blindly at the entire economic structure by tightening up money.

Money is very tight indeed. Interest rates have been pegged at the highest rate since the Civil War. But inflation has not been stopped. There is plenty of money for the rich and for the giant corporations, who have the best pipelines to the money market. They are cheerfully paying high interest rates and passing the cost to the consumer.

The banks are gladly lending money to their most powerful customers, but they have nothing but empty hands and pious talk about inflation-fighting when it comes to workers or consumers or small business or the housing industry or state and local governments.

In short, money is available to the rich and the greedy, for the financing of business mergers and conglomerate takeovers and for building gambling casinos and overseas production facilities. It is not available for public or private housing, or for schools or hospitals, or for other socially useful purposes.

Tight money means a bonanza to the banks and those who rent out money rather than goods and services. It means disaster to everybody else.

So private housing construction is nearly at a standstill, the homes and public facilities this nation needs so badly are not being built, and skills, manpower and resources vital to the welfare of the nation are idle.

The story is the same elsewhere. Industrial production has fallen below 80 percent of capacity, which means one machine in five is standing idle.

Those who have jobs are working shorter hours. In May, the average American worker had just \$104.02 to take home at the end of a week's work to feed a family of four. And it bought less than it did last year. It bought less than it did five years ago.

And the number of those who do not have jobs is increasing ominously. At this point one out of every 20 Americans who need and want jobs cannot get one.

In our mid-year economic report to the Congress last week, the AFL-CIO quoted some words spoken by President Nixon in October of 1968, when he was a candidate for the White House. He said:

"In the next four years, we must help create 15 million new jobs . . . Economic growth is the best assurance for a working man that his job will be secure, his real earnings on the rise, his route to advancement open."

Then, in February of 1969, in a letter to President Meany, President Nixon said this:

"We must find ways to curb inflation . . . without asking the wage earners to pay for the cost of stability with their jobs."

But that is exactly what is happening. The workers of this nation, who did not by any means share equally in the "affluence" we kept reading about in the 1960s, are expected to pay the full penalty for an economic squeeze they did not create.

And as we told the Congress last week, it isn't only the Administration that feels

workers and their families are expendable in the fight against inflation.

Even before the Administration took office, in October 1968, the Business Advisory Council agreed that the new President should act quickly to stem inflation, even if it meant an increase in unemployment to as much as 5½ percent of the work force.

It is safe to say that the people who coldly decide that such casualties are acceptable have no fear that they will ever find themselves among that 5½ percent.

Percentages only hide the fact that we are talking about human beings—more than four million individual persons—heads of families struggling to meet their responsibilities, or youngsters who want to come in off the street, find a decent job and build themselves a better world.

We in the labor movement believe that no human being is expendable. We understand that for the person who is unemployed, this nation and its society and its economic system are a failure. We will never admit that failure is any more acceptable when it involves one person—or four million persons—than it would be if it involved us all.

Workers have a right to protest when they are singled out to bear the brunt of what should be a national problem. I think it is more than a right. It is our duty to protest it, and to demand that other, more reasonable, more humane and more equitable solutions be found.

Labor intends to do just that, and to keep on doing it until the financiers and politicians begin to act on the principle that every American citizen has a right to a place in society, a right to earn his way and provide for his family, and a right to a productive job.

We will, as we have so often done in the past, search for candidates who will seek ways to even the burden and put America back to work. We will support such candidates and work to see that they are elected.

This is something labor knows how to do, and of course the Bookbinders know it as well as anybody. So the AFL-CIO does not doubt that in the coming months you and your members will be doing the hard and necessary house-by-house and shop-by-shop canvassing to make sure all of your families and friends and neighbors are registered to vote, that they know the issues and the truth about the candidates' position and track record, and that they go to the polls on Election Day.

There are economic analysts who predict that the present state of affairs will last well into next year. If we do our part, we can see to it that the task of putting America back to work begins no later than Election Day, Tuesday, November second, 1970.

Thank you.

HON. MICHAEL KIRWAN

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Michael J. Kirwan, the Nation lost a great public servant. Ohio lost one of its finest Representatives. The Congress lost a dedicated and progressive Member. The Democratic Party lost a stalwart leader. I lost a true friend.

Mike Kirwan always made his own way, from his boyhood days as an adventurer and laborer in young America

to the days of substantial power in his party and in the Congress. His code of treating others as he liked to be treated gained him vast admiration and a host of true friends. It also gained him a few enemies, but he even took pride in them, noting that his enemies always told as much about a man as his friends.

The contributions of Mike Kirwan to the preservation of America's resources and the conservation of her lands and her waters will be his monument. His 34 years of active service in Congress spanned many eras, and he was in the forefront of most of the legislative movements which changed America from a frontier land into the world's mightiest industrial nation.

Mike Kirwan was always there when his country needed him, and when his friends needed him. He served his Nation well. His memory will long sustain many in this body; would that we all leave as great a legacy as Mike Kirwan.

A GREAT LADY AND A GREAT AMERICAN

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I take note of the death of Helen Rogers Reid. Mrs. Reid was a great lady and a great American.

I will not take the time of the Members to recount the facts of her long and full life and many achievements, which were duly recorded in the New York Times article which I shall append at the end of my remarks.

I do want to express to the members of her family, including particularly her sons, our colleague, the gentleman from New York and Mr. Whitelaw Reid, both of whom have been my friends for many years, the profound sympathy of my wife and myself. The end of a life is never easy to accept, even when it comes, as in this case, many years after the allotted Biblical span.

I have only the fondest personal recollection of Mrs. Reid. Among her many interests was her great involvement in the activities of young people. Mrs. Reid twice gave me the opportunity to serve as a space-rate correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune, a very great newspaper, writing articles for the Sunday edition on youth movements in Germany, Italy, and the Soviet Union in 1935 and on conditions in Japanese occupied China in 1938. I am grateful to her for that, as well as for many other kindnesses.

Helen Rogers Reid will be sorely missed by a host of friends in New York and around the world.

The article follows:

MRS. OGDEN REID IS DEAD AT 87; EX-PRESIDENT OF HERALD TRIBUNE

Mrs. Helen Rogers Reid, former president of The New York Herald Tribune, died of arteriosclerosis yesterday at her home, 834 Fifth Avenue.

Mrs. Reid, who was 87 years old, was the widow of Ogden Reid, president of The Herald Tribune until his death in 1947.

In her 37 years on The Herald Tribune and its predecessor, The Tribune, Mrs. Reid was an unflamboyant but powerful force in the newspaper world and in the city's civic and social life.

Her business acumen, first displayed as an advertising salesman, and her editorial judgment, in making the paper attractive to women and suburban readers, helped to transform The Herald Tribune into a modern newspaper.

Entering journalism as a by-product of her marriage to Ogden Mills Reid, whose father, Whitelaw, had acquired The Tribune from Horace Greeley, its founder, Mrs. Reid gradually established herself as a newspaper personality in her own right. Never overtly aggressive, she won her reputation by quiet tenacity, dowagerlike charm, and a clear and orderly mind.

There was little in Mrs. Reid's appearance to suggest the influence she wielded, nor the force of her character. She stood only an inch over 5 feet; and she looked as fragile as a piece of expensive china. Her hair, at first brown, then gray and later white, was a fine soft fuzz that curled close to her head. Her large green eyes, however, were alert and probing. According to advertising salesmen who dealt with her, they could be quite unnerving.

In dress Mrs. Reid was feminine but not fancy. Her taste ran to bright colors, with various shades of purple predominant. Day in and day out she wore a plain beret-like hat embellished with pearls, a diamond clip, sequins, flower petals or feathers.

Although she was pleasant and informal in conversation in the office or at dinner, her talk did not run much to chit-chat, and she did not encourage it in others for long. For many years Mrs. Reid included her editors and columnists at luncheons, dinners and weekend parties she gave for guests notable in national and world affairs.

A gathering might include a Presidential aspirant, an international statesman, a best-selling author, an economist, an editor and a few couples from the Reids' social circle on the upper East Side. With dessert, Mrs. Reid would swizzle a glass of champagne with a piece of melba toast and throw out a general question on current affairs.

DINERS SUMMONED TO SPEAK

Going around the table, she would call on the diners, one by one, for their views. According to one account of these affairs, some gave their opinions seated, but a number were wont to rise and address Mrs. Reid as though she were a public meeting.

Mrs. Reid's interest in the political and economic forces that shaped the world about her was reflected in the establishment, in 1930, of The Herald Tribune's annual Forum on Current Problems. Although the Forum was at first a promotional device aimed at clubwomen, it was expanded to include the public generally.

With Mrs. William Brown Meloney, the Forum director for many years, Mrs. Reid took a hand in choosing and obtaining prominent speakers, many of them from abroad. She presided at the big sessions in the Waldorf-Astoria, and published the proceedings in a special supplement for high school and college students.

Mrs. Reid's own politics were Republican, but the forums were nonpartisan and dispassionate presentations of world news and issues. They were discontinued after 1955, for emphasis on the paper's Youth Forum.

At The Herald Tribune Mrs. Reid raised her voice for moderate Republicanism and for internationalism. In 1952 she supported Dwight D. Eisenhower for the Presidency; she had backed Thomas E. Dewey in 1948.

Mrs. Reid was a leader in civic affairs. She served for nine years as chairman of the board of trustees of Barnard College, her alma mater. A dormitory built in 1963 with funds she helped to raise is named for her. She was a trustee of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. She was active in the New York Newspaperwomen's Club, and she was president of the Reid Foundation, established by her husband in 1946 to give fellowships to journalists for study and travel abroad.

NEEDY CHILDREN HELPED

Another of Mrs. Reid's civic interests was her newspaper's Fresh Air Fund, which raised public contributions to send needy children to summer camps and homes in the country.

As a society figure Mrs. Reid was far less formidable than her mother-in-law, a vigorous matriarch who died in 1931. Mrs. Reid's style in entertainment was informal—and indefatigable. There was a constant round of guests at her 15 East 84th Street apartment, at 30-room Ophir Cottage in Purchase, N.Y., at a summer place in the Adirondacks and at a hunting lodge in North Carolina.

To those who sought to assay her career, Mrs. Reid appeared as a Cinderella who became Queen Helen. She was born in Appleton, Wis., on Nov. 23, 1882, the youngest of 11 children of Benjamin Talbot Rogers and Sarah Louise Johnson Rogers. Her father died when she was 3. Although the family was not poverty-stricken, she was obliged to earn part of her way through boarding school and then through Barnard, which she entered in 1899.

EARNED DEGREE IN ZOOLOGY

She enrolled to study Latin and Greek and perhaps to become a teacher, but she shifted her interest to zoology and took her degree in that. She established a reputation among her classmates as a crisp, attractive, enterprising girl who could even turn a profit on the senior yearbook. The class poet summed her up in this quatrain:

We love little Helen, her heart is so warm
And if you don't cross her she'll do you no harm.

So don't contradict her, or else if you do
Get under the table and wait till she's through.

In June, 1903, when Helen Rogers received her Bachelor of Arts degree, she heard that Mrs. Whitelaw Reid, one of the city's grande dames, was seeking a social secretary. She applied, was accepted and went to work in the Reids' sumptuous Florentine fortress on Madison Avenue, across from St. Patrick's Cathedral. Mrs. Reid, who had a dinner table seating 80 people and the wealth to festoon it with elegant viands, never lacked for social engagements; a secretary to handle this facet of her life had few idle moments.

SECRETARY FOR 8 YEARS

Helen Rogers was in Mrs. Reid's employ for eight years, dividing her time between the United States and London, where Whitelaw Reid was Ambassador to the Court of St. James's from 1905 to his death in 1912. During this time she met the Reids' only son, Ogden Mills Reid, fresh out of Yale. The couple were married in Wisconsin March 14, 1911.

Tall, handsome, genial and convivial, Ogden Reid was deeply interested in swimming, tennis, shooting and sailing—activities in which his wife learned to excel by putting her mind to them.

She at first took only a passing interest in The Tribune, which her husband inherited on his father's death. In the first six years of her married life she devoted herself to her children, Whitelaw, Elisabeth, who died in childhood, and Ogden. Her chief outside concern was women's suffrage. She helped raise \$500,000 for suffrage campaigns in New York.

"When I was at Barnard, working my way through," she explained later, "the necessity for complete independence of women was borne in on me."

JOINED PAPER IN 1918

Mrs. Reid's newspaper career began in 1918, when she became an advertising solicitor for the palsied Tribune, into which the Reid family was reported to have poured \$15-million since 1898. "Come down to the office," Ogden Reid asked his wife, "and work the paper's success out with me." Within two months she was its advertising manager, a post she held under slightly different titles on The Herald Tribune until she became its president in 1947.

Immensely loyal to the Reid name and eager to make The Tribune a great, self-supporting paper, Mrs. Reid channeled enormous energy into advertising salesmanship. Between 1918 and 1923 the paper, competing in the morning field with The Times, The World, The American and The Herald, more than doubled its lineage.

Then and later she was relentless in pursuit of space buyers.

"She had the persistence of gravity," an associate once remarked. She called on advertisers or had them to luncheon. Banter, deft flattery and an array of voluminous and precise facts constituted her arguments.

ADVERTISING STAFF DRIVEN

She was as unsparing of the paper's other ad solicitors as she was of herself. "You get so you sneak up the back stairs rather than confess you're not a wonder boy," a member of her harried but admiring staff once said.

On The Herald Tribune in the nineteen-thirties and forties, Mrs. Reid was accustomed to hold advertising staff meetings on Mondays at 9 a.m. sharp to get an accounting of each salesman's work. At one point she presided from a platform decorated with a cardboard apple tree and red cardboard apples. Each apple represented an account the paper was seeking.

She called up the salesmen by turn, and whenever one announced a new account she would remove the appropriate cardboard apple from the tree with a ceremonious flourish to the accompaniment of the assemblage's applause.

By means of this and other encouragements to salesmanship, including at one time impromptu choral singing, Mrs. Reid kept the advertising flowing in. For her doggedness and for her conviction that The Herald Tribune was the finest advertising medium in the city she was much admired by her sales staff.

INFLUENCE ON PAPER STRONG

Mrs. Reid had a pervasive influence on the paper's news and editorial content, although its precise demarcations were a matter of speculation.

One story is that Mrs. Reid once protested to her husband about a news article and that he retorted:

"Helen, will you get the hell back to your department and run it while I run mine." She is said to have departed meekly.

Mrs. Reid always denied the story. "In the first place," she once explained to an interviewer, "my husband wouldn't speak to me that way. In the second, I wouldn't leave meekly. Besides, nothing like that ever happened."

Actually, when Mrs. Reid put her mind to it, she usually got her way. One exception was in trying to make the paper dry during Prohibition. On this point her husband was unyielding.

SPURNED DEAL FOR HERALD

Mrs. Reid's editorial presence was felt especially after The Tribune, at her prompting, acquired Frank Munsey's Herald in a \$5-million deal in 1924.

Shortly after the purchase The Herald

Tribune moved uptown from Nassau Street to quarters at 230 West 41st Street, and began to expand its news coverage and increase its circulation.

Mrs. Reid was generally credited with being responsible for its concentration on the suburban, middle-class field of circulation. She frequently suggested story ideas and advised on coverage of others. The paper devoted, under her stimulus, much space to the news of gardening and allied interests of suburban dwellers and women.

STAFF MEMBERS RECRUITED

Mrs. Reid's influence was also reflected in the appointment of the late Mrs. Irita Van Doren as editor of Books, the Sunday literary supplement, and of the late Mrs. Meloney as editor of This Week, the Sunday fiction and articles supplement. She added the late Dorothy Thompson and Walter Lippmann, the commentator, to the staff. She was also responsible for the paper's Home Institute, a widely known experimental kitchen that devised and tested recipes for publication.

When Ogden Reid died in 1947 his widow succeeded him as president of The New York Herald Tribune, Inc. She became chairman of the board of directors in 1953. Her elder son, Whitelaw, who had joined the staff in 1940 and had been named vice president in 1947, succeeded to the presidency.

In 1955, at the age of 72, Mrs. Reid resigned as chairman but continued as a member of the board. Whitelaw succeeded her as chairman, and her other son, Ogden, who had joined the staff in 1950, became president, publisher and editor.

RETIRED IN 1958

For some time The Herald Tribune had not been gaining sufficient circulation and advertising in a period of rising costs and intense competition. A loan of \$2.5-million from the Massachusetts Life Insurance Company in the fall of 1954 proved insufficient to restore the paper to prosperity. In September of 1957 John Hay Whitney, the financier, invested \$1.2-million in the paper with an option to buy. He took up the option a year later, leaving the Reid family with a minority interest. Mrs. Reid retired at that time from the board of directors.

Mr. Whitney ran The Herald Tribune until 1966, when it merged with The Journal-American and The New York World-Telegram and The Sun. The new paper, The World Journal Tribune, expired in May, 1967.

In retirement, Mrs. Reid lived quietly in her apartment at 834 Fifth Avenue, entertaining her friends and members of her family and venturing out socially from time to time.

Many organizations honored Mrs. Reid. In 1935 she received the medal of award of the American Women's Association "for professional achievement, public service and personality." The Cuban Red Cross gave her the Comendador Cross of the Order of Honor and Merit for her "helpful understanding of world problems and friendliness toward Latin America."

At the annual dinner of the Hundred Year Association of New York, an organization of business institutions with more than a century of unbroken existence in New York, she was awarded a gold medal in 1946 for services in behalf of the welfare and prestige of the city. The 1949-50 seal of the Council Against Intolerance was presented to her for "outstanding service in the cause of tolerance and equality."

ELECTED TO ARTS ACADEMY

She was selected by the editors of "The Book of Knowledge" as one of 12 women who are "inspiring examples of intelligence and accomplishment." She was one of four women elected fellows of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1950. In 1951 she was listed among 10 notable women

in industry, communications, labor and the professions in New York State.

Mrs. Reid was also the recipient of a number of honorary degrees, and she was a member of the Colony Club, the Women's City Club, the Women's University Club, the New York Newspaperwomen's Club, the River Club, and, in Paris, of the University Women's Club.

She is survived by her sons, Whitelaw Reid and United States Representative Ogden Reid of Westchester, and by 10 grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held Thursday at 10 a.m. at St. Thomas Episcopal Church, Fifth Avenue and 53d Street.

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED APPOINTEE TO EEOC

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mrs. CHISHOLM. I would like to express my opposition to the Nixon administration's consideration of Mrs. Irene Witan Walczak for appointment to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Although I do not base my opposition on a critical evaluation of Mrs. Walczak's capabilities or motivation, I do feel strongly that her experience is incongruous with membership on a Board such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Membership on the Commission should not be arbitrarily chosen. The responsibility of participation on the Commission can only be fulfilled through a long developed sensitivity to prejudicial discrimination. Such sensitivity, and the capacity to apply it to the injustices of society, evolve from a direct experience with discriminatory practices.

It is necessary to express my opposition to the possible appointment of Mrs. Walczak in the context of the function of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. In elaborating on the Commission, I would like to add that its small size of a five-member Board, by no means indicates an ineffective role. One the contrary, the Commission fulfills a unique function in the process of eliminating the legal condonement of prejudicial discrimination. The Commission reviews complaints of job discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. The function of review includes resolving cases through conciliation. Although the Board lacks the power of judicial review, it does have the power to refer cases to the Justice Department. Without pressure, the Justice Department can easily slip into a lax role in combating discrimination.

In the above context, the experience of Mrs. Walczak is incongruous. According to reliable newspaper sources, Mrs. Walczak has been active in Republican campaigns. In 1964 she worked for Barry Goldwater, who as Senator voted against the Civil Rights Act. During 1968 she was a Republican chairman of the Citizens for Nixon-Agnew for three New York counties, and contributed upward of \$1,000 to the GOP. On a nonpolitical

level, Mrs. Walczak has completed 1 year of college, and has never held a salaried position. Her experience has included such activities as membership on the development board at the State University College at Buffalo, and support for the Buffalo Philharmonic.

In contrast to the background of Mrs. Walczak is the direct involvement of Commissioner Kuck in the problems of labor. Miss Kuck previously served as personnel director for the International Harvester Co. of Chicago, and in the assembly line of that company. Her concern over discrimination is evident by her contact with the Justice Department in confronting sexual discrimination. The result of her action was that the Civil Rights Division initiated a brief in support of a woman filing charges on the grounds of job discrimination. The case is now pending before the Supreme Court. While Commissioner, Miss Kuck was praised by various organizations for her competence. The White House recently gave their approval of her term as Commissioner, but withheld renewal of her appointment.

The contrast between the experiences of the prospective Commissioner Walczak and the expired Commissioner Kuck is clearly evident. The prospective appointment of Mrs. Walczak cannot help but weaken the confidence of victims of discrimination in our system of government. The mounting crisis in the credibility of leadership is based on all levels of leadership, this being no exception.

I call to your attention this discrepancy between qualification and appointment to a position of responsibility, in the hope that the administration will withdraw its consideration of Mrs. Walczak for appointment to the EEOC. I expect that if the House of Representatives had the power of approving appointments, they would not do so in this case.

IN MEMORIAM: PETER V. ROVNIANEK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of Slovaks in America will turn toward Chicago next week when the 25,000 member National Slovak Society of the United States of America assembles for its 25th national convention. The National Slovak Society, with headquarters in Pittsburgh, Pa., is in its 80th year of existence and is the oldest Slovak-American fraternal organization. The Society, through its membership, national officers and convention delegates from all parts of the country, will honor its founder, the late Peter V. Rovnianek with graveside memorial services at Bohemian National Cemetery on Sunday afternoon, August 2.

Following are excerpts from an article written by Dr. Stephen J. Hletko, national director of activities for the National Slovak Society:

IN MEMORIAM: PETER V. ROVNIANEK

Peter Vitazoslav Rovnianek was born on June 27, 1867 in Dolny Hricov, county of Trencin, Slovakia, and migrated to the United States in September 1888.

Rovnianek was proud of his Slovak ancestry and maintained a deep love for the land of his birth. During his student days abroad, and later in this country as a student and then as a journalist and author, he was a consistent supporter of Slovak nationalism and independence and encouraged the downfall of the Austro-Hungarian empire. He was a loyal son of his adopted country, and continuously encouraged the Americanization of Slovak immigrants.

He was the first to recognize the need of organizing a fraternal beneficial society of Slovaks in America which became a reality on February 15, 1890 when the National Slovak Society of the U.S.A. was born and he was elected its first president. The organizational meeting took place at Walther's Hall in Allegheny, Penn., (now a part of Pittsburgh) and the motto, "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity," was adopted by the original membership which totalled 25.

Mr. Rovnianek believed in fraternalism, and helped organize other Slovak-American societies, particularly Zivena Ladies Beneficial Society and Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol (now known as Sokol USA.) A number of other Slovak-American societies are actually offshoots of the society that he organized and therefore he is rightfully referred to as "The Father of Slovak-American Fraternalism."

He was a true patriot, fraternalist, author and journalist, businessman and a brilliant orator with a dynamic style and personality. Unfortunately, as it so often occurs, he did not always receive the recognition he deserved and encountered complications in his fraternal activities. Mr. Rovnianek died in virtual obscurity on November 16, 1933 in Hornitos, California. Later his Chicago area friends arranged to have his remains moved to Bohemian National Cemetery in Chicago and also arranged for the erection of an imposing monument in his memory.

Rovnianek was a dedicated genius who had foresight and was obviously years ahead of his time. His ideas and successful methods were later imitated by others. Although Slovak history has neglected Rovnianek, the architect of Slovak Fraternalism and unity, it is becoming clearer and time will properly vindicate him and the National Slovak Society and the Slovak-American fraternalistic system will serve as a living monument to him and will credit the success of his walk through life.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hletko is a resident of Oak Lawn, Ill., in my district, and it is appropriate that we make mention of the great contributions to American life that fraternal organizations such as the National Slovak Society have provided.

HOW LONG, MR. PRESIDENT, BEFORE YOU REPLY?

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on July 23, Congressmen STOKES, HAWKINS, and I wrote to President Nixon indicating our concern for the President's failure to give audience to black representatives or consideration to the problems of black

Americans. We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, that neither by word nor by deed has the President indicated anything but premeditated indifference toward 25 million black citizens. The policies of this administration have served to accelerate the tragedy of separate and unequal societies moving steadily and dangerously apart.

The July 18 edition of *The New Republic* magazine carries a comment by the editors entitled "Nixon and Blacks: Substance and Symbol." Since this comment addresses itself to the effect of Nixon policies upon the aspirations of black Americans for equal opportunities and rights, I submit it for the attention of my colleagues in order that they may review some of the reasons for the alienation of black America.

The article follows:

NIXON AND BLACKS: SUBSTANCE AND SYMBOL

Is the Nixon Administration "anti-Negro," as alleged by the chairman of the NAACP, Stephen G. Spottswood? It does not think itself so. The President's Special Consultant, Leonard Garment, cites evidence that it is not, in an aggrieved telegram to Bishop Spottswood. And in a sense Mr. Garment is right. George Wallace is not the symbol of this Administration; the Attorney General is. And Mr. Mitchell does not hate blacks; he hardly knows them. He is not a bigot, he defends the law and order that underpin his own success and that of his friends. He is an expert on municipal bonds, intelligent, self-assured, provincial. Mr. Garment is broader-gauge, but, with all the goodwill in the world he cannot close the great divide between the government and the blacks. It is beyond his reach. So if he comes off worse in his interchange with NAACP, it is not because he is insincere, or because the Administration is hard-hearted, but because government, business, unions, schools, philanthropies are run by whites, primarily for the benefit of whites, and the blacks rightfully resent it.

What does a black man see? He sees a man nominated for the Supreme Court who once pledged himself to white supremacy. He sees the President sign a Voting Rights Act only after having lobbied in the Congress, and failed, to sap its strength. He sees a persistent income differential: In 1968, 58 percent of white families earned \$8000 or more, 32 percent of nonwhite families. He sees 29 percent of black families existing below the poverty line. He sees white unemployment drop in June from May's 5 percent to 4.7 percent of the labor force; and the black jobless rate rise from 8 to 8.7 percent. He knows that "Black Capitalism" is a fraud. "Under programs announced last fall," *The New York Times* (June 28) reported, "hundreds of companies, in partnership with the federal government, were to make millions of dollars available to minorities by June 30 . . . So far only nine companies have kept their commitment of \$150,000 each with two-to-one federal matching money [and] not all of the nine have yet granted loans . . . Some banks still refuse to finance minorities, even with 100 percent guaranteed government loans."

Seventy percent of black America is in the metropolitan areas, and if all the words written to deplore the impoverishment of poor blacks in cities were translated into renewal dollars, the ghettos would bloom—and no longer be ghettos. The most recent Bureau of Labor Statistics data (1968) showed that 24 percent of black housing is substandard. Not much can be done about that now; too inflationary—though a brand-new US-financed program for Vietnamese soldiers' families will produce 20,000 new houses in

Vietnam, built in each of the next five years, according to *The Washington Post* of July 7. Two years ago, Congress enacted a historic fair housing law which decreed, in essence, that any American of any color or religion had the legal right to rent or buy a place to live, assuming he could afford it. And about the same time, the Supreme Court upheld an 1886 statute which gave a man the right to sue if he was kept from buying a home because of race. Since the Act became effective on January 1, 1969, the Housing Section of the Justice Department Civil Rights Division has filed only about 50 cases. (HUD has received more than a thousand discrimination complaints.) Restrictive covenants are honored in practice, if not in theory, in every section of the country. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has not yet issued regulations spelling out the details of how the Open Housing Act should be enforced, how HUD field offices will handle grievances, how the department should fulfill its statutory obligations to coordinate federal programs in a way to best further the 1968 Act's objectives. This February, the US Commission on Civil Rights recommended that the Administration prohibit federal agencies from moving into communities with out adequate housing for low income or minority group employees; it asked President Nixon to issue an executive order to that effect. No order has been issued. The Commission charged that the government has been "inadequately concerned" with the impact of relocation on blacks.

TRB in his report this week cites testimony from Senator Mondale's investigation of prolonged, protected Southern evasion of school desegregation. On June 26, the director of the Civil Rights Division of Justice, Jerris Leonard, promised to file a single suit against the state of Mississippi if the 27 districts in that state not in compliance failed to act within three days. "We're going to be disinterested in discussing it after next week," he said. Three days came and went; there was no suit. Two weeks passed; the Department was not disinterested in further discussion. HEW estimates there are 150 hold-out school districts which have neither submitted desegregation plans to the Department nor led the Department to believe they intend to. Only 43 of these districts have had their federal funds for education cut off, and that does not tell the whole story. Many school districts make promises in order to meet September deadlines for compliance and thus qualify for funds—only to let those promises lapse in the ensuing 12 months, until the next deadline has to be met. Many districts under court orders to desegregate are assumed to be in compliance with the law (and so are not included in the 150), but they are not. Monitoring is spotty, review inadequate.

This is the substance of the NAACP's indictment. In the background there are other, unspoken thoughts. The NAACP, too, has constituents, an impatient membership to which is must answer, militant pressures before which it must bend or give way. Bishop Spottswood's is a cry for help—help us help blacks to believe they can make it! The NAACP criticism goes beyond the Nixon record; it is a condemnation of the Administration's thinness of dedication; the White House is not hospitable to black hopes, or to black spokesmen.

The Administration responds by trying to recruit Whitney Young of the Urban League as its ambassador to the black community. The gesture is not exactly a slap in the face, for Mr. Young is an excellent man. But it does not ease the pain of a smarting NAACP, whose executive secretary, Roy Wilkins, has been the black elder statesman, the leader of established civil rights groups.

No one has to tell the NAACP that society does not move at the speed of light.

But the Administration—the next one if not this—can and must convey to black America, moderate and militant, that it wants to move farther, faster—away from poverty and toward equality. It does not convey that when the President vetoes a hospital construction bill as "inflationary," and subsequently plans an additional \$100 million in economic aid to the Saigon government—on top of the \$365-million already allocated for fiscal '70. It cannot convey that when the President welcomes to the White House a delegation of "hard hats" who are anything but sympathetic to black aspirations; or when the Vice President twice attacks the credentials of the single young black selected by the President to serve on an advisory committee on campus unrest. Symbols count; John F. Kennedy rode a long way by a single telephone call in 1960 to Mrs. Martin Luther King, when her husband had been arrested. And it is ironic that a White House so amply staffed with advertising talents, so sensitive to "image," so quick to see the political advantage in any situation, fails to grasp this desperate need of the black community for true signs of concern. It is ironic, unless one believes the President has embraced a "Southern strategy," and that he is investing his political capital in the presumed loyalty of those whites who resist and fear black emancipation.

Black America's confidence in the national government has rapidly, dangerously diminished. When, 30 years ago this summer, Walter White, who was "Mr. NAACP," was asked whom the Negroes would vote for that year for President, he replied, "FDR, of course, for if they don't, Mrs. Roosevelt won't be in the White House, and I'm going to tell them so." He didn't need to tell them anything. They knew then that they had friends and allies in the highest places.

NEW SEARS BUILDING IN CHICAGO PLANNED AS THE WORLD'S TALLEST

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to inform my colleagues of a very interesting situation which is growing—in a manner of speaking—in my own city of Chicago. One of America's largest corporations, Sears, Roebuck & Co., has announced plans to add still another dimension to Chicago's position as America's No. 1 city. Sears, Roebuck & Co. is going to construct the world's tallest building, a 110-story structure which will rise over 1,450 feet above the Loop in downtown Chicago.

For those of you who might be unfamiliar with the finer aspects of the great battle of the sky, our building will soar some 200 feet over its only eastern rival, the Empire State Building.

New York's hasty attempt to gain some degree of its former prestige through the construction of its twin tower world trade center will, at last report, fall some 100 feet short of our magnificent edifice.

So, Mr. Speaker, at this time, I must commend the Sears, Roebuck & Co. for undertaking this tremendous feat and offer my condolences to my colleagues

from New York for losing still another one to the great city of Chicago.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the article in today's Chicago Tribune which announced the good news to the people of Chicago, and a copy of the article in the New York Times which released the sad facts to the people of that city.

The article follows:

NEW SEARS BUILDING IN CHICAGO PLANNED AS THE WORLD'S TALLEST

CHICAGO, July 27.—Sears, Roebuck and Company, the world's largest retailer, announced today that its new central headquarters in downtown Chicago would be the world's tallest building and the largest private building in the world.

Gordon M. Metcalf, chairman and chief executive officer of the company, said at a news conference that the 110-story Sears tower would be 1,450 feet tall, surpassing the twin towers of New York's World Trade Center by 100 feet and the Empire State Building by 200 feet.

The gross floor space, he said, will total 4,400,000 square feet, equal to 101 acres, with actual commercial and office space of 3,700,000 square feet. Only the Pentagon, which houses the Defense Department near Washington and has about 6,500,000 square feet, will be larger.

Mr. Metcalf said that the building's cost, not yet determined, would exceed \$100-million. The building is to be financed through Sears' earnings. Excavation at the site has already started. Originally, Sears officials talked of providing 3 million square feet, then, last December, of 4 million square feet. The enlargement of the project became known as details were announced today.

Mr. Metcalf said completion of the building was scheduled for 1974.

Sears initially plans to occupy 2 million square feet of the building, leasing 1.7 million square feet to office and commercial tenants. It will take over more of the building as its requirements increase.

NEAR TRANSIT LINES

The site of the building, on the west side of the downtown business district near major commuter railroad stations and other transit lines, includes 129,000 square feet, about the equivalent of a normal downtown city block.

This site is bounded by Wacker Drive, Jackson Boulevard and Adams and Franklin Streets. One block of Quincy Street, which bisected the site, was purchased from the city last December for \$2,767,500 and this portion was vacated to permit the construction of a single building instead of two.

From a base 225 feet square, the building will rise with a series of setbacks and will have a 20-story rectangular top. A curtain wall of black duranodic aluminum will give the building a "black-heath effect." Mr. Metcalf said. The windows will be bronze tinted.

There will be 102 high-speed elevators, including 14 double-deck units, and 16 escalators serving the lower levels and "sky lobbies" at the 33d and 34th floor levels and at the 66th and 67th floor levels.

16,500 IN BUILDING

The building was designed by the Chicago architectural firm of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill. The general contractor will be Diesel Construction, a division of Carl A. Morse, Inc.

Initially, about 16,500 persons, including 7,000 Sears employees, are expected to work in the building.

The company's main offices are now in a Sears complex of 17 buildings in a slum area on the city's West Side, with headquarters personnel scattered in several buildings in Chicago and its suburbs.

This complex, which is much less accessible than the downtown site, is to be retained principally for centralizing catalogue order processing and a retail store.

Last year, Sears had net sales of nearly \$8.9-billion and a net income of \$441-million. It has more than 355,000 employees, including 31,200 in the Chicago area, and 826 retail stores, 11 catalogue order plants and more than 2,100 sales offices and independent catalogue merchants. There are subsidiaries and affiliates in 23 foreign countries.

SEARS BUILDING TALLEST, COST IS PLACED AT \$100 MILLION

Sears, Roebuck & Co. announced yesterday it will build the world's tallest building on South Wacker Drive.

The building will be 1,450 feet high, as tall as the tip of the antennas on the John Hancock Center.

It will have 109 floors on the Wacker Drive side and 110 floors on the Franklin Street side. It will contain 4.4 million gross square feet of space on the two-block site between Jackson Boulevard and Adams Street from Wacker Drive to Franklin Street.

More than 16,000 persons will work in the building, which is scheduled for completion in 1974. Work is expected to start next week.

Mayor Daley said: "On behalf of the people of Chicago, I thank Sears for the confidence they are showing in the future in the planning and designing of the building . . . which will adorn the west side and stimulate growth of the west side."

MAYOR IS ENTHUSIASTIC

Mayor Daley said he was particularly enthusiastic because there has been concern about companies moving out of the city.

"I want to thank Sears again for the confidence they are showing in the city," he said.

Warren Skoning, Sears vice president-real estate property, said the building will be called Sears Tower. It follows company tradition in naming the first mail order store building in the west side complex the Tower Building.

Skoning said building will cost \$100 million. Financing has not been arranged but "Sears has no problem financing the expansion; it will come out of earnings," he said.

In 1969 Sears had net sales of nearly \$8.9 billion and earnings of \$441 million.

Skoning said there will not be a Sears store in the building.

HIGH AS FAA LIMIT

Skoning said the building will be as high as the Federal Aviation Administration would permit. He said he believes Sears officials should say it would have 110 stories so that it has the same number of floors as the World Trade Center in New York City.

Sears Tower will be second in size in number of square feet only to the Pentagon in Washington.

DESIGNED BY SKIDMORE

Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Chicago architect, designed Sears Tower. It will rise in a series of setbacks at the 50th, 66th, and 90th stories, creating various floor arrangements as the height increases.

The exterior will be black aluminum with bronze tinted windows. An observation level at 1,350 feet above the street is planned for the 103d floor.

Sears will occupy initially less than 2 million square feet of space. About 1.7 million will be available to outside tenants.

ASSEMBLED OVER 5 YEARS

The Sears building will be on a two-block tract assembled by private developers over a five-year period starting in 1964.

A jumble of 15 grimy blackened buildings, similar to those which once stretched the

length of North and South Wacker Drive, had to be purchased from 100 owners.

Quincy Street bisected the tract between Franklin Street and Wacker Drive. To consolidate its holdings, Sears paid the city \$2.7 million for the street.

Sears is moving into one of the fastest growing sections of the Chicago central city. Altho the redevelopment of both banks of the south branch of the Chicago River is already underway, real estate men say the Sears building is generating new enthusiasm for the area.

STARTED IN EARLY 1960

Sears will be across the river from Gateway Center which started the redevelopment movement in the early 1960s. Tishman Realty & Construction company has built two 20-story office buildings and has a 35-story tower under construction.

The Sears site is flanked by two buildings under construction and several more are planned.

The Sears tower will be close to the commuter trains in Union and North Western railroad stations, and near the main post-office, making it a prime office building.

Sears will continue to occupy its sprawling plant of 17 buildings at Homan Avenue and Arthington Place. It is expected to be used mainly for catalog orders and a retail store.

The first phase of the west side plant was built in 1905. Altho there have been additions, expansion has not kept pace with the growth of the giant retailing chain.

BIRMINGHAM HOUSING AUTHORITY: A JOB WELL DONE

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be much attention given in our time to various things which are wrong with our society and which need changing. It is a pleasure to include herewith an article from the Birmingham News about the Birmingham Housing Authority which is clearly doing a lot of things right. Under the competent leadership of Mr. Hugh Denman, executive director, and his able and energetic assistant, Mrs. Melba Moebe, the authority is doing an excellent job not only in providing housing itself but in working toward providing a full and rich life for the people who live in its various housing projects. Recreation for the project's more than 17,500 children, activities for the elderly, and adult education occupy the time for attention of the housing authority staff as well as providing adequate housing for low-income families in the Birmingham area. The people of Birmingham are proud of the excellent work the Birmingham Housing Authority is doing and it is a pleasure to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, July 19, 1970]

6,471 FAMILIES HELPED: NEW HOUSING BRINGING HAPPINESS

(By Harold Kennedy)

Happiness is . . . the Birmingham Housing Authority.

It is a youngster swinging precariously from a monkey bar, hitting a home run, zipping down a slide.

It's a basketball gym, a ping pong table, a dash through a stream of cold water in the heat of summer.

Happiness is a quilting bee, dominoes or bingo to help the elderly pass the time. It's an adult first learning to read and write, a course in charm and modeling for a young girl, a Boy Scout camping trip.

And perhaps most of all, happiness is having enough to eat, a good roof over head and adequate health attention.

Aspects of happiness, perhaps better than anything else, tell about the Birmingham Housing Authority.

The authority's overwhelming success in obtaining rent subsidy housing for low-income families has been splashed across newspapers, blared over radio and depicted on TV.

But the real story does not begin until the brick-and-mortar stage is over. It lies in the people.

Some 6,471 low-income families will be living in the authority's 14 housing projects after completion of two complexes now under construction. And, as one official put it, these people are the Housing Authority.

Declared Mrs. Melba Moebes, assistant executive director: "We feel that we are in the people business, and that housing should pay human dividends."

The best way to reap human dividends, she added, is to create happiness. To this end, the authority already has been assured of almost \$4 million in federal grants during 1970 and 1971.

The money will finance a host of projects, ranging from replacing old appliances and plumbing to maintaining a broad recreational and educational program for adults and youngsters alike.

The authority has concentrated most of its recreational efforts around the projects' more than 17,500 children. The reason, said Mrs. Moebes, is that "a happy child is more apt to grow up to be a happy and well-adjusted adult."

To carry out this philosophy, the authority during the next two years will purchase \$96,000 in playground equipment, such as swings and slides, along with barbeque pits and picnic tables for family enjoyment.

Another \$64,000 will be invested in special playground equipment for smaller children. The equipment, which looks like creations of a modern sculptor bent on futuristic designs, is engineered to let each child develop his own talents and abilities at his own rate—and have fun.

And there are such things as "spray pools," which shoot streams of water aloft as children gleefully dash through them, and tetherball and little league baseball.

The authority supports 34 little league teams, 13 girls' and women's softball teams and five men's softball teams. All the equipment and fields are furnished by the Housing Authority, with the exception of the uniforms. This year, the little league players earned the money to buy their own uniforms.

Several hundred youngsters also take advantage of authority-sponsored Boy and Girl Scout troops, and a Boy Scout workshop is backed annually in Birmingham by the authority with the help of the National Boy Scout Council.

Yet, perhaps the most impressive recreational program maintained by the housing agency is the chain of community centers strung throughout the projects. Aimed at serving project residents as well as surrounding communities, the centers are headquarters for an almost unlimited flow of recreational, health and educational programs.

Each center has a full-size gymnasium which can be used for everything from basketball for youngsters to square dancing for the elderly.

More than 93,000 persons attended functions at the centers last month alone.

They came to play ping pong, checkers, dominoes, bingo and any number of other table games, as well as to attend free courses and classes on subjects of vital importance to youngsters preparing for that adult world.

To help the girls capture—and keep—that boy of their dreams, there are instructions in charm, modeling, sewing and cooking.

Courses in radio and electronics are available for teenagers, as well as classes in arts and crafts, which saw some 2,196 in attendance last month.

There also are courses in ceramics, losing weight, and food-buying and meal-planning to help families prepare better meals. Elementary reading and writing classes for the illiterate are available.

Each center has a health clinic attended by doctors and registered nurses from the Public Health Service two days a week.

One of the most prideful accomplishments of the Housing Authority is its system of child day care centers. There already is day care service at most projects, but due to the demand the authority is building three new ones at a total cost of \$750,000 and have requested \$1 million for four more, each of which will take care of about 100 youngsters while their mothers work.

Job training and employment opportunities are another service offered free to project tenants. A special program with the Department of Housing and Urban Development in job training will begin before September.

The one-year program will train 30 tenants in such trades as refrigeration, carpentry, landscaping, auto mechanics and small motor repair. It will be given by the Jefferson County Schools' Vocational Department.

"What we're after is total development for the children, and at the same time to give the adults advantages they would not have outside the projects," Mrs. Moebes explained.

REVERSING THE TREND

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last week the Evening News of Newark ran a full page statement sponsored by civic minded Newark citizens offering congratulations and support to our newly elected mayor, Kenneth Gibson.

My own city of Newark is one of the oldest urban centers in the United States. It has seen the coming and the going of millions of American families. The spirit of Newark's citizens has been, throughout the years, often tested. Therefore, it is altogether fitting that Mayor Gibson, should receive support and be reminded of an earlier call to restore the city to a proud position among the municipalities of America.

I can only add my own fervent hope that together and united the mayor and the people will reverse the trend of blight and renew the city to a position of greatness.

The statement follows:

REVERSING THE TREND

By way of congratulating, and supporting, our newly elected Mayor Gibson, we call upon the people of Newark, as well as those whose interests are entwined with those of our City, to walk with and sustain our Mayor in his difficult and dedicated journey toward the accomplishment of the restoration of our

City to the proud position it once held among the municipalities of America.

To this end, both as an inspiration and as a guide, we refer to a set of New Year Resolutions, made by the City, itself, and which were promulgated at the request of the Sunday Call, and carried in its issue of January 1st, 1928, as follows:

The New Year brings with it, as always, a group of resolutions made by thousands of Newarkers, with more or less seriousness of purpose. But what of the City itself; cannot it, too, make resolutions on behalf of its citizenry?

The question was put up to Judge Nicholas Albano of the Newark Police Court. It was felt that he, perhaps better than anyone else in Newark is in a position to know, from his close official contact with those unfortunates on the fringes of the law abiding citizenship, just what Newark needs most in the way of resolutions.

The resolutions that he suggested for the City of Newark are as follows:

As a great American municipality, viewing with thankful retrospection the magnificent progress of the past year, and hopefully expectant of the blessings of the coming year, I resolve:

"To summon to peaceful council, at my broad fireside, all who dwell within my household, for calm deliberation of common aims and needs;

"To invoke, to the full measure of their ideals, the active co-operation of all my agencies, Social, Fraternal, Institutional, Educational and Religious—for the relief, protection and enlightenment of my people;

"To foster a spirit of universal brotherhood, based upon the solid foundation of patriotism, charitableness and kindness;

"To engender among those who are new on our soil a true love for their adopted country, a just appreciation of the benefits of free government, and an honest respect for constituted authorities, by viewing their habits traditions and opinions with sympathy and understanding;

"To inculcate in the minds and hearts of those who are just beginning to tread the broad highway of life a higher regard for home—a deeper love and a more sincere respect of parents;

"To treat the erring with a justice which listens to mercy—a mercy which seeks causes, and, where possible, is healing, a mercy which recognizes misery and want and understands their problems through contact and experience, rather than theoretic surmises, and takes pains to mend where, perhaps, society has crushed;

"To banish hatred of race and criticism of creed;

"To be tolerant and broad visioned and to criticize impartially, and dispassionately, but constructively;

"To erect even greater houses of industry, but intermingle them with houses of God;

"To build even more pretentious temples of art and amusement, but match them with hospitals and homes where the stern realities of life may be softened;

"To seek an atmosphere of religion, not dominantly Protestant, nor Catholic, nor Jewish, but dominantly God-fearing;

"And, withal, to press my claim for a place in the leading ranks of the cities of the Nation, not as a vain achievement, but in justification of the foresight and judgment of those of my sons who have rendered years of faithful service in order that my doors might be opened to the shipping of the great seas; that my merchandise might be sold upon the markets of the world; that my industries and business might flourish and progress, and that my school systems and municipal departments might be held out as models for the other municipalities of the Country."

It is our conviction, and, undoubtedly that

of all the people of our City, that the hopes and aspirations of the Newark of 1928, are envisioned in the mind and heart of Mayor Gibson, and that he is entitled to and should receive universal encouragement and support in his announced intention to reverse the trend of our City toward the greatness it deserves.

This advertisement is sponsored by:
 Dr. Edwin H. Albano, State Medical Examiner, 150 Cabinet St., Newark, N.J.
 Nicholas Albano, Jr., Lawyer, 22 Pompton Avenue, Cedar Grove, N.J.
 Bayonne Barrel & Drum Co., Frank A. Langella, President, 1154 Raymond Blvd., Newark, N.J.
 Leslie Blau Company, Real Estate & Appraisals, Leslie Blau, President, 15 Commerce Street, Newark, N.J.
 Branford Press, Printers, Harry Applebaum, President, 21 William St., Newark, N.J.
 John J. Budd, Lawyer, 60 Park Place, Newark, N.J.
 Joseph M. Byrne Company, Insurance & Travel Agency, Joseph M. Byrne, President, 828 Broad Street, Newark, N.J.
 Nicholas E. Caprio, Lawyer, 134 Evergreen Place, East Orange, N.J.
 Ralph C. Caprio, Tax Collector, City of Newark.
 Carteret Savings & Loan Assn., Anthony M. Surano, President, 866 Broad Street, Newark, N.J.
 Frank Cocuzzo & Son, Inc., Building Contractors, Joseph A. Cocuzzo, President, 393 So. 11th Street, Newark, N.J.
 The Contract Bridge Center, Helen D. Albano, Director, 658 Sandford Avenue, Newark, N.J.
 David Cronheim, Company, Real Estate & Insurance, Robert Cronheim, President, 900 Broad Street, Newark, N.J.
 Ralph D'Ambola, Sheriff of Essex County, Court House, Newark, N.J.
 Dr. Samuel D'Ambola, 191 Elmwood Avenue, Newark, N.J.
 Federal Storage Warehouses, Frank Visceglia, President, Vincent Visceglia, Vice President, 155 Washington St., Newark, N.J.
 Robert Inlander, Lawyer, 75 Orange Ave., South Orange, N.J.
 The J. I. Kislak Organization, Real Estate & Insurance, 581 Broad Street, Newark, N.J.
 Samuel Klein, President, Hebrew Youth Academy, 91 Halsey St., Newark, N.J.
 La Fera Contracting Co., Engineers—Contractors, Joseph LeFera, President, 149 Vernon Avenue, Newark, N.J.
 Rev. Virgil E. Mabrey, Pastor of First United Methodist Church of Newark, 227 Market Street, Newark, N.J.
 David Mandelbaum, Lawyer, 17 Academy Street, Newark, N.J.
 Nathan Mandelbaum, Lawyer, 17 Academy Street, Newark, N.J.
 Philip Mandelbaum, Lawyer, 17 Academy Street, Newark, N.J.
 The Mount Carmel Guild, A Community Agency of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Newark, Rev. Msgr. Joseph A. Dooling, Director.
 Jack Parker, Associates, Contractors, Joseph Katowitz, Vice President, 11 Hill Street, Newark, N.J.
 Louis Schlesinger Company, Realtors, Joel L. Schlesinger, Chairman of Board, 901 Broad Street, Newark, N.J.
 Zev Segal, Rabbi of Youth Israel Congregation, 61 Parkview Terrace, Newark, N.J.
 Irving Siegler, Lawyer, 60 Park Place, Newark, N.J.
 Jack Slavitt, Lawyer, 17 Academy Street, Newark, N.J.
 George Wallhauser, Sr., Vice President, U.S. Realty & Investment Co., 972 Broad St., Newark, N.J.
 Nicholas Albano, Sr., Former Judge of Newark Police Court, Legal Assistant, Newark Law Department, Secretary, N.J. Institute of Municipal Attorneys.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING SERVICEMEN CAPTURED AND MISSING IN ACTION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the plight of our prisoners of war of the Vietnam conflict deserve our constant attention. We must continue efforts to see that they receive the treatment to which they are entitled to under the Geneva Conference.

Therefore, I was pleased and impressed when I was advised that the city council of the city of Hometown, Ill., in its meeting of June 9 adopted a resolution in support of captured American and allied fighting men and those missing in action in the Vietnam conflict. The resolution signed by Mayor Francis E. Anderson follows:

RESOLUTION 8 1970

In support of captured American and allied fighting men and those missing in action in the Vietnam conflict

Whereas article VI of the United States Constitution specifically states that provisions of treaties ratified by the United States Government become the "supreme law of the land", notwithstanding contrary limitations of the Constitution itself; and

Whereas, notwithstanding solemn promises ratified at the international conference at Geneva that all prisoners of war captured would be given the respect of humane treatment; that Article 2 of the convention provides that it "shall apply to all cases of declared war or any war or any other armed conflict which might arise between two or more of the High Contracting parties, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them."

Whereas, the government of North Vietnam acceded to the convention on June 28, 1957, and the government of South Vietnam acceded to the convention on November 14, 1953, and the government of the United States acceded to the convention on August 2, 1955; no pretense of compliance has been advanced by North Vietnam or the National Liberation Front (Viet Cong) despite a request to do so on June 11, 1965, by Jacques Freymond, Vice President of the International Committee of the Red Cross and numerous appeals by the international humanitarian organizations subsequently, and

Whereas repeated appeals on the part of wives, parents, relatives, and dependents of those unfortunate victims of Communist inhumanity have proven ineffective through diplomatic, military and humanitarian channels.

Now, therefore be it resolved that we, representing the City of Hometown 8000 people condemn in the strongest terms the repressive and cruel treatment of American and allied prisoners and petition that the government of North Vietnam act as follows to:

1. Observe the international accords of the Geneva Convention in the same manner the government of South Vietnam accords to captured troops of the North Vietnam government and their allies.
2. Release names and physical condition of all prisoners held.
3. Immediately release sick and wounded prisoners.
4. Provide for impartial inspections of prisoners of war facilities by the international humanitarian organizations.
5. Provide for medical treatment of all prisoners.

6. Provide for regular flow of mail, food and comfort items.

7. Cease using prisoners for purposes of public degradation, political propaganda and mental torture of prisoners and their innocent families.

8. Agree to immediately negotiate through international humanitarian organizations for the fair and equitable exchange of prisoners of both sides.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Hometown in meeting this 9th day of June, 1970.

This Resolution was approved by me this 9th day of June, 1970.

FRANCIS E. ANDERSON, Mayor

Attest:

MAE L. RANDLE, City Clerk.

TEACHERS OPEN DRIVE TO SELL UNIONISM

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

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

[From the U.S. News & World Report, May 18, 1970]

TEACHERS OPEN DRIVE TO SELL UNIONISM

Unionized teachers are starting a drive to tell the story of public-employee unions in the classrooms of the nation's public schools.

Plans for the campaign were announced by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) on May 4, in Washington, D.C. AFT President David Selden said that teaching materials are going out to 200,000 members of the union and to school superintendents.

It will be optional with each member, Mr. Selden explained, as to whether he or she uses the AFT lessons. He said teachers will not be under pressure to join in the campaign.

"Lesson 3" of the printed material suggests that the instructor might use a series of questions to get the points across to pupils. The teacher is told to "remember, the rhetorical question is not an academic crime!"

Among the suggested questions are:

"Should strikes be prohibited? For all workers? For all public workers, regardless of their work? If so, how? If not, should there be conditions imposed by law before a strike can be called by public workers?"

The instructions also suggested that "the teacher should attempt to tie up loose ends of the discussion, pointing out areas where there is no common agreement as well as where consensus seems possible."

GOAL: OPEN MINDS

The teacher also is told to "take special care to sweep away as many cobwebs of mythology as possible" and to "let your students go forth with at least an open mind on the subject."

Members of AFT are offered ideas for class activities, listed as useful at "almost any grade level or group."

One suggestion: "Students should be given the opportunity to march on a picket line with public employes, if a strike occurs in your neighborhood and if students decide they want to support the strikers."

Making picket signs is another possibility. The material states that "a good sign has bold lettering suitable for TV-camera pickup and with no more than six or seven words."

A suggested writing project would have the student describe "what would you do if you

were the leader of a teacher union and (a) the school board wouldn't meet with your union; (b) you hadn't received a raise in four years; and (c) class sizes had increased by five students each over the past three years?"

AFT officials said the teaching material is geared to high-school, college and possibly junior-high students. The union says its teaching aides are balanced and objective.

Union President Selden said that if any teachers are disciplined or fired for using the AFT lessons, the union is prepared to assign lawyers to defend them. Mr. Selden said AFT will defend the members' right to use the material without approval of the school board.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, July 6, 1970]

THE RESULT OF FORCED UNIONIZATION OF TEACHERS'

Teachers' agency shop.—The Detroit Board of Education on June 23 fired, at least temporarily, 52 teachers for refusing to comply with the board's agency-shop contract with the Detroit Federation of Teachers. This requires nonunion instructors to pay a fee equal to union dues of about \$77 a year. Some 1,200 other teachers are not complying but are protected against discharge because they are testing the clause in court.

SOUTH FLORIDA WINNERS OF "SPEAK UP FOR AMERICA" CONTEST

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to offer my congratulations to five south Florida youths, Gloria Davis, Debbie Renuart, Paul Bockting, Joan Ziegler, and Richard Lee Grimm, who are winners of the "Speak Up for America" contest sponsored by the Certified Plumbers of South Florida.

Miss Davis, the first prize winner, lives at 19645 NW. 12th Court in Miami; she is a junior at Miami Norland Senior High School. The second prize winner, Miss Renuart, is in the 10th grade at Our Lady of Lourdes Academy, and lives at 11111 Killian Road in Miami, Fla. Third prize winner, Mr. Bockting lives at 9656 Dominican Drive in Miami. He attends Southwest Miami Night School and hopes to become a medical missionary. Miss Ziegler, the fourth prize winner, is a straight "A" student at Southwest Miami Senior High School and lives at 6310 SW. 93d Court in Miami. A senior at Miami Senior High, the fifth prize winner, Mr. Grimm, lives at 1360 SW. Street, Miami, and plans to attend the University of Miami.

These five young men and women, and others like them all across the country, have "spoken up for America" through local and State "Speak Up for America" essay contests. In a time when the youth of America is demanding to be heard, programs like these are providing forums for responsible dialog on America.

These youths and their program should be encouraged and commended. They do not take the irresponsible road of de-

struction but, rather, turn toward the future with a firm constructive commitment to America. I can only agree with the sentiments of one educator who wrote:

It is great to see young people who belong to the construction gang when usually we hear only about the "wrecking crew."

Mr. Speaker, I commend these outstanding young people for participating in this program. Likewise, great credit should go to the sponsors, the Certified Plumbers of South Florida for making the program possible and encouraging young, able, and articulate Americans to "Speak Up for America."

COLUMBUS, IND., POST OFFICE DEDICATION SPEECHES

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on July 19, 1970, the Columbus, Ind., post office was dedicated. I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention several speeches made upon that occasion. The speeches follow:

REMARKS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL WINTON M. BLOUNT

I am delighted that we have such good representation from Members of Congress today. Some stories would have you believe that Members of Congress and I have been constantly fighting over postal reform. The truth is that while there have been differences of opinion, I have found the cooperation of Congress excellent—and particularly on the part of the Congressional members here today.

Senator Hartke, a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, has a thorough understanding of the postal problems we are facing and he and his committee have worked hard this last year.

Congressman Hamilton, a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, has been extremely helpful to the Department during this past year and we relied heavily on his expert advice in solving the many legislative problems concerning the Post Office reorganization. I believe most of you know that he has also worked closely with the Department on this new Columbus Post Office. Lee, I want to thank you for all your help.

Many of our postal employees are veterans and no one in Congress has worked harder for veterans than Congressman Dick Roudebush. In addition, he has been a strong supporter for postal reorganization. Dick, I'm happy you could be with us.

It is a great pleasure for me to be here in Columbus—"the Athens of the Prairie"—to dedicate this new post office.

This structure is a handsome addition to a city already famous for its architecture. I can tell you it is certainly the most beautiful and the most modern post office I've ever seen, and I think it is especially appropriate now when the Post Office Department is about to acquire a modern look of its own.

As you know, we have been trying for some time to change the direction of the postal service. This effort was begun by the Kappel Commission in 1968, and I think it is important to note that Mr. Miller was a very able member of this Presidential Commission. It is known in Washington as the hardest working Commission ever appointed by a

President. When President Nixon asked me to be a member of his Cabinet and take this job, he asked me to study the report of this Commission and if I agreed, to recommend legislation to put it into effect.

Today the basic proposals of the Commission are on the verge of becoming law. We are about to leave behind the outmoded, inefficient operation of the past to become a self-supporting independent system, serving the public efficiently and effectively.

But while this dedication reflects the spirit of progress in our nation, it also reflects the spirit of community service which has played such an important role in the history of this city. Here in the best American tradition, the interests of business and the interests of the community are one, and out of this unity of purpose has come an environment which is unique and beautiful, and which is an inspiration and an example to the rest of the nation.

In his Inaugural Address, President Nixon called upon private citizens to dedicate themselves to community service. I think there is nothing more central to the President's philosophy of government than the belief that the greatness of America rests not with its government but with its concerned and committed citizens.

The accomplishments I see all around me in this city bear witness to the President's wisdom. The architecture of Columbus is more than a pleasure to the eye. It is a promise to the future. It shows most clearly what private enterprise can do to reshape the land in which we live.

Too many of our people have become accustomed to thinking that there must be a government program for every problem the nation encounters. Ask what we should do about our dead lakes and rivers, ask what we should do about the murdered old mountains of Appalachia, or forests we have destroyed, or the wild life we have driven to extinction, ask about poverty, prejudice, pollution. Almost automatically, most Americans will say these are problems that the government in Washington must solve.

But this is wrong. Throughout our history, democracy has meant much more than a big government stretching out along the Potomac. It has involved the notion that leadership comes not from an elite in Washington, but from the individual American citizen. To every man belonged the right to assert his own ideals and the obligation to act on them. While other nations entrusted their government to an aristocracy, in America it was always the private citizen who possessed the power.

Yet today, too many Americans have relinquished this power. While the problems multiply, too many of our people, out of cynicism, frustration, or fear, do nothing.

This attitude does not reflect the spirit of America. In his call for voluntary citizen service, President Nixon looked to those thriving, vital, restless people who are anxious for the opportunity to push this country forward again, anxious to use their abilities, to display their independent spirit, and exert their individualism. These qualities are the bedrock of what the President calls voluntarism.

Voluntarism is the idea that the best approach to the problems of America is not through the Federal government but through the people. And where government action is essential, it must come through those organs of government as close to the people as possible at the lowest levels. It is at these levels that self government functions.

With this faith in America restored to the highest levels of government, I believe we are witnessing a rebirth of citizen concern in this country. All over the nation, Americans are asking what they can do to make their towns or cities a better place to live.

A Gallup Poll taken two years ago esti-

mated that 61 million adult Americans would be willing to contribute 245 million man-hours every week to voluntary activities. This is a phenomenal resource waiting to be tapped. It needs only that spark of leadership that translates will into action.

Such leadership can be found today in the business community. When business leaders become involved in programs to improve our cities, as so many of them are, they find that people everywhere are eager to help. A good example of this is Mills Lane, a banker from Georgia who founded the Community Development Corporation. His Savannah Plan, aimed at raising the standards of Georgia's underprivileged citizens, is a dramatic example of what voluntarism can accomplish. Ten thousand volunteers went into the slums of Savannah in 1968 and cleaned them up. The effort that began there has been extended to eleven other cities in Georgia.

But you don't have to be a banker. The same principle is at work when a college youth decides to go into a ghetto and tutor children. And our young people are doing this all over the country. Quietly. Effectively. Voluntarily.

Even within the government we can see voluntarism at work. In the Post Office, we are experimenting with a program of storefront postal academies in six cities. For the project, we are using qualified postal employees who have offered to teach skills to dropouts from city schools, and we expect to train around 2,000 young people by the summer of 1971. We're proud of the program and it's showing good results. We're proud of the volunteers who are making it work.

There are many other examples that I could use. But they all have one thing in common: that someone makes a decision. That individuals give leadership.

President Nixon has provided this leadership on the national level. But it is neither the duty nor the desire of the President to shoulder the full burden of leadership in America. It is his duty to make government perform its proper function, and it is the function of government in this regard to create an atmosphere in which people can do for themselves what needs to be done.

Here in Columbus, you have effective leadership. And I don't have to tell you that one of the finest leaders this country has is Irwin Miller.

As a businessman, as a philanthropist, and as a man concerned about the urban problems of this nation, Irwin Miller has given Columbus the leadership that changed the face of this city. His leadership built not only schools and churches, it built pride and community spirit, and self-reliance and independence. His leadership is a reaffirmation of the meaning of America.

Today it is with a sense of success and accomplishment that we dedicate this new building. The story of this city has given America something to think about. For while it is easy to talk about voluntarism as an abstraction, it is much more difficult to make it a reality. In Columbus, we have seen the abstraction become a reality.

REMARKS OF SENATOR VANCE HARTKE

Here today is a building worthy of this community of Columbus, illustrating the strength and influence of the genius of the leaders of Columbus.

Today is a part of the renaissance of Columbus: the exciting, exhilarating adventure of the reconstruction of the city of Columbus.

I have had the good fortune to participate in reconstruction and renewal efforts on a local level as a citizen and as Mayor of Evansville, Ind., on the national level as U.S. Senator. From this experience I am convinced that the problems of our cities in America and Indiana will be met when—and not until—we recognize that a joint pub-

lic trusteeship must be responsibly committed to such private reconstruction efforts. Both private enterprise action plus public action are required.

And I take personal pride in the fact that in my home city of Evansville—urban renewal—public housing—a new post office—civic center—stadium and public olympic size swimming pool are not only words but good words.

These problems of the cities demand shoulder-to-shoulder, two-fisted attack; their success depends entirely on an alliance of private and public agencies—with each respecting its own limitations and the capacities of the other; and with each acting in support of the other.

The new Columbus Post Office fits this formula precisely. Communications is the nerve network of a nation and a city, and the Columbus Post Office is a vital part of this network. The Columbus Post Office is a part of the public participation in the rebuilding—reconstruction—renaissance of Columbus. It is a public participation on the national level. As we appreciate this fact it is equally essential to recognize that the public involvement should operate at three levels—Federal, State, and local—each of these must be equipped and ready to do its appointed part.

America has the resources, the wealth, the raw material, the intelligence, the technical know-how, the pressing need and the driving desire to solve all the problems of our cities.

The question is not—*what* to do—but *who* is to do it, and how to make an alliance among the agencies involved—as you have evidently done with such spectacular success here in Columbus.

To support a program of renaissance of Columbus is not to be softhearted (which is sin), it is also to be hardheaded. I am not a budget buster. *But* I do believe in America's greatness, and I believe that this greatness can be traced to bold leaders and bold enterprises and the basic idea that—as you are doing here in Columbus—money invested properly and adequately will multiply wealth—and provide for human needs.

Bold leaders and bold enterprise exist here in Columbus. You stand out as a shining example for other cities. It will be left to the citizens of those other cities, acting through their own governments, to settle their own issues—following your example.

I leave you with this thought: Solving the problems of the City of Columbus (as with other American and Indiana cities) demands the exercise of what is perhaps the most difficult are of democratic governments: the effective mobilization of all the forces which make up the free body politic and the free body economic—not just to make the right decisions—but also to carry them out.

So the new Columbus Post Office is a part of a New Columbus of tomorrow in which every person of Columbus can share in the renewal of our combined faith in our selves—and our combined ambition for a better life for the people of Columbus.

So on this Sunday—the Lord's day—let us never forget—the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein.

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN LEE H. HAMILTON

This day has been a long time aborning.

It began, so far as I know, when local businessmen over cups of coffee decided Columbus needed a new Post Office and that it could be a major part of downtown development.

Often, it appeared that this day would never come—

When there was a long and agonizing struggle over the site, with the Post Office Department insisting it be on the outskirts of town and most of Columbus wanting it downtown, (and General Blount, one reason

we celebrate this day is because it proves the Post Office Department doesn't win them all).

And again it appeared this day would never come when in a few harrowing, suspense-filled days, the intricate financing for this building was being worked out. And at one point, I can recall putting the phone down after a pessimistic report and saying to myself, "Well, it's all over, we lost it."

It can be said without equivocation, that without the negotiating skills during that period of Richard C. Stoner, this building simply would not have been built.

And no one who took part will forget the painful debates, the agonizing deliberations, and the summit conferences on whether to build a wall around the entire Post Office Grounds. The Post Office Department said "no" for security reasons. The designers said "yes" for aesthetic reasons, and as you can tell from looking about you, that's one the Post Office Department won.

Of course, there have been bright spots along the path to this day too.

The generous offer to pay the fee of one of the Nation's finest designers and the acceptance of a unique and untried venture by the Post Office Department—the patient, cooperative attitude of four Postmaster Generals:

General Grouniski gave original approval. General O'Brien gave support during the painful early planning.

General Watson gave the final go ahead, and General Blount gave support during the critical building period.

As the doctor would say, however, the gestation and birth of this building was accompanied by "severe complications."

That is all behind and this is a happy day as the city of Columbus, with this building of grace and distinction, adds another jewel to its architectural crown.

This Post Office is no ordinary building. Perhaps no building is more intimately related to the lives of all the people of a community than the Post Office. By reason of the work that goes on here, friendships are maintained, business transacted, families united. This building will measure the heartbeat of Columbus. Through its doors will pass messages of joy and happiness, sadness and grief, information and education, business and commerce.

Without it, Columbus would be—not an Athens of the prairie—but a prairie of dry bones.

This building stands as a symbol of gratitude for all who labor in the postal system and especially those who labor at the Columbus Post Office. You and I often take for granted the employees of the postal service. I doubt very much whether any service, public or private, operating on so large a scale as the Postal Service has a comparable record of honesty in dealing with the public's property or of faithfulness to duties.

And this building serves a mighty purpose: the exchange of ideas and information. No Nation has ever achieved greatness without a strong, dependable postal system. Without it, this Nation could not remain united, and our economy would collapse.

I walk into many post offices and see often the battered, gray canvas bag full of mail. It is as mundane and commonplace a thing as I can imagine. And yet, what concerns it contains: life and death—love and hate—success and failure—drama, romance, tragedy, comedy.

They are all in that bag—serious and frivolous—the important and the inconsequential—news to gladden and news to sadden.

All brought with equal impartiality to the designated recipient and all carried in that gray, undistinguished mail bag.

For me, the significance of this day lies not just in the dedication of an important building. Rather it lies in the privilege of working with one's friends, toward a common and worthy goal. There is an abiding satis-

faction in the experience citizens in a free society may have as they hope, strive, work, and accomplish in their associations one with the other.

This post office—fervently pursued and successfully achieved—has been such an experience for many of us.

Very close to the heart of what this Nation is all about is the opportunity to work with one's friends to accomplish shared goals. In Columbus, we have had that fine experience and we celebrate it today.

It is fitting, then, to add a final adornment to this building of purpose and elegance—a flag of the United States of America which has flown over the Nation's Capitol. It symbolizes the nation that has permitted us this deep privilege of common endeavor.

I present it to the Postmaster of the Columbus Post Office with the hope that when we see it wave, we will see not just a flag, but a Nation—its power, its purpose, and its people, and its dedication to liberty and justice for all.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the good work of the Polish Legion of American Veterans has spanned more than two generations already, with special service and sensitivity to the problems of veterans.

An anniversary celebration is by its nature both a sad and a cheerful occasions, sad because of the memory of those friends who are no longer with us, cheerful because we see one another once again.

The Polish Legion of American Veterans had its beginning in my home town of Hamtramck, Mich., in 1920. It has maintained its vitality while building an extensive membership, including 24 posts in the State of Michigan. Recently, the State senate of Michigan commended the P.L.A.V. on the occasion of its 50th anniversary and its forthcoming national convention in Detroit. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD the resolution follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION No. 277

(Offered by Senators Stanley Rozycki,
Stanley Novak and Joseph Mack)

A resolution commending the Polish Legion of American Veterans on their Golden Jubilee Celebration

Whereas, The Polish Legion of American Veterans, Post No. 1, will celebrate their Golden Jubilee at a dinner in Hamtramck on June 6, 1970, and will also observe their 50th Anniversary with a national conventional in Detroit, in August; and

Whereas, During May of 1920, a group of veterans in Hamtramck, Michigan, met to re-live some of their military experiences and to celebrate the Third Anniversary of their volunteering for service in World War I. From this group the Polish Legion of American Veterans was formed, which selected its first officers on May 19, 1920, and operated as the "Polish American Veterans Club" and continued to use this name until 1923, when the Polish Legion of American Veterans came into being as a national organization, with Posts in ten states; and

Whereas, At the present time the P.L.A.V. has twenty-four posts in the state of Michigan, the group of young men who met in Hamtramck in 1920, are now known as Post No. 1 of the P.L.A.V. and was the first organization in the city Hamtramck to own its own building. Their purpose is to uphold patriotism and to assist members and their families who may be in financial need. They have assisted and actively carried out a patriotic program in sponsoring essay contests in high schools, and have been strong supporters of the Red Cross, receiving a certificate for its extensive blood donation campaign during World War II; and

Whereas, During World War II, P.L.A.V. Post No. 1, collectively, through its members, purchased over a third of a million dollars worth of United States Savings Bonds, with the result that a B-24 Bomber was named "The Spirit of the Polish Legion of American Veterans"; and

Whereas, Since its inception fifty years ago, P.L.A.V. Post No. 1, has spent more than \$100,000 of its money for charitable work, including help to veterans, whether members or nonmembers of the organization, as well as aid to the widows and orphans of veterans; now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate, That a sincere and warm welcome is extended to the Polish Legion of American Veterans and to P.L.A.V. Post No. 1, on the occasion of their 50th Anniversary, and offer best wishes for their continued success and prosperity; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the officers of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, National Convention, and to P.L.A.V. Post No. 1.

Adopted by the Senate, June 3, 1970.

BERYL I. KENYON,
Secretary of the Senate.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN C. KUNKEL

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was with the deepest regret that I learned today of the untimely death of my dear friend, former Congressman John C. Kunkel, of Dauphin County, Pa.

Congressman Kunkel was one of my very best friends when I came to Congress in November of 1963—no one in the Congress was nicer and friendlier, and more willing to guide me through the first few months of service than Mr. Kunkel.

I always enjoyed discussing matters of current interest with him. I was amazed at his keen analytical mind and tremendous storehouse of knowledge on almost any subject. He was a real asset to the Congress of the United States, and made a valuable contribution to its work.

Mr. Kunkel also possessed a keen sense of humor and no matter how tense a given situation he always came up with the pleasanter side of the argument and made everyone feel at ease.

We in the Pennsylvania delegation were very disappointed when he chose voluntarily to retire from the Congress. He was one member of our delegation that we were all very proud of. He added

distinction and honor to our group. It was a real loss to Pennsylvania and the Nation when he decided to return to private life.

And now may I extend to his dear wife and family my deepest sympathy and I want them to know that I considered John Kunkel one of the great men of this century from Pennsylvania.

TEXTILES ALREADY IN TRADE WAR

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues' attention a perceptive editorial from the Greenville, S.C., News of July 25, 1970. As the title of the editorial suggests, the MILLS' textile-shoe-wear import bill is designed to remedy the effects of a current trade war, not to initiate a trade war. Free trade is a worthy goal, but it requires cooperation among the major trading partners. Unfortunately, with respect to textiles, the free-trade policies of the U.S. Government have been taken advantage of unfairly rather than reciprocated.

The editorial follows:

TEXTILES ALREADY IN TRADE WAR

Nobody, least of all the textile industry, wants to set off an international trade war. Traditionally the Southern states, now the home of most of the textile industry in this country, have been free trade territory.

But the fact is that so far as the textile industry is concerned, it already is involved in a deadly international trade war with Japan and other low-wage countries. American textiles did not make this war, and tried to avert it by agreeing to cooperate with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The textile industry's landmark decision on international trade back in the 1960's was a key factor in getting this country to lead the attempt to lower tariffs and other trade barriers around the free world.

The fact is that American barriers have been lowered, but many other nations, Japan included, have not reciprocated in good faith. Tariffs and non-tariff measures all but prohibit many foreign goods from entering numerous countries which enjoy almost limitless access to American markets. This is war against the American industry.

The result is that the domestic textile industry has been injured in recent years, is hurting badly now and can be virtually destroyed unless something is done to save it.

Since all efforts at voluntary control agreements have failed, it is necessary to get some relief by unilateral action in the form of legislation to impose reasonable restrictions on textile imports.

The word "reasonable" is emphasized. The American textile industry does not seek to cut off imports. Neither would it limit them excessively. All the industry asks is a mild restraint which would give it a chance to plan its own production and to expand enough to keep abreast with population and economic growth in this country.

That certainly is not too much to ask. All the industry seeks is a reasonable opportunity to compete in its own markets. Unless it has that opportunity, this country must prepare to phase out domestic textile production because American companies inevitably will move operations overseas in order to survive.

The result will be loss of jobs and economic disaster for wide areas, especially in the already hard-pressed South. It also will involve costly restraining of workers and disruptive population movement to provide other jobs for displaced textile workers.

The need for a thriving textile industry to assist the upward economic movement of minority groups in the South ought to be apparent to anybody. Preservation of the textile industry should be one of this country's top socio-economic goals. Instead, the flood of imports threatens to destroy the industry.

The pending textile quota measure as proposed by Representative Mills, Ways and Means Committee chairman, is a reasonable proposition. In and of itself it should not set off a trade war or escalate the one already being waged against this country by foreign textile producers.

Neither would the Mills proposal pose any sort of threat to American consumers, as some opponents charge. Textile imports would continue, giving consumers adequate protection against price-fixing by the American industry. The widely-distributed textile industry is just about the last that could be accused of price-fixing in this country anyway.

But the Mills proposal is threatened by a combination of factors. There is the danger it will become a Christmas tree bill if import quotas on other products are added. If that happens, the bill will be vetoed by President Nixon.

Whether the measure as now being written, with quotas on footwear and stand-by authority for other quotas, is acceptable to the President is not clear at the moment. It is clear, however, that the textile quota measure is in dire danger of being overloaded.

The textile industry and its workers are not out of the woods by any means. They still are in a political thicket in which textile relief can be lost while the Democratic Congress and the Republican administration blame each other.

JACOBS ARRESTS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished Indiana colleague, ANDREW JACOBS, JR., recently set an example for

each of us to follow in our capacities as individual citizens concerned about rising crime rates.

In a letter of July 23, 1970, to Congressman Jacobs the District of Columbia Chief of Police commended him for his "alertness and assistance" which produced the arrest of a robbery suspect whom he had observed exchanging gunfire with a special police officer at the scene of the robbery.

The letter from Chief Jerry V. Wilson, as well as an Indianapolis Star article describing the incident, follow:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF POLICE,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1970.

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACOBS: The Commander of the First District has brought to my attention your commendable action and assistance in obtaining the tag number of the vehicle in which robbery suspects made their escape from the scene of a robbery (hold-up) at the Acme Supermarket, 45 "L" Street, S.W. on June 12, 1970.

The official report indicates that about 11 a.m., Friday, June 12, 1970, while in a private auto westbound in the unit block of "K" Street, S.W., you and Mr. Chris Fager observed the exchange of gunfire between Special Officer Adams and two subjects getting into a maroon Ford parked at the curb and then driving off at a high rate of speed.

Realizing that a very serious crime had been committed, you directed Mr. Fager to drive around the block back to South Capitol Street to get behind the getaway car. While pursuing the suspects into the southeast area, you copied the tag number before they made good their escape in the area of Alabama Avenue and Stanton Road, S.E.

Your swift action at the time of this crime saved our officers many hours of investigative police work and assisted in the arrest of one of the hold-up men and a warrant being obtained for the driver of the getaway car.

It is very encouraging to know that there are citizens like yourself in our community who abhor criminal acts and respond to assist the police in the solution of serious crimes.

In recognition of your alertness and assistance, I am pleased to congratulate you and extend my personal thanks for your help.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY V. WILSON,
Chief of Police.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star,
June 20, 1970]

JACOBS HELPS IN PURSUIT OF BANDITS AT WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON.—When the bullets started flying, ex-deputy sheriff Andrew Jacobs, Jr. forgot he was a congressman and started chasing the hoods.

Detective Hermann Steiner of the Metropolitan Police Department credited Jacobs with helping catch the robbers of an Acme Supermarket on Washington's southwest side.

Jacobs and Chris Fager, a congressional intern from Indianapolis, had gone to a filling station June 12 to have Jacobs' car serviced. Fager was driving and protested when Jacobs urged him to make a left turn on a busy street.

"I know what I'm doing," Jacobs said, as the car turned into a hall of bullets.

Jacobs later complained that Special Officer Freddy N. Adams, an Acme employe, wasn't so good with his hand gun. "He grouped his shots, all right," ex-Marine Jacobs said, "but he was hitting a row of parked cars and not the fugitives."

Moments before Jacobs and Fager happened upon the scene, three men had entered the supermarket and disarmed Adams. The robbers scooped the money from a cash register, grabbed up three bags of newly-delivered coins and fled.

The getaway car was driven by a woman. Adams grabbed another gun from the manager's office and was busy trying to shoot the culprits when Jacobs and Fager came along.

After driving through the hall of lead, Jacobs and his young assistant pursued the getaway car.

The robbers fled over a bridge and into a remote Washington residential neighborhood. At Stanton and Alabama streets, southeast, the fugitive car turned into a housing project and came to an abrupt halt.

Jacobs ducked into a phone booth and called for police help.

When a cruiser arrived, he gave the policemen District of Columbia License No. 662-938 and a description of the car.

Subsequently, detectives interviewed a young woman who said her father's car with that license number had been stolen.

Questioning gave the detectives the name of the young woman's boy friend, Landin Mozon, who was listed in police files. They later went to pick Mozon up at his address and found his girlfriend and two other men taking narcotics.

Mozon was identified by Adams and others who were in the robbed grocery store. The young woman was arrested for narcotics violation and a warrant was issued for her on a robbery charge.

SENATE—Wednesday, July 29, 1970

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, before the mountains were brought forth, or ever the world was formed—from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God. Grant us now an awareness of Thy presence that shall brace us for new tasks. Empower us to work with sensitive spirits and sharpened minds. When evening comes may we be at peace with Thee and with one another.

Remember, O Lord, all those who labor under the danger of death that others may be comforted and protected. Sustain

those who represent the Nation in the Armed Forces and those who by diligent service and constant sacrifice enforce the law and keep the peace.

Bless all who work in the laboratory, at the bench, on the farms, or in offices, and grant that we may so hallow daily toil as to make it a divine vocation. Unite our endeavors to make us a better people and a better Nation.

In the name of the Craftsman of Nazareth. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore of the Senate (Mr. RUSSELL).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SPONG thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of