

Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. ROE, and Mr. LEGGETT):

H. Res. 1173. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to balance of power in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. CABELL, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. EDMOND-

SON, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FOREMAN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MAHON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHRIVER, and Mr. WOLD):

H. Res. 1174. Resolution relating to the protection of consumer supply of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUKENS:

H. Res. 1175. Resolution expressing the

sense of the House of Representatives with respect to balance of power in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. VAN DEERLIN introduced a bill (H.R. 18834) for the relief of Karl E. Neathammer, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ENFORCED BUSING OF SCHOOL CHILDREN IN VIRGINIA

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I can say with candor that rarely, if ever, during my 23 years in public office have I seen the people of Virginia so disturbed and so embittered as they are about the prospective compulsory busing of children away from their neighborhood schools.

I feel that it is the obligation of the Department of Justice to support the expressed will of Congress in opposition to enforced busing.

A prohibition against enforced busing was included in the Education Appropriation Act of 1970 approved last week by Congress and now awaiting final action by the President.

It is of great significance that Congress last week spoke loudly and clearly. This makes timely, I feel, a letter which I wrote to the Attorney General of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter of August 4, 1970, addressed to the Honorable John N. Mitchell, the Attorney General, be published in Extensions of Remarks.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., August 4, 1970.

HON. JOHN N. MITCHELL,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The crisis in the school situation in Virginia has reached such serious proportions as to require immediate action by the Department of Justice.

There are seven Federal court suits now pending against school boards, including major ones in Richmond, Norfolk, Lynchburg and Roanoke. In at least four of these suits the compulsory busing of children away from their neighborhood schools is the central issue.

It hardly need be said that the school systems involved are threatened with chaotic conditions. No one knows in these communities how or what to plan for the new school year which opens in September. Indeed, no one knows whether the schools will be able to open and operate as required by the constitution and laws of Virginia.

No thoughtful Virginian seeks to reopen the basic issue resolved by *Brown v. Board of Education*. Desegregation is the policy of our Virginia schools and this has been progressing in an orderly manner, and on a

substantial scale, predicated primarily on a freedom of choice program which accorded to each child and his parents a reasonable option.

Now that such programs have been held invalid in southern states, the demand is for instant and complete racial mixing without regard to neighborhood patterns, the availability of school and transportation facilities, or the deep feelings of the parents and children concerned. The proposed method of accomplishing this end is by the arbitrary uprooting and busing of children.

Moreover, when the enforced mixing of races pursuant to a prescribed formula becomes the dominant end of public education—as now appears to be the objective—we are witnessing a perversion of the educational processes. These processes have been developed with great care and cost. They have been of great benefit to the community and country.

The Congress, recognizing all of this, has at least twice recorded its opposition to achieving racial balance by enforced busing. In the 1964 Act authorizing suits by the Attorney General (upon receipt of a complaint), the Congress provided:

"... nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance..." 42 U.S.C.A. 2000c-6.

A similar prohibition against enforced busing was included in the Education Appropriation Act of 1970 approved last week by the Congress and now awaiting final action by the President. Section 209 states:

"No part of the funds contained in this Act may be used to force any school or school district . . . to take any action to force the busing of students; . . . or to force the transfer or assignment of any student . . . to or from a particular school over the protest of his or her parents or parent."

It is of great significance that the Congress last week spoke loudly and clearly. This makes timely, I feel, this letter to you.

It is my understanding that President Nixon also has expressed the opposition of the Executive Branch of the government to this form of coercion.

Finally, I am informed that the Supreme Court has not held that the Constitution requires any such action.

We thus appear to be in a most remarkable posture.

The Legislative and Executive Branches of the Federal Government oppose enforced busing. The Supreme Court has not held that this is required by the Constitution. Yet lower Federal courts continue to decree busing in the South, and in my state of Virginia, there appears to be every prospect of enforced busing decrees becoming effective any day.

Is there such a state of paralysis in the Government that the expressed will of the Congress and the President is not being enforced—at a time when public education, the rights of citizens, and, indeed, the well-being of our communities are endangered?

1. *Oppose enforced busing.* I respectfully request that you, on behalf of the United States, take appropriate action in the Virginia cases to oppose the enforced busing of children (i) as being a denial of the constitutional rights of such children and their parents, and (ii) as being contrary to the will of the Congress as expressed in the Acts above cited.

2. *End the double standard.* It is time, in the interest of elementary fairness and of assuring a renewal of respect for our system of "equal justice under the law", that the double standard with respect to school integration be ended.

That such legally enforced hypocrisy exists, no one doubts—as Senator Ribicoff of Connecticut so eloquently stated some months ago. The legal standards with respect to school integration should be the same in all states. There can be no moral or legal justification for one vindictive set of rules in the South and a different and a much more lenient set of rules for other areas of the country.

The Department of Justice is the agency of the government most responsible for assuring both equal justice and respect for law. I respectfully request that you take such steps as may be necessary to bring an end to this unprecedented double standard which so degrades the quality of justice in our country.

More specifically, I feel that it is the obligation of the Department of Justice to support the expressed will of the Congress in opposition to enforced busing.

I am informed that the Justice Department is a party to the Norfolk Suit. It is not my purpose to comment on any particular litigation but rather to address the overriding principles with which I am concerned. If, as I believe, the Justice Department has not yet taken a strong and unequivocal position against enforced busing and against the double standard, it is urgently necessary that you do so now. This is necessary to resolve the conflicting and chaotic condition being imposed upon public education, and also to sustain and implement the expressed will of the Legislative and Executive Branches of government.

In recent years, the Justice Department has been imaginative and innovative in making its voice heard effectively on behalf of civil rights. The issue here involved is one of basic civil rights—of both white and black pupils—not to be forced, against their wills, to be transported away from their own neighborhood schools to accomplish arbitrary and theoretical concepts of enforced racial mixing.

I can say with candor that rarely if ever, during my long public service, have I seen the people of my state so disturbed, frustrated and embittered. This public attitude does not reflect—certainly to any major extent—opposition to racial integration of the schools.

This unprecedented opposition results, rather, from the traditional American resentment of (i) extraordinary invasion of personal liberty, (ii) enforced separation of children from neighborhood life and activity, and (iii) a policy so widely regarded as

a capricious attack on freedom and, indeed, public education itself.

In view of the urgency and dimensions of this crisis, I would be grateful—as would the people of Virginia—for your prompt and effective action to protect the rights of the parents and children of Virginia.

Sincerely,

HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

SOUTH CAROLINA FRESH PEACH WEEK

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, as vice chairman of the Agriculture Committee I am naturally interested in all phases of agriculture. Last week here in the Nation's Capital, the South Carolina Peach Council and Promotion Board in cooperation with the Agriculture College of Clemson University, made it possible for the Members of the House and the Senate to enjoy tree ripened South Carolina peaches. Members of the delegation and their staffs were supplied with this very delectable fruit, both fresh and in the form of a wonderful fresh peach cobbler, prepared by the bakers of the Senate and House Restaurants. I want to acknowledge Mr. Kermit Cowan and Mr. Joseph Diamond, managers of the House and Senate restaurants for their fine cooperation in producing the finest fresh peach cobbler that I have ever tasted.

Mr. Speaker, the South Carolina peach orchards now number into the thousands and the number of fruit bearing trees are just under 2 million—latest available figures. South Carolina is now second

only to California in number of peach producing trees with our high speed interstate highway systems, as well as the new mechanical methods of harvesting our fruit, the great eastern markets are all within 20-hour delivery distance for fruit harvested in the sandhills of eastern South Carolina to the foothills of the great Smoky Mountains in the northwest section of our great State.

Among the many fruit farmers who have contributed so much to the peach industry in South Carolina, many are active as officers and directors of the Peach Council and Promotion Board. They are as follows:

H. D. Barnett, president; Richard Taylor, first vice president; Allen Belcher, second vice president and treasurer; Ben Boatwright, executive secretary; directors: Tracy Childres, Manning Shuler, Toy Hyder, Ralph Thompson, Vincent Caggiano, E. C. Black, J. M. Vann, Tracy Gaines, Maynard Watson, Pat Chappell, Burney Chappell, Frank Bush, J. Calvin Rivers, Jr., Jerrold Watson, and Cleveland Holmes.

The South Carolina Peach Council can boast of three national presidents of the National Peach Council; namely, Mr. Paul Black of Spartanburg, Mr. Mark Boatwright of Johnston, and Mr. Tracy Gaines of Inman.

I should also like to thank the following gentlemen, without whose help it would have been impossible to organize "South Carolina Peach Week":

Dr. William H. Wiley, dean, Clemson University College of Agriculture; Dr. T. L. Senn, head, Clemson University department of horticulture; Roy J. Ferree, horticulture department—peach specialist—Clemson University; Mr. John D. Ridley, area agent, horticulture, of Spartanburg, and Mr. J. Whit Gilliam,

county agent of Edgefield, S.C. Transportation for the fruit was donated by Mr. L. G. DeWitt. The orchard-ripe fresh peaches were donated by Mr. E. R. Taylor of Greer, Mr. Louis Caggiano—Sunny Slope Farms—of Cowpens, Mr. Bobby Dandy—Cox Farms—of Greer, Mr. Woodrow C. Cash of Cowpens, Mr. James R. Sease of Gilbert, Mr. L. D. Holmes & Son of Johnston, Van Brothers of Trenton, Mr. Carroll Clark of Trenton, and G. C. Holmes & Son—South "C" Farms—of Johnston.

Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks, I wish to commend the efforts of the entire agriculture industry of South Carolina. They are striving to produce better quality food efficiently and economically. They are doing their part to help provide better nutrition to an ever-growing consumer market.

RESULTS OF A PUBLIC OPINION POLL CONDUCTED IN THE FOURTH DISTRICT OF INDIANA

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the results of my recent public opinion poll conducted in the Fourth District of Indiana have just been compiled and I would like to share them with my colleagues. In my view, the opinion trends are significant in view of the problems we face today. These results are based upon approximately 18,000 responses from the people of the Fourth District, in addition to the hundreds of letters written by concerned constituents who wanted to expand on their views. The results were as follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided	No vote
1. Do you support President Nixon's decision to destroy the Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia?	78	14	6	
2. In order to encourage industry to install antipollution devices, would you favor granting tax credits for compliance and fines for failure to comply?	72	15	8	5
3. Do you favor returning a certain percentage of Federal tax revenue to State and local governments to relieve pressure on local tax resources as proposed by President Nixon?	76	14	7	3
4. Regarding Student Disorders, which course do you think Congress should take?				
(a) Stop all Federal funds to schools whose administrators fail to curb disorders?	52	18	6	24
(b) Deny Federal aid to individual students committing these disruptions?	80	4	1	15
(c) No Federal intervention?	11	32	4	53
5. Many suggestions have been made for curbing inflation. What do you favor?				
(a) Curtail Federal spending?	70	4	4	22
(b) Raise taxes?	6	41	4	49
(c) Control credit?	45	8	6	41
(d) Wage and price control?	45	18	7	30
6. Do you favor continuation of the Federal farm price support legislation?	31	41	18	10
7. Do you favor changing the present lottery system for military service to an all-volunteer army?	43	39	12	6
8. Do you favor lowering the voting age to 18 or 19 or 20? If your answer is "yes", circle one of the above.	46	46.1	7.9	

Of those who favored lowering the voting age: 26 percent favored 18 as the age; 53 percent favored 19 as the age; 17 percent favored 20 as the age; and 4 percent made no selection.

PROPHETS OF DOOM ARE LOSING BATTLE

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I read this last week an article which was most interesting and in my opinion, most appropriate. At a time when so many in

our Nation are reciting all the wrongs in this country and finding fault with everything and everyone it is refreshing to read an article like this. The author has proposed that people take action through more self-help. Not only do I agree with this philosophy, but I take extra pride in that the author is my wife's uncle.

The editorial follows:

PROPHETS OF DOOM ARE LOSING BATTLE
(By Dan Murphy)

Maybe you'd like to know that in my case, at least, the prophets of doom are losing the battle. Often I don't even listen to their scare talk anymore. After all, I too observe . . . and I like most of what I see.

The Nader types find death and destruc-

tion everywhere . . . in the meat they eat, the cars they drive and the dolls their babies play with. Phooey. We do have meat to eat, which beats rice. Maybe the car needs more padding, but I prefer it to a rickshaw, wheelbarrow or bicycle.

A West Coast professor is raking in fantastic fees for telling us we'll drown in our own wastes within 20-30 years. If he'd run a scythe around a 40-acre field some summer day, he'd find there is lot of nice, clean space left . . . kept that way for 100 years by people who both understand and appreciate nature.

Protect the consumer, the gloomies cry. Okay. There are some crooks, both buyers and sellers. But I have a credit card from a bank I've never seen, telling me and millions of others that we are basically honest.

My watch keeps time, my roof doesn't leak, my perma-pressed pants need only a little pressing. Wheaties may not make me a cham-

plon, but they taste good. My suits last a long, long time.

People nearly always return a smile. I know at least 300 youngsters who wouldn't know a jail from the Taj Mahal. I can phone anyone I know in the 48 states for a dollar . . . and most of them still speak to me.

This evening, in my own yard, I saw a woodpecker, a robin and a sparrow sharing the same tree with a squirrel . . . not a chirp about DDT.

My 25-year-old typewriter makes a satisfactory noise when I work. My youngsters not only demonstrate affection but they're good house painters.

Most of the people I know solve problems, rather than complain. In fact, most people actually enjoy their work. (I've often wondered if those who won't work enjoy not working.)

So the pessimists can peddle their over-stuffed worries elsewhere. The pursuit of fear, misery and trouble has become profitable for some people.

I'm finding my share and more of happy days on this earth. Good things happen like clockwork. It is even going to rain, one of these days. Want to bet?

SOCIAL MAN IN CONFLICT WITH HIS ECONOMIC SELF

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a thoughtful article written by one of my constituents, David P. Eastburn, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, on what he perceptively calls the conflict between "The Social and Economic Man." The article originally appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, August 2, 1970. I commend it to my colleagues:

POINT OF VIEW: SOCIAL MAN IN CONFLICT WITH HIS ECONOMIC SELF

With attention focused on violence in the Parrot's Beak, Kent State, and countless city streets, there is danger of losing sight of a desperate conflict underlying much of the violence. This is the conflict between Economic Man and Social Man.

Each of us, of course, is both Economic and Social Man. Each of us is concerned with making a living and with living with his fellows, but the mix varies, and it is there that the source of conflict lies. Those who are 90 per cent Economic Man see today's world differently from those who are 90 per cent Social Man. Many, in whom the proportions more nearly approach 50-50, are torn apart by conflicting beliefs. And so we have a kind of national schizophrenia which is both divisive and debilitating.

It is easy, of course, to overdraw the contrast between economic and social values, but as a first approximation, let us consider the following shorthand description of characteristics and concerns:

Economic man	<i>Social man</i>
Production	Distribution
Goods & services	People
Money values	Human values
Work & discipline	Self-realization
Competition	Cooperation
Laissez faire	Involvement
Inflation	Unemployment

Economic Man tends to be concerned primarily with producing goods and services, with quantitative problems. He is largely responsible for the doubling in the nation's real

output over the past quarter of a century. Ironically, however, his very success has made it possible for Social Man to gain a sympathetic hearing for his concerns about the distribution of output and the quality of life. The turning point for many was the appearance of Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith's "The Affluent Society" in the late nineteen-fifties. Professor Galbraith made a persuasive argument that the problem of production in this nation had been solved. It is no coincidence that the war on poverty followed in the nineteen-sixties, and concern for the environment promises to be the issue of the nineteen-seventies.

Economic Man embodies many of the values of the Establishment, which youth today finds so distasteful. He believes that a relatively free pursuit of self-interest has served his nation well; that self-interest in a market economy is expressed largely in monetary terms; that monetary rewards are directed by competition to the efficient and enterprising; and that the Puritan ethic of hard work and self-discipline is still a major guidepost to the good life.

Social Man sees the good life reached by a quite different route. He stresses people rather than things; human rather than monetary values; and freedom not to pursue one's self-interest but to realize one's true individuality by involvement in a cooperative way in solving society's problems.

Obviously, these are caricatures, not carefully toned portraits, yet it is precisely because such black-and-white conceptions exist that much of the current conflict is possible.

Consider, for example, the present effort of the Federal Government to steer a narrow course between inflation and recession. This task is made particularly difficult because of the clash of economic and social values.

In the nineteen-twenties, the problem was simpler. When inflation got out of hand, the orthodox solution was to clamp down on the economy. In the ensuing recession, men were unemployed but prices came down. Recession was believed to be not only inevitable but a necessary purgative; it was the bitter medicine we had to take for living it up.

The Great Depression changed this view. It brought home the tremendous costs of idleness, the psychological maiming of a whole generation. Consequently, the nation resolved in the Employment Act of 1946 to prevent a recurrence of such disaster. The idea of the inevitability of milder recessions persisted during the nineteen-fifties, however.

In the nineteen-sixties the public began to hope that recessions might be avoided altogether, and as the decade proceeded, this hope was increasingly bolstered by unprecedented success in keeping the economy growing. It was about at this time also that the nation became increasingly conscious that everything was not well socially. And as prices rose at a quickening pace in the latter sixties, public authorities became confronted with a dilemma more perplexing than ever before: how to curb inflation without incurring recession. The dilemma is now in its acute phase.

Economic Man is on one side. He has been telling the authorities: hang on; don't let up on efforts to curb inflation until you really have it licked; if this means recession, better pay the price now than a bigger one later.

Social Man is on the other side. He fears that a recession will hurt most those who are already disadvantaged. When unemployment rises, as it must when the economy slows, those who are laid off first are the unskilled; efforts to recruit workers from the ghetto are suspended. Social Man, therefore, is inclined to trade inflation for jobs.

It is not exactly clear why these positions are held as firmly as they are. There are economic and social costs in both inflation and recession. Both ultimately can destroy our economy. Both cause severe distress to

important groups in society (10 per cent of the population, for example, is over 65, many on fixed incomes that are eaten up by inflation; 7.6 per cent are working poor, many of whom are put out of work in recession). The fact is, however, that Economic Man tends to be concerned primarily about inflation and Social Man about recession, and so an issue of great significance to the entire nation has tended to become polarized.

Social Man must convince Economic Man that this Nation cannot prosper unless action is taken to solve social ills. A great deal of progress has already been made.

Economic man may not be aware, however, of one valuable benefit from social action: it can enhance the possibility that public authorities might achieve a stable economy. Unemployment compensation and minimum income maintenance provide buffers between the disadvantaged and recession. Better training and education make it possible for those who are disadvantaged at present to hold their own in recession. If public authorities could gain more assurance that their actions will not bear down unfairly on the poor and greater confidence that their economic policies will not have severe social side effects, they could move with more vigor and effectiveness against inflation whenever it threatened. Social action, in short, promises Economic Man not only expanding markets in which to sell his wares but a more stable economy in which to produce them.

At the same time, Social Man needs to understand what to Economic Man is a central concept of life: opportunity costs. This is the concept that everything has a cost in terms of opportunities foregone. Resources are scarce and once a decision is made to use them for one purpose, they are no longer available for another. One opportunity cost of reading this article, for example, is not simultaneously being able to read one of the others in this newspaper.

Economic Man, by and large, has learned to live with this principle. He is constantly forced to use the resources at his command—money, people, technology—in the best possible way to get the best possible results. His success in doing so determines his success as a businessman. He makes his cost calculations carefully; he sets priorities. He has developed a degree of patience and a way of looking toward the long run in evaluating progress and results. Social Man, by and large, has yet to get the message. Perhaps because of his "human" approach, he tends more often to look at small parts of the picture, see specific problems that could be met with relatively small expenditure, and to press for their solution without realizing the cumulative implications of his proposals. With so many things needing doing, he is impatient for results. If Economic Man can—without dulling the edge of the drive for social betterment—convince Social Man that everything cannot be achieved at once, he will have gone a long way toward a constructive resolution of today's conflict.

Resources are expendable, but in the short run, attempts to do too much, to solve all our social problems and still satisfy our inexhaustible desires for material things will only produce inflation. Limited resources force us to make hard decisions about priorities.

In the longer run, it is possible to meet rising social needs without sacrificing material comforts; the slices may be the same, but the pie can be bigger. Social Man's best hope is to work with Economic Man toward the kind of dynamic economy that will make such a happy solution possible.

Both Economic Man and Social Man have a vital role to play. Social problems cannot be solved without a strong and growing economy, and we cannot prosper economically if we continue to have large parts of the population not sharing in the fruits of production.

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE
DURWARD G. HALL ON THE
PANAMA CANAL

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives on August 4, 1970, for the information of all:

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE DURWARD G.
HALL ON THE PANAMA CANAL

Mr. Chairman, it appears that this nation has become "obsessed" with the idea of giving up control of the Panama Canal. It is my considered judgment that such action if accomplished would contribute greatly toward smoothing the roadbed over which the juggernaut of international communism would travel.

We have given away the Island Iwo Jima and plan same for Okinawa—our hard won and most strategic base in the Pacific.

We have given away Wheeler Air Force Base, undoubtedly its tarmac will soon become a favored resting place for aircraft bearing the hammer and sickle.

Now comes the news that the President has appointed Mr. Daniel W. Hofgren, a man whose credentials as a negotiator are at best suspect, to be a special representative of the United States for the Inter-oceanic Canal negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is time that the Congress makes it perfectly clear that this nation has no need for a negotiator. The Congress should make perfectly clear, once and for all: We are there, we intend to remain there and, in the language of today, the sovereignty of the Panama Canal itself—is unnegotiable. It's time we made crystal clear that this involves U.S. territory, and hence is a constitutional prerogative of the House and entire Congress.

I have joined with my colleagues from Missouri, Pennsylvania, and Ohio in introducing legislation that would arm the President with the sentiment of the House of Representatives, and that of the American people in any future negotiations with the Government of Panama over the status of the Canal Zone.

It is essential that this be done so that a re-occurrence of the abortive proposed 1967 treaty does not come back to haunt us. As many may remember this proposed 1967 treaty contained provisions that ceded additional rights of the Canal Zone to Panama, gave Panama joint administration, increased our annual payments to Panama, raised tolls and forced the United States to share its defense and police powers with Panama. When the text of this treaty was published there was a hue and cry throughout the United States opposing its provisions. At that time about 150 members of Congress introduced or co-sponsored resolutions expressing the sense of the House that it was the desire of the American people that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone. The same language exists in the resolution we are introducing today. Public indignation ran so high that the 1967 draft treaty was never sent to the other body for ratification. I ask that those hearings be made a part of this hearing record!

Mr. Chairman, it is now over two years later. Much has transpired. A military junta is now ruling Panama. A new administration has taken over the reins here in Washington. On the other hand, much has remained the same. Castro is still preaching and exporting revolution in Latin America.

American property is still being expropriated "south of the border." Many people both here and abroad call for the surrender of American bases and rights throughout the world. The Panamanian Government is aware of this and is now willing to make another attempt to negotiate a new treaty. They know that they have *nothing* to lose, and *everything* to gain. They no doubt feel that if they obtain concessions from us as they did in the negotiations for the 1967 treaty, they can obtain them again in any new round of negotiations.

I am also confident that the citizenry of this country know and comprehend the strategic importance of the Canal Zone. As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services I was particularly concerned about the possible effect of the 1967 treaty on both the subjects of national security and hemispheric defense. The importance of the Canal Zone as a bastion on our "southern flank" cannot be overrated. Without our control of the Canal Zone the possibility of a potentially hostile regime in Panama denying access of the transferring of our naval forces from ocean to ocean ever grows. The loss of this access could destroy a link in our defense chain and could produce a disaster. It is particularly inappropriate in this time of contingency expectancy around the world.

Mr. Speaker, intertwined with the aspect of *national security*, is the equally important area of *hemisphere defense*. The Canal Zone under our control and jurisdiction serves as an outpost thwarting the perverted ambitions of Castro, Moscow and Peking. Our presence serves as a constant reminder of our determination to stop subversion in Latin America. I ask, would Panamanian control of the canal serve a like purpose? I think the answer is obvious.

Besides military considerations, the *commercial* considerations must also be examined. A Communist or hostile government could completely close the canal to United States shipping. Over sixty-five percent of all United States shipping passing through the canal annually either originates or terminates in United States ports. The added shipping costs, as well as the curtailment of shipping would be astronomical in the event this facility was denied our use.

Besides paying the price for increased shipping costs, the United States taxpayer could possibly be forced to surrender his aggregate investment of over \$5,000,000,000 which would constitute the biggest single "give-away" in recorded history. I cannot envision the American people wishing to write off this huge public asset, without some reasonable and tangible compensation in return. Let's at least put the question to them!

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to inform you that many Members of the House of Representatives are in total agreement with the statement I have made here today, and I remind you that no other branch of the Government has the feel or the knowledge of the electorate as does the membership of the House.

It is imperative that all who are concerned do everything in their power now, to prevent the surrender of our right to the control of the Panama Canal. We cannot sit idly by and watch the Panama Canal become another Suez.

MORE ABOUT RHODESIA

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, I made a statement before this body to

shed light on recent events concerning the status of Rhodesia and her struggle for recognition among the comity of nations. At that time I emphasized several important points; namely, that Rhodesia adequately fulfills the criteria for acknowledgment as an autonomous state, that Rhodesia is not the "threat to world peace" and the "bogyman" that some would have us believe, and that the present U.S. policy of confrontation and non-recognition are gravely injurious to our best interests.

At this time, I am pleased to share with my colleagues a recent article by the noted columnist, James J. Kilpatrick, which further strengthens my convictions that we have been led down the wrong path. It is my urgent hope that the newly elected British Government will put a quick end to the discredited and pointless policies of enmity and ostracism toward Rhodesia, and that the United States will have the wisdom to follow suit.

The article follows:

U.N. IMPOTENCE MATCHES ITS HYPOCRISY

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

NEW YORK.—The U.N. Security Council went through one of its recurring exercises in huffing and puffing a few days ago, the better to build up its wind, and wound up, as usual, by sweating hypocrisy from every pore.

The object of these dumbell exertions was South Africa, or more accurately, South Africa, France and Great Britain. The nominal purpose of the resolution finally adopted 12-0, was to condemn violations of the embargo on shipment of arms to South Africa. But South Africa pays no more attention to the Security Council than a great dane pays to a playing pekingese. France is the largest supplier of arms to South Africa, and finds it profitable to stay that way. Britain's new Conservative government last week voted to resume limited arms shipments.

The council's impotence as to South Africa is matched by its impotence as to Rhodesia. The only difference is that United Nation's hypocrisy toward Rhodesia, a small country, is meaner and more contemptible than its hypocrisy toward South Africa, which is large.

Last month the U.N. special committee on enforcement of Rhodesian sanctions brought in its third report. This bulky paper, running to 337 pages, is quite unintentionally one of the funnier documents of the summer. The United Nations, it will be recalled, has formally ostracized Rhodesia from the family of nations as a punishment for her multiple sins. These sins are, first, that Rhodesia had the indecency to secede from the British Commonwealth; second, that her franchise falls short of one-man, one-vote; and third, that Rhodesia constitutes a threat to the peace.

The first and second sins are none of the United Nations' business. The third is a transparent falsehood. Yet Rhodesia remains, in theory, utterly isolated from the commerce of the civilized world, an "illegal regime" that must be starved and whipped to its knees.

Somehow the sanctions have not worked out that way. As the committee unhappily acknowledged, the sanctions "have not been fully effective and have not led to the desired results." And why is this? It is because much of the world is paying less and less attention to them. Reports of evasions, far from declining in number, are soaring; there were 60 such reports last year. But 31 countries, including 27 members of the U.N., will not even answer the committee's mail.

It is all very sad. Plainly, the illegal regime

is thriving. By Britain's own estimate, Rhodesia's export trade—in the very teeth of the sanctions—jumped from \$227 million in 1968 to \$336 million in 1969. Immigration to Rhodesia is increasing. Last year a record 254,000 tourists strolled the streets of Salisbury.

The Rhodesia government will not have the kindness to die. It has announced plans for more airfields, public parks and game preserves to attract even more visitors. And in the private sector, sighed the committee: "the illegal regime is reported to have completed five new hotels in 1969, with more than 20 major hotel projects in various stages of implementation."

When does the show stop? An honest United Nations, applying moral suasion to the world as it is, could perform a useful purpose. But nothing of value is gained so long as the United Nations proclaims empty embargoes and imbecile sanctions upon a world as the world is not.

ACTIONS, NOT TALK, WILL CHANGE NATION

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial in the Pensacola News Journal of Sunday, August 2, elaborated in a most effective way on the need to translate the views of youth into constructive, not destructive, action. It makes good sense and good reading. I respectfully urge my colleagues to give full thought to its message:

ACTIONS, NOT TALK, WILL CHANGE NATION

Jack Anderson said it.

U.S. Rep. Bob Sikes endorsed it.

And we could not agree more.

It is time for the youth of the nation, so verbally concerned with the state of the world, to translate their views into direct action—not the destructive action with which we are all too familiar, but constructive action.

Anderson, who writes a daily syndicated column which appears in The Pensacola News, recently made this appeal to youth:

"Stir the starry-eyed from their pseudo-romantic dreams; rouse them to their feet; inspire them to substitute deeds for dreams. Invite the militants down from their soapboxes; challenge them to exchange their rhetoric for practical solutions."

"Fill your Summer with constructive, not destructive, activity. If you can find no great cause, settle for a small cause. In Salt City (for instance) white Mormon teenagers mowed lawns, washed cars, sold baked goods, cleaned garages and did yard work to raise more than \$25,000 to help build a Negro church.

"You can do as much. Organize a project of your own; roll up your sleeves; pitch in and do something worthwhile."

This column struck the right note with Congressman Sikes, who took the trouble to repeat it in his weekly report from Washington.

It also strikes the right note with editors of this newspaper, who have been urging a similar course for some time in these columns.

Though West Florida has been fortunate in having been spared, largely, the agonies of racial and student dissent which have marred so much of the nation over the past few years, we are certain this is not because of lack of concern by our young people.

They are concerned.

And rightly so.

For while there is much in this nation that is good—and we happen to prefer it to all other nations—there is no doubt there are many areas which could stand improvement.

Yet we are convinced the only way these improvements can be made is through action, not rhetoric; through example, not polemics.

Are the elders intolerant? Is this wrong? Then show it is wrong—by practicing tolerance.

Are the elders hypocritical? Is this wrong? Show it is wrong—by practicing honesty.

Are the elders not peaceful? Is this wrong? Show it is wrong—by being peaceful.

According to John D. Rockefeller III, in a recent speech, "Young people today are committed to values of love, human dignity, individual rights and trust in one's fellow-kind . . ."

But their elders see little of love in blatant and casual sex, in rock-and-bottle throwing confrontations; see little respect for human dignity in those shouting obscenities and epithets at those who disagree with them; see little respect for individual rights in campus seizures, the burning of private buildings and public institutions, in shouting down speakers; little trust shown by those who will not believe most people are basically decent and are trying to work out solutions. . . .

In West Florida, as elsewhere, the elders have their share of intolerance, hypocrisy, greed, lust—all the base emotions of human-kind.

We also have our share of decency, respect, honesty, and love.

Yet if our youngsters hope to make a better world they must demonstrate they do, indeed, have more of the latter and less of the former than their elders—and they can't do it by talking.

In West Florida, also, we have our share of social problems: Inadequate housing, environmental pollution, racial disharmony, inept politicians, even some unemployment.

And youngsters can do something about it.

As Anderson points out, if there are no great causes at the moment, then find smaller ones.

Clean the roadways. Join the fight on pollution. Work to elect politicians who are honest, sincere and capable—even if you can't vote, you can campaign, help convince those who can.

No jobs? Create them. Find your own. Do yard work—or, as in one case we read about, form a corporation to build treehouses for youngsters to play in.

The opportunities, in this great nation of ours, in our own West Florida, are limited only by the lack of imagination, the lack of dedication of each individual.

With imagination, with dedication, the possibilities are endless.

The Escambia High School Rebelaires, a talented and entertaining choral group which left Pensacola Saturday for a three-week concert tour in Europe, provide this community with an excellent and highly commendable example of positive effort.

The youngsters worked long hours to raise \$25,000 for the Summer tour, and their appearance overseas will be an inspiration for all Pensacolians who are troubled by unrest among many of today's youth.

Faced with the money-raising challenge six weeks ago, the students used their initiative and energy in a variety of enterprises to collect funds voluntarily. We are proud they made it—and this sort of challenge and ultimate victory proves that today's American youngster is willing to battle the odds for positive achievement.

The world can be a better place. You—youth and elders alike—can start making it a better place by contributing something positive, as Escambia High's Rebelaires contributed, instead of talking.

LEAGUE OF POW/MIA FAMILIES

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, recently the families of U.S. servicemen who are prisoners, or missing and believed to be prisoners, in Southeast Asia, opened a new Washington headquarters. Their goal is to generate increased public concern about the prisoners and missing men, and to stimulate growing public involvement in programs designed for this purpose.

It was my pleasure to be present at the ceremonies in which these brave wives and parents formally opened their new office. They are located at 1 Constitution Avenue NE., just across the street from the New Senate Office Building, in space which has been donated to them, rent-free, by the Reserve Officers Association.

The organization, now incorporated as the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, is one that all citizens can warmly endorse. But I am particularly proud of the league because it had its genesis in my district under the leadership of Mrs. Sybil Stockdale, who is serving as chairman of the board. Mrs. Stockdale has been indefatigable in her efforts to shed new light on the prisoner issue, and to insure that Americans are made more fully aware of the terrible plight these men have now suffered for periods of 4, 5, 6 years, as well as the dreadful anguish of their wives, children, and parents.

All of us in the Congress should be doing whatever we can to support the League of Families, as well as seeking new initiatives of our own.

It is my understanding that the league currently is attempting to win approval from the House and Senate leadership for a joint meeting of the Congress devoted solely to the prisoner issue. I, for one, certainly would support such a meeting.

The league's Washington office is manned by the national coordinator, Mrs. Iris R. Powers, mother of a missing Army warrant officer; and by two Air Force wives, Mrs. Joan Vinson and Mrs. Mary Jane McManus, whose husbands are missing or imprisoned.

Their first newsletter has just gone out to families throughout the United States, and I am tremendously impressed by the scope of activities they have undertaken and are planning to undertake. I know that all Members will be interested in the wonderful work of this humanitarian, nonprofit organization. For the benefit of those who may not have seen the league's newsletter, I have extracted some of the material which I think Members will find of particular interest. The excerpts follow:

EXCERPTS FROM NEWSLETTER OF LEAGUE

Prime Minister.—We met here in D.C. with Prime Minister Olaf Palme of Sweden, and made a strong plea for him to try, and try again, to reinforce his contacts with North Vietnam and its allies, in efforts to obtain humanitarian treatment for our men. At his request, we have furnished him with a list

of all the prisoners and missing men. He said he will try to help (but quietly, and out of the public spotlight). We told him that if he sincerely wants to improve Swedish-American relations, as he has stated, there would be no better way of accomplishing that purpose than his determined help in solving the POW/MIA problem.

Mayor Washington.—When we learned that D.C. Mayor Walter Washington and Mrs. Washington were to make an around-the-world trip, visiting with foreign official press, and business and women's groups in a number of countries, we arranged to talk with him before his departure, and asked that both he and Mrs. Washington raise the prisoner issue whenever possible in their meetings. We consider that every personal contact anyone can make abroad will serve our cause.

Opening Ceremonies.—We formally opened our D.C. office with a press conference and open house, both of which drew outstanding attendance. You may have seen the excellent CBS coverage, quoting Sybil as saying that POW/MIA families "have worked too long out of their living rooms and kitchens" and that the new office will give the League the ability to better coordinate its activities, broaden communication with family members, and stimulate improved press-coverage and public involvement. We also were able to focus attention on the omissions from the so-called "complete list" of prisoners North Vietnam reportedly gave the Committee of Liaison. We did this by presenting one wife (as a typical example of many other families) who has photographs of her husband released by the communists at the time of capture, although his name *did not* appear on the list. This effectively punctured the spurious North Vietnamese claim. And, at the same time, we reminded the press that many hundreds of others have never been identified at all and have never been allowed to write.

Senate Signatures.—To help support a Junior Chamber of Commerce petition signing drive, we took part in a kick-off signing ceremony in the Senate, with 22 Senators placing their names at the top of the petition, in a matter of 35 or 40 minutes, as they scurried back and forth from an important debate on the floor. Senator Dole was especially helpful in rounding up colleagues to sign the petition, and many in the group were members who are pegged as "doves."

Meeting with Speaker.—On July 10, six of us met with House Speaker John McCormack to seek his assistance in obtaining a Joint Meeting of Congress devoted to the POW/MIA issue. This could be the most important forum we might ever obtain, particularly with all of the foreign ministers and ambassadors in attendance, as well as possible live TV coverage. Sybil told the Speaker, in part, "There could be no more stirring evidence of our national concern for man's humanity to man than a joint meeting of Congress focused on the forgotten Americans of the Southeast Asia war." The Speaker promised to give the matter "most serious consideration."

Other Leaders.—On July 24, we met with the House Majority and Minority Leaders, Representatives Carl Albert (Okla.) and Gerald Ford (Mich.) to urge them also to support the plea for a joint meeting. Reaction was excellent. They both said they would endorse the meeting. We are arranging similar meetings with the Senate leadership and with other influential members of both the House and Senate.

Donations.—Most of you know by now of Vice President Agnew's generous donation to the League of \$12,500, representing his "royalties" from the sale of Agnew wrist-watches and sweatshirts. We were invited to the White House to accept the checks. Other donations also have been coming in, in amounts ranging from \$1 to \$100.

News Media Trip.—Three of our members—Candy Parrish, Kathy Plowman, and Jane Tschudy—traveled to New York to

talk with editors of magazines, TV networks, and other media. In three days, they accomplished more than they had dared hope. Examples: ABC will present a "special" on September 14; NBC is considering a spot on their First Tuesday program; Ladies Home Journal has promised an article with (hopefully) a tear-out letter for readers to mail in expressing concern (then a later follow-up after delivering the letters to Paris); Priscilla Buckley of National Review will do an editorial, and there may be a possibility of William F. Buckley's devoting one of his hour-long television shows to the POW/MIA issue. The gals who made the trip performed an outstanding service, and we will keep similar projects moving at carefully spaced intervals. Unrelated to the New York trip, but of like interest, the League has been interviewed by Dan Green of the National Observer, who is preparing what we hope will be a major POW/MIA story. George Fielding Eliot, the noted author, has written an article for distribution in the Family Magazine on 25 August (supplement to medium-size circulation newspapers).

Speakers.—We know that one of our most valuable assets is the articulate, dynamic League member. We're fortunate in having so many in this category, and we plan to make good use of them. We are working out details for a solidly organized Speakers' Bureau and are making contacts for our gals to speak as often as possible to both national and international groups.

MIA Emphasis.—Much of the attention that has been given to the POW/MIA problem by the press and public has been directed at the prisoners held in North Vietnam, and to various negotiations and contacts with the government in Hanoi. Some of this is due to the fact that the curtain of secrecy has not been held so tightly in place by the North Vietnamese, and the press (and, therefore, the public) has been given more frequent glimpses of the prisoners and prison conditions in North Vietnam. The result has been disheartening for those families whose loved one is imprisoned or "missing" and believed to be imprisoned by the Viet Cong, the Pathet Lao, or other communist forces. They cannot help but feel "left out" when they see press accounts or public campaigns, or petitions or letter-drives which are directed only at Hanoi. We recognize the need to stimulate more interest in and more publicity about those who are imprisoned or missing in other places than Hanoi, and we will be working to find new ways to publicize their plight, and to try to assure that letters, petitions, campaigns, etc., are beamed at these areas, and to assure that the news media are constantly reminded about these men, the conditions under which they are held, and the fact that they have never been identified nor allowed to write to their families. But, of course, we certainly will not neglect those captured or missing in the North. *All* of the prisoners and missing will get our undivided attention.

Billboards.—We are working on a national billboard project. We want to develop the best possible billboard presentation—one that will have a dramatic and compelling impact on the public. Our plan is to perfect the billboard design, get it into production, and send the basic materials to local communities throughout the nation.

News Media Project.—Similarly, we are preparing a nationwide and foreign news media campaign. The materials will be put together professionally and with the same care as the billboard material. When the program is ready to go, you also will be able to help in the fulfillment of this project—as we supply the materials.

Encouragement.—We have just had delivered to our office from the White House, a magnificently framed picture with three large photographs of members of the League, taken with President and Mrs. Nixon. The inscription, signed "Richard Nixon" and "Patricia Nixon," says, in part: "You have

our deep admiration for your courage and determination and our prayers for early success in our mutual endeavor to reunite your families."

MR. AGNEW'S POLEMICS BRING BALANCE TO U.S. POLITICS

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I append herewith a very penetrating article by John P. Roche in today's issue of the Washington Post about the Vice President which I am sure many of my colleagues will want to read:

AGNEW'S POLEMICS BRING BALANCE TO U.S. POLITICS

I wondered how long it would take for the high theorists to catch up with Spiro Agnew. Now the parade of analyses has officially begun with a New York Times Magazine piece by Arthur Schlesinger Jr., and one can predict that before the year is out every journal in the Western world will feature a similar exercise. It will be discovered that Agnew is a symbol of American "status displacement" a paradigm of the "paranoid style" in American politics, a model of the "authoritarian personality," and—of course—a harbinger of "fascism."

This is good, clean fun and keeps a number of people off the streets, but one can anticipate with considerable accuracy that the results will tell us more about the anxiety of the authors than about Spiro Agnew. Take, for example, the statement that "Agnew is terrifying dissenters" (or TV producers or professors or effete snobs). I can easily imagine a dissenter being terrified by a tough cop or a longshoreman or a hard-hat. But only a person born terrified could possibly flee an onslaught by the Vice President of the United States. It is in the same class as fear of college presidents.

Take the quote from Orson Welles that Schlesinger seemed to take seriously. Asked how anyone today could scare people the way his "War of the Worlds" radio drama did 30 years ago, he said "give unlimited air time to Spiro Agnew." It is possible that Agnew scares hell out of Welles, but again I submit that this tells us something about Welles, not Agnew.

The key to Agnew's success is not that he touches some profound psychic nerve in the American character, triggering authoritarian, fascist reflexes. It is rather that he has provided some rough entertainment, some polemical balance to American politics. I don't know who started the rumor that Americans thrive on consensus—perhaps President Lyndon Johnson, who had his own patented consensus in mind and was delighted to let others have *his* way. In fact, Americans have always looked on politics as a body-contact sport and were by 1969 extremely bored by the one-sidedness of the match.

Everywhere the average citizen looked from about 1866 onward, the President and his administration were getting the leather. The antiwar groups escalated their rhetoric to a level that would constitute sedition just about any place else in the world. When you turned on the tube, what did you see? Some militant calling the President a "murderer" and calling for a revolution.

Americans, contrary to rumor, are not passionate devotees of sedition laws (or, for that matter, of any other kind of laws). But when the rhetoric gets rough, they expect a good verbal brawl with two contenders in the ring. Thus when the antiwar spokesmen started laying it on the Johnson administration, the citizenry waited for some solid

counterpunching. But aside from a reference to "nervous nellies" and a couple of other side shots, the President "hunkered up like a jack rabbit in a hallstom." This was no bout

Into this polemical vacuum came Spiro Agnew. Actually his first "hard" speeches were pretty mild, say, by comparison with any of FDR's assaults on his opponents. By 19th century standards, Agnew wouldn't even have made it into the big ring. But his victims responded as though they were en route to labor camps, and the populace suddenly awoke to the fact that a brawl was on. Agnew achieved the status of a dragon killer without ever drawing his sword. He became first-class entertainment.

Yet the American people are quite capable of keeping their categories straight. Asked if they think Agnew is doing a good job, a majority will say "yes"; asked if they think he would make a good President a majority will say "no." Their attitude reflects that of the frontier woman in Abe Lincoln's story who saw her husband wrestling with a bear: "Go it husband," she would yell—then "Go it bear!" The jackrabbit in a hallstom is not the American ideal of a politician, and Spiro Agnew is capitalizing on our fondness for a scrap, not our desperate quest for an authoritarian womb.

FREEDOM IS A RESPONSIBILITY

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion Auxiliary in Trenton, Tenn., recently sponsored an essay contest in the city's schools on the subject of freedom. The winner of the contest was Don King, an eighth grade student at Peabody High School and son of Mr. and Mrs. Allen King of Trenton. I request that his winning essay be printed at this point in the RECORD:

FREEDOM IS A RESPONSIBILITY

"When men like George Washington fought the Revolutionary War, they fought not only for their freedom, but for the freedom of their descendants as well. Many men like Nathan Hale gave their lives for their country.

"I regret that I have but one life to give for my country."

"I know not what stand others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Words such as these reflected the feelings of many. In other countries many have died for the freedom of others. Even now, the U.S. is involved in a war for the freedom of South Vietnam. Millions died in both the World Wars. These men gave their lives for a cause and a privilege we take for granted. Some, who remember vividly the oppression in concentration camps of World War II, still thank God every day for the freedom they now possess.

Many Americans today do not know what a great gift they have. How many people in communist countries would gladly trade everything they own for their freedom?

Those that have died in wars have entrusted to us the sacred responsibility of both maintaining our freedom and obtaining freedom for others. There have been quite a few countries and probably will be more in the future who would not have freedom if the U.S. was not in existence.

Also we must think of freedom within our

own country. Our Congressmen make our country's laws. Who elects the Congressmen? We do, of course. Indirectly, then, we are responsible for the laws we made. What would happen if we put a communist in Congress, or in the White House. Such a tragic mistake could well end in the death of our country as we know it.

Anyone can see for himself that there are communists in our country now. Some are harmless. Some aren't. The C. I. A. and the F. B. I. have on file plenty of cases in which communists were the key characters. No doubt many of the riots that are constantly occurring had "commie" leadership behind them.

Recently Vice-President Spiro Agnew has been making speeches against the "hippies". He urges that the state governments try to rid themselves of these "crackpots". It is our responsibility, if they are a threat to our freedom, to rid our country of them.

All these reasons, and more, give us cause to fight for our freedom. The United States has been like a mother to us. If our own loving, devoted mother were threatened wouldn't we fight for her? So ought we to fight for our country's freedom. May God be with her.

CONDEMNATION OF THE COMMUNIST

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very emphatic defense of the American system and proper condemnation of the Communist system was carried in the Saturday, August 1, Polish American. I believe this editorial makes its point quite well and therefore I insert it into the RECORD:

FREEDOM WORKS BETTER

"Greedy businesses" in the capitalistic system are often chosen as scapegoats for environmental pollution. The environment issue has become one more tool in the arsenal of those who would like to rework the American economic system to conform more closely to the statist system of other lands where private citizens are virtually the property of the state.

But, surrendering to even the most tyrannical form of state socialism won't bring an environmental millennium. This fact is emphasized by a press release from Prague, Czechoslovakia. The release comments on an article in a Czechoslovakian newspaper telling how air pollution is threatening to wipe out the evergreen forests of northern Bohemia. Notes the release, "Although not so intended, the article amounts to a refutation of the Communist claim that socialism, by its very definition, protects nature from depredation." The damaged forests mentioned in the article cover more than 300 square miles. It is easy to imagine the uproar that would be raised in the U.S., within the shelter of our free press, if 300 square miles of choice recreational forest land were threatened with destruction from environmental pollution.

Under the freedom of capitalism, the pressures to curb environmental pollution within the limits permitted by a growing population is irresistible. U.S. industries have had no choice but to move ahead as rapidly as possible in meeting environmental problems. As private enterprises, they cannot ignore the wishes of customers who are also the public. Where the state is master, the wishes of customers and the public carry very little weight.

"TIMELY OBSERVATIONS": MARK EAGLETON WAS A CITIZEN WHO DID HIS DUTY

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, a great American and Missourian passed away recently. The Honorable Mark Eagleton, father of Missouri's distinguished junior Senator, THOMAS F. EAGLETON, was a courageous fighter for the best principles of our American democracy and he will be acutely missed by the many thousands of persons who loved and admired Mark Eagleton.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent "Timely Observations" column which appeared in the St. Joseph, Mo., News-Press eulogizing Mr. Eagleton:

"TIMELY OBSERVATIONS": MARK EAGLETON WAS A CITIZEN WHO DID HIS DUTY

Going through life with its tortuous ways, its stumbling blocks, its deceptions, its disappointments, one all too rarely meets a man who is so outstanding as to make a lasting impression as to ability, accomplishment, genuineness, and extreme devotion to public welfare. Mark Eagleton was such a man. He died unexpectedly Saturday night.

This newsman first came to know Mark Eagleton 27 years ago when he was a correspondent at Jefferson City and a sordid task faced the Senate of Missouri. The question was whether a senator from St. Louis should be expelled on the ground he had solicited a bribe. He denied the allegation. Mr. Eagleton, skilled and highly reputed lawyer of St. Louis, was the man retained by the Senate to prosecute the expulsion case. It was not a duty to his liking; he accepted it solely because he thought he should get involved in the interest of the public welfare.

The accused senator was a powerful man. He had political roots deep not only in St. Louis but also in other parts of the state. No one ever thought it would be easy to prove he should be expelled. A Senate committee of three—one of them State Senator Francis Smith from St. Joseph—called on Mr. Eagleton at his summer retreat in Michigan and prevailed upon him to direct the prosecution of the expulsion action. Only a true sense of duty could have won him to the task.

Strong legal opposition was retained to fight the expulsion, and the Senate floor became a forum for a bitter battle over whether the accused senator actually had solicited a \$1,500 bribe to work as a senator in behalf of legislation to aid the cosmetology business. There was no shadow boxing; legal and political fists were bared. It was a burly battle. It was the first time in a century that the Senate has sought to expel one of its own.

Only Mark Eagleton was fully aware of the pressure being exerted to soften up the prosecution, to go easy on the accused senator. Some of the backers of the senator stopped at nothing. There is a memory of Mark Eagleton standing on the Senate floor and relating how threats had been made against him and his family, including one to kidnap his young son, Tom, if the prosecution was not halted. But Mr. Eagleton, speaking with tears on his face, told the Senate he could never acquiesce.

Young Tom Eagleton, he was 13 then, probably was the only one who got any type of pleasure out of that interlude. He had a bodyguard—a policeman who went to parochial school with him, remained with him on

the playground, and accompanied him home to watch him until bedtime. The Senate trial of one of its members ended only when the accused solon resigned, pleading worry by relatives.

The Senate had absolved itself, kept clear its jealous record of keeping its name for integrity intact. And Mark Eagleton, with his vigorous handling of the matter, was the man largely responsible for removing any blemish from the so carefully-guarded precept of the Senate of keeping its actions and its membership above suspicion.

Mr. Eagleton served as president of the St. Louis board of police commissioners and also of the St. Louis board of education. Outstanding lawyer, fine citizen, he lived to see his son, Thomas F. Eagleton, elected as St. Louis circuit attorney, attorney-general of Missouri, lieutenant-governor of the state and then United States senator—all before young Eagleton was yet 39.

Mark Eagleton made many notable contributions to St. Louis and to Missouri. He represented the very best in dedicated citizenship. Peace to his fighting spirit.

SIX MILLION MENTALLY RETARDED TO BE HELPED BY HOUSE BILL

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the House for its overwhelming passage of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act, H.R. 14237.

The unanimous approval of this legislation illustrates, once again, the firm commitment which we have as a nation to improving the lives and the chances of the 6 million persons who are mentally retarded. This legislation, and strong programs in the States throughout the Nation, provide a hope that the majority of our mentally retarded citizens can become contributing members of society. This legislation bespeaks our determination that the mentally retarded will no longer be condemned to a life in an institution or a life of despair and complete dependence on others.

Additionally, we have recognized the special needs of the 2.5 million Americans suffering from neurological disorders—such as epilepsy and related disorders, cerebral palsy, and neurological impairments from childhood. This bill recognizes that they must not be lumped with the mentally retarded, for their problems are different. At the same time, it makes a commitment to help them solve their problems.

I am particularly pleased with the support which H.R. 14237 will give to the University-Affiliated program additional support. The University Affiliated Facilities are a major factor in our increasing ability to deal with the retarded in a rational manner. Their interdisciplinary cooperation has provided new expertise in dealing with the broad problems of all sorts which a retarded person faces—social, psychological, medical and so forth. These programs will be vital in increasing the numbers and quality of trained

professionals in the fields of mental retardation and neurological disorders.

It has been my great pleasure to work with the program at the University of Michigan in this regard. I view it as one of the most exciting and interesting efforts with which I have had the privilege to work. It has already been highly influential in modernizing Michigan's programs in this regard. This legislation will enable it to make even greater contributions.

I am hopeful that the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill can be quickly resolved and that this legislation can be signed into law in the near future. It will be a major step in aiding the developmentally disabled to live fuller and more productive lives.

AFGE—A GREAT UNION

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the 22d Convention of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, opened this morning in Denver, Colo.

Representing over 650,000 Federal employees in every department and agency of the Federal Government, both at home and abroad, the American Federation of Government Employees is the largest industrial-type union of Federal employees ever to have existed in the history of the United States. The AFGE today includes among its dues-paying membership of 325,000, lawyers, doctors, diplomats, nurses, meat inspectors, truck drivers, machinists, stenographers, helicopter pilots, river dredgers, prison guards, and just about every kind of profession and occupation which exists in the Federal service. Only postal employees, who are organized on a craft and not an industrial or general basis, are not included among the membership of the AFGE.

Thus, I believe one can say that the union is truly representative of Federal employees throughout the Federal service.

I myself have had the privilege to serve continuously in the House of Representatives since May 20, 1958. I have seen, during this period of service four different Presidents of the United States. I have seen this country in peace and in turmoil and, as a result, I have had the opportunity to come to know the character of many men, as the challenges of events tested them and placed them before opportunities for greater growth or for decline.

One of the organizations which has grown phenomenally during those 12 years is the AFGE. When I entered the House of Representatives, in May 1958, the AFGE had a dues-paying membership of approximately 56,000. Today, 12 years later, it has six times that dues-paying membership and it represents 12 times as many Federal employees as it did in 1958.

Opportunities come in life, it is true, but they must be discovered by men of

foresight and they must be converted from possibilities into facts. Dynamic men use these opportunities as soon as they arise. They are thus the makers of the precedents of history.

In the area of Federal employee unionism, the American Federation of Government Employees is most fortunate that it elected John F. Griner to its presidency in 1962. For earlier that year, on January 17, 1962, President Kennedy has issued Executive Order 10988, setting up for the first in history an Executive direction for the handling of labor-management relations throughout the executive branch. Thus that was the year of the great new opportunities.

Mr. Griner saw this opportunity and, under his dynamic leadership, he undertook a pace of employee union activity of unprecedented vitality. Between June of 1962 and June of 1970, a period of 8 years of his presidency, the American Federation of Government Employees added over 220,000 dues-paying members. It became the fast growing union in the AFL-CIO.

The union also immediately began to articulate its functions in every department and area of the Federal Government. We ourselves saw a great burst of activity, in the repeated appearance of Mr. Griner before the committees of the House and Senate, especially the House Post Office and Civil Service on which it is my privilege to serve. In fact, there were times when it appeared to me that Mr. Griner lived on Capitol Hill, he was so often appearing there to represent the interests of Federal employees.

As a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for many years, I am in an especially strategic situation to observe the effectiveness of the representatives of Federal employee leaders who are seeking legislation on behalf of their constituents. Outstanding among them, in my opinion, is John F. Griner. Not only has he appeared more often than anybody else, but his statements and his arguments have been always objective, thorough and enlightening.

His choices of legislative representatives were equally wise. Over this period of time, the AFGE was represented on the Hill by such eminent men as John McCarty, Thomas Walters and, at the present time, by two of the finest men I have known, Carl K. Sadler and James H. Lynch. I have the highest respect for the skills of these men and I can understand why the AFGE has had such major successes in its legislative program.

As an example, the House has before it today H.R. 17809, a bill designed to establish for the first time a statutory basis for the setting of the wages of prevailing rate employees. These number close to 800,000 human beings when one adds to their number the employees of nonappropriated funds, who are also included in the terms of this bill. I know I am not slighting any other union or employee group when I state that, if it were not for the AFGE, this bill would not have progressed as far as it has. Since the Senate is also ready to act on this bill in the near future, it appears that a major step will have been taken

in this session of Congress to bring those legal rights to wage grade employees which have been lacking to them since the establishment of the United States. Just for his role in this single piece of legislation, John Griner deserves the deepest thanks of all wage grade employees.

Classified, Foreign Service, and Department of Medicine and Surgery employees also are deeply indebted to the AFGE. As recently as July 28, Mr. Griner appeared to testify on H.R. 18403, H.R. 13000 and H.R. 12124, bills designed to implement the Federal employees' pay comparability system and to establish a new procedure for assuring that Federal employees have a fair and objective governmental mechanism to eliminate the failures of the past to achieve comparability.

I believe that Mr. Griner's statement on classified pay is a classic example of direct, forthright, and honest comment. My colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee were most impressed, once again, with his command of the facts and with his intelligent and cooperative attitude. As I supported him and the AFGE in the progression of the wage grade bill through committee to the floor of the House, in the same way I shall help to advance legislation for the classified, Foreign Service and Department of Medicine and Surgery employees so as to provide them with true comparability.

The list of other bills on which Mr. Griner has testified is so long that it would require an index or directory of the bills before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee merely to list them. I shall not elaborate further on them than to say that they cover retirement, hospitalization, and medical benefits, overtime, classification, per diem, the protection of the privacy of Federal employees and a host of other matters. In brief, everything with which the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has dealt has been of interest to the AFGE and to Mr. Griner.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the membership of the House will agree with me that Congress is helped very much when organizations like that of the AFGE give us their views and share with us their experience. I am sure that the membership will also agree with me that we have been most fortunate to have had a man of Mr. Griner's caliber working with us for the last 8 years.

In closing, I wish to express here my own best wishes to the American Federation of Government Employees and hope that their 22d Convention is as fruitful as their past conclaves have been. I regret that I am unable to attend and, for that reason, I am taking the opportunity of making this statement to inform them that I am there in spirit and that I shall always be interested in the welfare of Federal employees.

To the American Federation of Government Employees, and to all its officers, staff, and members, I say, "Good fortune and greater progress than ever before on behalf of all Federal employees."

THE FAILURE OF VIETNAMIZATION

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in an August 1 editorial in the New York Times Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY very clearly exposed the fallacy behind the theories being put forth by the administration regarding Vietnamization. I urge my colleagues to read this penetrating analysis and insert it in full at this point in the RECORD:

TOPICS: THE FAILURE OF VIETNAMIZATION BY ANY NAME

(By Eugene J. McCarthy)

Vietnamization, like the proverbial cat, seems to have at least nine lives, about five of which have already been lived. Vietnamization was tried first by the French nearly 20 years ago. On May 10, 1970, General Henri Navarre, formerly commander of the French forces in Indochina, said: "Vietnamization is an old idea. It was the basis of my own plan when I was sent to Indochina in 1952."

Jean Lacouture, in "Vietnam: Between Two Truces," published in 1965, wrote that the policy of "yellowing" (*jaunissement*) the war was the subject of debate "throughout the entire Indochinese war and particularly after the assumption of command by General de Lattre in 1951-52."

The French leaders who pressed for Vietnamization argued that if the Vietnamese Army could be trained and equipped to take over the job of pacifying and defending French-held territories, French troops would be freed to end the war by defeating General Giap's Vietminh Army. The French were able to take the offensive—and went on to defeat at Dienbienphu.

After the United States under President Eisenhower took over from the French in 1955, our first program of Vietnamization through training and equipping the South Vietnamese Army was initiated. By 1966, when military assistance to Vietnam had grown so large that it was removed from the foreign aid budget and incorporated into the Defense Department budget, the United States had spent over \$1.6 billion on the South Vietnamese Army.

Under President Kennedy, new policies of "counter-insurgency" and "pacification" were announced. Major Robert K. G. Thompson, the British anti-guerrilla "expert," was brought in as an adviser. Although 16,000 troops were sent to Vietnam by President Kennedy, he insisted on the Vietnamization of the war. In one of his last comments on the situation, he said: "It is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it . . ."

JOHNSON'S ESCALATION

During the 1964 campaign, President Johnson promised the American people that he would not send American boys to do the job that Asian boys should be doing. Toward the end of the Johnson Administration, the training of South Vietnamese to secure "pacified" areas was emphasized. American combat troops were to be free for search-and-destroy missions against the North Vietnamese main force units. Almost to the letter, this was a restatement of the Navarre strategy of 1953.

When President Nixon took office, there were a half million American troops in South Vietnam. Within the first year of his Administration, he too announced a new policy of Vietnamization although the definition of "Vietnamization" was slightly changed. Sec-

retary of Defense Melvin Laird, in a speech given on Oct. 1, 1969, explained the difference.

POLICY DIFFERENCES

Under the Johnson Administration, according to Secretary Laird, "Vietnamization" meant "de-Americanizing" the war. In the Nixon Administration, he said, "Vietnamization" would mean "Vietnamizing" the war. There is, he said, "an enormous difference between these two policies." He did not explain these differences nor have they become clear in the ten months since that speech was given.

Vietnamization is being presented to us in a new form by the Nixon Administration. It is no longer limited to Vietnam itself but is being extended into Cambodia and other parts of Southeast Asia. Vietnamese are now killing Vietnamese and Cambodians. Cambodians are killing Vietnamese and Cambodians. Thais, we assume, are, or will be, killing both Vietnamese and Cambodians and, in return, we must assume that some Thais will be killed by Vietnamese or by Cambodians.

It was, after all, the inability of the South Vietnamese Army to fight effectively, even after more than ten years of training and equipment by the United States, that prompted the dispatch of combat troops in 1965. Even if through a resurgence of morale the South Vietnamese Army could be made into an effective military force—and the objective stated by one American general of changing the color of the corpses was achieved—there would still be the question of whether Vietnamization is desirable or defensible.

Asians would be killing Asians with American arms. Defoliation and destruction of crops would continue; villages be destroyed; refugees be "generated"; casualties continue.

The United States would still have moral responsibility for the war, for continuing the war and sustaining it. We would have made of the Vietnamese Army essentially a mercenary army, if we accept the Rusk and Nixon statements, fighting to protect the interests of the free world.

One must ask how many times we will announce and attempt new policies of Vietnamization before we acknowledge failure and attempt a genuine political settlement by negotiating an end to the war in Vietnam.

RESULTS OF OPINION POLL

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I recently submitted to my constituents a request for their opinion as it relates to the fighting in Southeast Asia.

The questions asked were short and direct to the point, and my responses were exceedingly good. I am pleased to report the results of the returns that I received. The questions and percentage of the answers to each of the questions is as follows:

The sending of troops into combat in Vietnam (June 8, 1965):

	Percent
I approved.....	34.5
I disapproved.....	59.7

The Vietnamization of the South Vietnamese war effort:

I approve.....	75.8
I disapprove.....	15.8

The rate of withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam:

Is about right..... 54.0
Is too slow..... 21.5
Send them all home now..... 25.0

The sending of American troops to Cambodia:

I approve..... 56.9
I disapprove..... 43.2

"HOW LONG, MR. PRESIDENT,
BEFORE YOU REPLY?"

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 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.

This week, the American Council on Education, in its weekly publication "Higher Education and National Affairs"—August 2, has outlined the situation of Federal funding for black colleges and universities. The findings and recommendations of the Federal Interagency Committee on Education are briefly summarized in this account. The FICE has shown, after a study of the facts documenting the flow of Federal

higher education money, that black higher education institutions receive only 3 percent of the education funds available.

I commend these findings to the attention of my colleagues since it is one more illustration of the way Government policy so often works against equal opportunity—whether in education, jobs, or housing. Mr. Speaker, we have asked the President to take notice of such situations. We have suggested that the Nixon administration should invite audience with black representatives and elected officials and become aware of the severe alienation of many black Americans—much of which falls at the door of the White House. The President must act—he must respond to the urgency of the unmet needs of 25 million American citizens. The account follows:

BLACK COLLEGE SHARE OF HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDS SAID 3 PERCENT

A study of Federal funds received by American colleges and universities in Fiscal Year 1969 shows that the traditionally black colleges received \$119.5 million, or three percent of the total. Most of the money for black colleges—\$87.3 million—came from HEW. The rest came from 15 other Federal agencies and departments (see accompanying table).

The unusual analysis of the Federal funds was made by the Federal Interagency Committee on Education (FICE) at the request of the Administration following complaints last year from presidents of black colleges about their share of Federal higher education money.

The FICE report, submitted to the White House, states that while total Federal funds

provided to black colleges "is not insignificant, it is relatively small when contrasted with the support the Federal Government grants to other minority groups." It notes that Federal programs currently provide \$125 million to educate at the precollege and vocational levels the children of 500,000 American Indians living on reservations. It also states that \$87 million was provided in 1970 to assist Cuban refugee families.

"It is important to realize that many Federal programs exclude the black colleges... because most Federal education funds are aimed at graduate training and research," the report points out. It notes that only 15 black colleges have graduate programs leading to the M.A. in a discipline other than education and only Howard University routinely grants the Ph.D.

As reported earlier, former HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch said President Nixon has agreed to a reprogramming of funds at HEW during the current fiscal year to boost the total amount of money received by black colleges to more than \$100 million (see Vol. XIX, No. 26).

FICE said in its report that most support for black colleges comes from human resource agencies, and that agencies devoted essentially to scientific development provide the least. Besides HEW, the agencies providing the most money to black colleges last year were the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Economic Opportunity, National Science Foundation and Department of Labor. The remaining 11 agencies provided approximately \$3 million altogether.

The report says that its findings "destroy a long accepted but false assumption: that all black colleges are ignorant of Federal programs, fail to participate in those available, or compete inequitably with white schools." The report adds:

TOTAL AMOUNTS ALLOCATED BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO TRADITIONALLY BLACK AND TRADITIONALLY WHITE INSTITUTIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1969

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

Agency	Institutions			Percent of total to black	Agency	Institutions			Percent of total to black
	Black	White	Total			Black	White	Total	
Atomic Energy Commission.....	\$59	\$120,973	\$121,032	0.05	Department of Justice.....	\$204	\$5,278	\$6,482	3.1
Civil Service Commission.....	0	0	0	0.0	Department of Labor ²	1,715	32,831	34,548	5.0
Department of Agriculture.....	494	155,506	156,000	.3	Department of State ²	354	958	1,310	27.0
Department of Commerce.....	146	4,768	4,914	3.0	Department of Transportation.....	0	13,204	13,204	0
Department of Defense.....	0	292,406	292,406	0	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	694	127,706	128,400	.5
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	87,259	2,411,272	2,498,531	3.5	National Endowment for the Arts.....	38	488	526	7.2
Environmental Health Service.....	(78)	(20,797)	(20,875)	(.4)	National Endowment for the Humanities.....	286	2,446	2,732	10.5
Health Services and Mental Health Administration.....	(3,976)	(270,563)	(274,539)	(1.4)	National Science Foundation.....	3,463	363,537	367,000	.9
National Institutes of Health ²	(5,215)	(872,680)	(877,895)	(.6)	Office of Economic Opportunity.....	6,869	67,018	73,887	9.3
Office of Education.....	(75,852)	(1,181,148)	(1,257,000)	(6.0)	Peace Corps.....	750	5,663	6,413	11.7
Social and Rehabilitation Service.....	(2,138)	(66,084)	(68,222)	(3.1)	Smithsonian Institution.....	0	0	0	0
Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	16,934	283,738	300,672	5.6	Veterans' Administration.....	28	1,768	1,796	1.6
Department of the Interior.....	190	31,863	32,053	.6	Total.....	119,483	3,922,421	4,041,904	3.0

¹ Preliminary fiscal year 1969 data collected by the Committee on Academic Science and Engineering for its survey, Federal Support to Universities and Colleges.

² Data for fiscal year 1968, the latest year for which totals are available.

³ Figures shown exclude \$1,815,059 going to Washington Technical Institute, which received the funds for the District of Columbia in lieu of a State agency.

⁴ Total includes grants and loans to all institutions.

"The fact is that many do participate well in all programs which support undergraduate institutions. Indeed, black colleges often are more successful in obtaining Federal grants than are traditionally white schools in certain parts of the country. Nonetheless, they could do better, and because of their modest resources and limited private support potential, should be considered in a special category by the Federal Government."

FICE concludes its report with the following specific recommendations:

Short range:

1. The White House should convene a conference of Federal officials, representing all agencies having education programs, and administrators of the black colleges. The conference should include an explanation and review of all Federal support programs, and establish means by which the Federal

agencies and the colleges can maintain easy communications.

2. The Administration should request Federal agencies to review their education funding programs and make a special effort to redirect more of their funds to undergraduate education in general and to black colleges in particular. To help accomplish this, the Administration should create an interagency review panel (which would include a black college policy group) to work with black college representatives in determining types and amounts of support relevant to the particular needs of each institution.

3. The Administration should request the Federal agencies to inaugurate program orientation and proposal-writing workshops pertaining to specific programs having relevance to black colleges. Subsequently, the agencies should solicit preliminary proposals from these colleges which should be reviewed informally and returned with criticism prior

to final submittal. This proposal-review is a long established practice for other institutions which customarily results in more funded proposals and correspondingly higher institutional morale.

4. The Administration should instruct the Federal agencies that wherever possible they should utilize black colleges as out-stations for agency-funded centers of inquiry, research and program development.

5. The Administration should request the regional offices, particularly Atlanta and Dallas, to appoint educational representatives to maintain liaison with the black colleges. Further, the regional offices should encourage the use of these colleges as sites for conferences and places for an interchange of personnel and ideas.

Long range:

1. The President should appoint a national advisory council on black affairs to meet

periodically with him. Membership should comprise eminent black national leaders including a substantial number of black college educators. The council should advise the Federal Government on ways to involve black colleges in relating to society's broad needs and to become a prime resource for developing intellectual and professional leadership, such as in law, the health professions, industry, commerce and community affairs.

2. The Administration should move towards the elimination of all matching fund requirements at colleges enrolling a large proportion of students disadvantaged in either economic or academic terms. The requirement for matching funds has always been a major obstacle to maximum participation of black colleges in Federal programs.

3. The White House should direct appropriate Federal agencies to propose new legislation or revisions to existing legislation which have relevancy to the economic plight of black students and to the special needs of black colleges. Such proposals should include a new program of direct student support, instituted grants and expansion of the current Development Institutions Program administered by the Office of Education.

The proposed National Foundation for Higher Education most nearly relates to needs for broad support. The Foundation, if established by Congress, and provided ultimately with funds approaching one billion dollars annually, would undergird an adequate institutional support program across the collegiate spectrum.

4. The Administration should fund a National Center for Higher Education Information to provide directory and counseling service to collegiate institutions on available support programs in the executive branch. This center could add to and utilize the current Federal computer bank and data sources. The center specialists could assist college and university faculty in reviewing programs appropriate to their situation and approaching program directors for guidelines. This center would constitute a locus for academic referral to Federal agencies, and it would be of special usefulness to black colleges.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT SENT TO
NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS—
AUGUST 5, 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

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

"THE LIST JUST KEEPS GETTING LONGER"

(By Congressman LEE HAMILTON)

Recently, a Ninth District resident said to me: "Congressman, we never seem to solve any of our problems. The list just keeps getting longer."

The Nation's list of problems is formidable: *a war we cannot win, or end; pollution which threatens our environment; crime, which threatens our safety; rising prices and unemployment; urban congestion and rural stagnation, and racial unrest and campus disorder, to name a few.*

Because of the magnitude and complexity of these problems, some observers are saying the American spirit is ailing under the sheer weight of them. They say that Americans always have been optimistic about the future of their country, but lately that faith has faltered.

Their assessment strikes me as too gloomy. But I do think all of us must do our best to

understand the implications of the changes which these problems are bringing upon us, and the impact they are having on the American people.

People are deeply concerned about the economy. When unemployment, prices, interest rates go up; and profits, stocks and real income go down, Americans become nervous, and understandably so.

Since taxes and government spending have a great impact on the economy, they want those of us in government to do a better job of collecting and spending tax revenues. They want tax relief and tax equity—that is, assurance that Americans in similar economic circumstances will pay about the same tax.

They want a saner sense of national priorities . . . enough money for national security, but not for monstrous military expenditures . . . adequate funds to stop the fouling of our natural environment . . . adequate funds to improve the quality of education and health care . . . funds to fight crime, but not for government programs of questionable value.

The American people understand our global responsibilities as a world power, but they reject the idea that America must be the policeman of the world.

These changing times demand of all of us in public life less rhetoric and more candor . . . fewer promises and more performance . . . less talking and more listening.

At the same time, the people are asking for a "piece of the action." They are suspicious of being shut out from the decision-making process, both in the political party and in government.

As your Ninth District Congressman, I am obligated to report to you my approach to these issues. I have no illusions that my suggestions will be the best, or the only answers in every case, but to fail to deal with them would be to fail my responsibility as your Congressman.

THE ECONOMY

Our national economic goals should be: adequate growth; high productivity and employment, and price stability.

It is not difficult to achieve any one of these goals, but it is a monumental task to achieve all at the same time. The statistics of recent months point out our failure to master this most important domestic problem.

We have experienced the highest inflation in many years . . . the highest interest rate in a century . . . a slowdown in real growth . . . rising unemployment.

The government, by pursuing policies of balance, flexibility and moderation, can change that picture. These are some of the needed steps:

1. The government should balance its budget, and government expenditures should be vigorously restrained.

2. Tax reform must be continued, aimed at a more equitable and reliable revenue system. This job was begun with the 1969 Tax Reform Act, but not completed.

3. An "incomes policy" should be established, with guideposts for wage and price increases. A strenuous effort must be made to have the voluntary cooperation of labor and business leaders in their day-to-day decision-making processes.

4. The competitive market must be allowed to operate more freely through strict enforcement of antitrust laws, the relaxation of import restrictions which increase domestic prices, better government purchasing procedures, and a wholesale review of the subsidy and administered-price structure.

5. Specific inflationary bottlenecks, as in housing and health services, should be eliminated. Manpower training in the health field should be accelerated, and monetary policies should be adopted to ease the spiraling home mortgage rates.

6. Government should pursue an aggressive manpower policy, providing job training

and placements to meet the labor force demands and employment to those who want it.

7. Monetary policy should allow moderate growth in money supply in line with real growth. The level of interest rates should be eased. Selective credit control may have to be employed.

Action along these lines would create an appropriate economic climate and enable private enterprise to meet our economic needs.

REFORMS

Our democratic process is being tested by new and complex challenges. People are not at all sure that the government can meet these challenges. All of us become frustrated when we feel that government is not responsive to our needs or when we feel the political processes are impotent.

No person should be shut out from the decision-making processes of this nation.

The list of institutions which need reform is long. Some of the places where changes are needed are:

1. Congress should be modernized and streamlined. The seniority system should be modified to emphasize ability, not tenure . . . the appropriations process should be made more open . . . non-policy business should be delegated . . . the procedures of the Congress should be computerized and modernized.

2. Our national political parties must be open to all the people, and political participation in campaigns widened. We must reform party structures which have not changed substantially for the last 100 years.

3. The Electoral College should be abolished. The time has come to elect this country's President by direct, popular vote. We can no longer take the chance that the Presidential candidate with the most popular votes loses the election.

4. Revenue-sharing efforts should be started to bring government revenues closer to the population. A portion of Federal tax revenues should be turned over to State and local governments, to spend on deserving programs, with a minimum of Federal supervision and control.

5. Our military draft system is faced with the dilemma of "Who serves when not all serve?" We must remove as many inequities in this system as we can now, and move as quickly as possible to an all-volunteer army.

6. Tax reform, begun by the Congress in 1969, is essential to maintain taxpayer confidence in the system. We must be sure that those with substantially the same incomes pay the same tax, to make general tax reductions possible, and simplify the tax code.

7. The Post Office Department should be reorganized into an independent, self-contained postal service—outside politics. It should operate on a sound financial basis, giving managers freedom to manage, and offering realistic career opportunities.

The democratic system is not an achieved state or a resting place. It is a process, a living tissue. The institutions which make up our system are not inviolate. They must change to meet the demands of the times.

POLLUTION

The Nation is stirring itself to express its concern about the environmental crisis . . . and none too soon. Every river system in America is polluted to some degree. Americans discard enough trash each year to fill up the Panama Canal nine times. Millions of tons of pollution are spewed into the air each year.

Some experts believe that the "point of no return" is a decade or less away. It is time to act, and our efforts should include such steps as:

1. Funding: Providing and budgeting adequate funds for pollution control at all levels of government.

2. Education: Expanding the educational effort to reach citizens, both at school and

in the community-at-large, on what needs to be done to preserve our environment.

3. **Polluters Must Pay:** Initiating a nationwide system of effluent charges on polluters, with the fine based on the amount and danger the pollutant poses to the environment.

4. **Congressional Oversight:** Creating a joint Congressional committee to oversee all Federal activities in pollution control and help to plan and implement future action.

5. **Enforcement:** Streamlining enforcement procedures to assure polluters their activities will be met with swift and financially painful action.

6. **Governmental Cooperation:** State and local units must form stronger partnerships to combat pollution. Since pollution does not begin or end at city limits or state lines, regional and interstate cooperation also must be expanded.

7. **Research:** More research is needed to find new alternatives in dealing with our pollution problems. Just as importantly, we must expand the know-how we have already in dealing with these problems.

The crisis is upon us, and it demands a positive response. The direction we take now will move us quickly towards the control of pollution—if we act positively—or towards possible extinction—if we let matters drift.

CRIME

Crime—the fact 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 up 13 percent over the first three months of 1969.

The first responsibility of any government is the safety of its citizens. In our democracy, the principal responsibility for dealing with crime rests with the State and local communities. However, the Federal government must help. I support a broad-based attack on crime which does not infringe upon local responsibility, including:

1. **Increased Funding:** The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration provides financial and technical support for local and State police agencies. It has never received adequate funding. This effort must be given priority budgetary consideration.

2. **Court and Penal Reforms:** With a "return" rate of 70 percent among criminal offenders, it is apparent our penal system has serious shortcomings. I have introduced legislation to improve penal facilities and methods at all levels of government and provide new controls over probationers, parolees and those found not guilty by reason of insanity.

I also have introduced legislation to require quicker trials for those charged with Federal violations. We need also to ease the load on overburdened criminal court judges and to press for sound court management at all levels of government.

3. **Juvenile Crime:** Crime rates are nearing a 10 percent annual increase among juveniles. Such efforts as the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968, which authorizes block grants to States to combat this growing menace, must be given new emphasis and adequate funding.

4. **Dangerous Drugs:** With statistics indicating that more and more offenders have histories of drug use, we must move to curtail the trafficking of drugs in this country, and internationally. More education on drug abuse is needed, and the root causes of drug abuse must be brought under increased scrutiny.

5. **Organized Crime:** Statistics show that nearly \$100 billion a year 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. I support and urge its passage.

6. **Social Problems:** We cannot expect po-

lice action, the courts, or tough laws alone to eliminate crime. Coupled with a national strategy against crime, we must work to correct the social conditions which help to breed crime.

In all of our efforts we must seek both justice and order.

FOREIGN POLICY

World peace is the goal of United States foreign policy, and how to organize it is the great question of that policy.

A steady and reasoned American foreign policy will shun both isolation and global intervention. Like it or not, America is involved in the leadership of the world, and cannot withdraw from that involvement. America must take the lead in maintaining stability in the world. Although every world event may affect it, not every event will affect it vitally, and we must be able to distinguish between the two.

I recommend that a steady and reasoned American foreign policy should:

1. Maintain our economic and military strength.

2. Define our national interests carefully and use our power carefully.

3. Maintain a minimum of commitments by engaging ourselves abroad only to protect vital interests.

4. Encourage regional and international cooperation as an expression of the new nationalism of developing countries.

5. Aid selected developing nations, but without giving them more aid than their public servants can administer.

6. Create a liberal trade policy without creating undue burdens for American manufacturers and producers.

7. In Vietnam, the U.S. should seek a negotiated settlement, and end the war by an orderly disengagement of American military forces which will protect the future position of the U.S. in world affairs, assure the safety of American forces now in Vietnam, and encourage the prospects of a safe return for American prisoners of war and the safety of Vietnamese citizens.

FARM PROGRAM

The average farmer does not receive his fair share of the Nation's prosperity—a prosperity he has done much to create. His income is about two-thirds of the income of the city dweller, and the cost-price squeeze continues to hurt him.

To achieve the goal of a fair income for the farmer, I support these steps:

1. A move in the direction of a market-oriented economy, protecting and improving the farmer's income by reducing surpluses, and, if necessary, making payments to the farmer to insure his income. Farm payments should be limited, however, to \$20,000 per producer per year.

2. Provide marketing research, better information, bargaining, marketing arrangements and cooperative buying and selling for the farmer. Safeguards must be enacted to protect the farmer from deceit, unfair competition and fraud in the marketplace, however.

3. Expand world trade, extending at the same time maximum self-help assistance to foreign countries to bring them into the world market.

4. Adjust cropland to retirement and less intensive uses such as grazing, forestry and recreation.

5. Increase negotiability of acreage allotments and marketing orders.

6. Extend long-term credit to young farmers.

7. Give the farmer more direct voice in government by adding to the President's Council of Economic Advisers an agricultural economist.

RURAL AMERICA

The "forgotten Americans" reside in our rural areas. In rural America, there are few-

er jobs, poorer schools, more substandard housing, and less adequate health facilities. The Nation's concern should be focused on rural problems to the same extent that it is now focused on urban problems. Only when the problems of the cities and of rural America are seen as part of the whole—linked together—will progress be made.

To help revitalize rural America, I recommend the following steps:

1. Attract new industry and expand present industry by tax incentives, loans, insurance and grants to industry which will locate and expand in rural America.

2. Provide regional information centers, so that communities applying for Federal assistance would have only to apply to one agency to see if their needs could be met, rather than fill out numerous forms for innumerable agencies.

3. Overhaul manpower policies to provide better job information, improved job training and counseling, and focusing on such critical fields as health, education, recreation, and conservation.

4. Help insure adequate health, education and recreation facilities and the people to staff them.

5. Increase the development of rural water and sewer systems, without which a community cannot develop.

6. Insist that economic opportunity funds and other government funds be spent at the same per capita level in rural America as in urban America.

7. Develop a simple and reliable channel of communication between Washington and rural America. The development of a competent and reliable community organization is crucial for success.

8. Utilize a representative from the Federal government to point out programs to potential initiators of applications, encourage them to participate, and be prepared to give technical assistance on the applications. The skill of the professional planner is needed in rural America.

9. Encourage regional planning and modernization of state and local governments to make assistance more effective and government more responsive to the people of rural America.

10. Reduce the massive outmigration from rural America by providing loans and loan guarantees to encourage private investment, vocational training, health care, hospitals, and public investment in roads.

The complexity of the problems of rural America preclude the success of a single program or approach. It calls rather for a concerted and coordinated attack across the board spectrum of problems which face rural America.

ISRAELI HISTORY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Sidney Korte, of Arlington, has requested me to insert the following two articles, which he prepared and which the Northern Virginia Sun printed, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He is of the opinion that the House of Representatives should have the benefit of his historical research into the legal foundations of the present State of Israel. I honor his request to petition the Congress to present his views and request these articles be printed in the RECORD:

LET EACH HAVE A NAME

The New York Times of Apr. 2 has an "Open Letter to Kosygin-Nasser & Co." from Mr. Sol A. Dann of Detroit, Mich. It proposes that Jordan's name be changed back to "Palestine."

The Palestine Mandate covered 10,000 square miles west of the Jordan River and 35,000 lying to the east. In 1922, Great Britain, the mandatory trustee, took the entire area east of the Jordan River out of the mandate, calling it Transjordan, and setting it up as an Arab kingdom under the Emir Abdullah, grandfather of the present King Hussein. In 1948, Transjordan seized 2,000 square miles of Western Palestine and called the combined area "Jordan." This seized portion was occupied by Israel in 1967.

The word "Palestine," as Mr. Dann points out, is not of Arab derivation. It was concocted from the word "Philistine" by the Romans who wished to erase from memory the claim of the Bible that the Jews had rights there. Since the destruction of the Jewish state by the Romans in the year 70, Palestine never has constituted an independent political entity. The Romans left no legal successor. The Arabs, who conquered it in 634, were in possession for a relatively short time, when it passed successively to the rule of the caliphs of Damascus, the caliphs of Bagdad, the Tullinide governors of Egypt, back to the caliphs of Bagdad, then to the Egyptian Ikshidi princes, and finally to the caliphs of Cairo. After 1071 Palestine was subjected to non-Arab conquerors, the Kurds, the Crusaders, the Mamelukes, and finally the Turks. In 1923, by the Peace Treaty of Lausanne, the Turks surrendered their rights to the Allied Powers.

Since the Jews were conquered after bitter resistance and continuously, by word and act, have asserted their claim, it follows, according to Oppenheim's International Law (5th edition, London, 1937, Volume I, Page 456), that the Roman conquerors never established a clear title to Palestine. The old Jewish claim, moreover, received renewed vitality in the Palestine Mandate of the League of Nations, according to which there is "the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine," providing "grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country."

Since 1071, there has been no Arab rule in Palestine until "Transjordan" was unilaterally, i.e. without international sanction, given to Arabs by Britain. Unlike the Jews, the Palestine Arabs never struggled for their independence; they submitted to every conqueror and thus acquiesced in their domination. Even in 1917, when the Arabs of the desert revolted against Turkish rule the Palestine Arabs took no action and the majority continued to fight for the Turks.

It is a myth that the Arabs were in uninterrupted possession of Palestine for centuries. This ignores the facts of Arab immigration into the area, including that resulting from economic development by Jews. Nevertheless, Arabs have rights here which have begun for the first time to regard themselves as "Palestinians," implying that the existing Arab states no longer speak for them. The Jordanians are also Palestinians. Arabs can choose from any one of 18 separate Arab States if it is a question of language (and no other viable definition of the word "Arab" exists). If the Roman bequest of "Palestine" finds Arab, rather than Philistine, heirs, well and good. It might give them a psychological lift if the Hebrew name "Jordan" is supplanted. Let the State of Israel have the Hebrew name and the Arabs the Palestinian name.

SIDNEY KORETZ,
Arlington.

IGNORANCE OF PAST NETS CONFUSION

According to Sen. J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as stated on a "Face the Nation" TV program on July 5, the United States has no "formal commitments" to come to the aid of Israel. But Sen. Mark Hatfield, in a speech in the Senate on June 16, had said that "We have legal and political commitments to Israel." How he came to this conclusion is hard to fathom, judging from a "compilation of the history of the Middle East" which he had inserted into the Congressional Record consisting of some 15 pages, a prelude to his speech. Judging from his account, the State of Israel is primarily the result of "broken promises" made by Great Britain, with about four pages devoted to the doubtfully relevant exchange of letters between the Sherif Hussein, then of Mecca (but later forcibly expelled by Ibn Saud), and Sir A. H. McMahon, British High Commissioner at Cairo. Palestine, by name, is nowhere mentioned in this correspondence. It has been accepted by the best authorities, that Palestine was specifically excluded in whatever pledges Britain made to support Arab independence. In one place in Sen. Hatfield's insertion, there is a mention that the Balfour Declaration was "directly incorporated, almost verbatim, in the League of Nations mandate," but in general the relevant international law in favor of the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine is omitted.

It is a bit presumptuous to treat of the British Declaration of Nov. 2, 1917, the so-called Balfour Declaration, "in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people," without examining the concrete institutions which its acceptance by the highest international authority at the time, the League of Nations, set up to implement it. A good summary is found in "Palestine, A Study of Jewish, Arab, and British Policies," published for the Esco Foundation for Palestine, Inc. (Yale University Press, 1947) on pages 234-240. The primary purpose of the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine, as expressed in its preamble and its articles, was to promote the establishment of the Jewish National Home. This document was framed in the Jewish interest, and the imperative obligations placed upon the Mandatory, i.e., Great Britain, were in favor of the Zionists. It is significant that the word "Arab" did not once appear, and that the native Palestinians were referred throughout as "non-Jews." The Mandate, although designed to facilitate the establishment of a Jewish national home, made full provision for the rights not only of the individual inhabitants of Palestine but of the non-Jewish communities.

This was formally incorporated into international law by the League of Nations on July 24, 1922. It had the concurrence of all the enlightened nations of the world. President Woodrow Wilson had already expressed approval of the Balfour Declaration, and added, as reported in the New York Times of March 3, 1919, that he was "persuaded that the Allied nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and people are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth." On Sept. 21, 1922, President Harding signed a Joint Resolution of Congress expressing support of the Jewish national home in Palestine. On Dec. 3, 1924, the United States and Great Britain, signed a treaty, whereby, the United States, a non-member of the League of Nations, became a party to its Palestine Mandate. Technically (although downgraded by our State Department) this Treaty was the fundamental law underlying United States relations with Palestine for almost a quarter of a century.

Is it any wonder that two United States Senators can't get straightened out between them what are or are not present formal commitments of the United States when they ignore or are ignorant of its past commitments? This is not a good harbinger of the time when Congress will take over from the President the conduct of our foreign policy.

SIDNEY KORETZ,
Arlington.

NAPHCC QUESTIONS HUD'S MODEL PLUMBING CODE PROMOTION

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that on June 24 of this year, the National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, NAPHCC, meeting in its 88th annual convention in New Orleans, La., unanimously adopted a resolution strenuously opposing the enactment by State and local jurisdictions of the Basic Plumbing Code published by the Building Officials and Code Administrations International.

It has also come to my attention that NAPHCC contends that the Department of Housing and Urban Development has considered designating this code as a "nationally recognized model code" and therefore may require certain jurisdictions to adopt parts or all of the code in order to obtain recertification of their workable programs for community improvement.

NAPHCC also maintains that the code is not truly a nationally recognized code and never has been; and that it was adopted without notice to the NAPHCC or representatives of the plumbing-heating-cooling industry.

In light of these developments, I am concerned that such may have a possible adverse effect upon small business and local jurisdictions. Because of my strong and continuing interest in small business, I am bringing these reports to the attention of my colleagues and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It is my sincere desire that plumbing codes not be designated as nationally recognized without the most careful consideration of the effects upon small business and local jurisdiction.

I include the text of the NAPHCC resolution at this point in the RECORD:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PLUMBING-HEATING-COOLING CONTRACTORS RESOLUTION

Whereas, the organization known as the Building Officials Conference of America or BOCA was at one time a co-sponsor together with the National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors and the American National Standards Institute (then known as the American Standards Association) to revise the *National Plumbing Code*, until BOCA in 1967 deserted this venture in order to publish its own plumbing code; and

Whereas, in 1968 BOCA did proceed to publish, over the most strenuous objections of

the NAPHCC, an inferior work known as the *Basic Plumbing Code*; and

Whereas, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has been so misinformed as to call the *BOCA Basic Plumbing Code* a nationally recognized model code and to require that cities and counties throughout the United States having Workable Programs throw out their existing codes and adopt the BOCA code as an indispensable condition of retaining eligibility for federal money; and

Whereas, BOCA has just recently amended the definition of plumbing to exclude all plumbing installations whatsoever beyond a line five feet outside the foundation walls of a building or structure, as well as all installations of gas piping; chilled water piping in connection with refrigeration, process and comfort cooling; hot water piping in connection with building heating; and piping for fire sprinklers and standpipes; and

Whereas, this action on the part of BOCA was taken without notice to the NAPHCC or representatives of the plumbing-heating-cooling industry, thereby causing untold confusion and disruption in construction industry practice and endangering the health and safety of the public by providing that a large volume of plumbing work can be performed by unlicensed and untrained personnel; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors oppose the recognition of the *BOCA Basic Plumbing Code* as a national model code and that such opposition shall be strenuously expressed to HUD, BOCA, and all other interested parties; and be it further

Resolved, that the secretary transmit a copy of this resolution to the Honorable George W. Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

RESULTS OF PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY IN NORTH CAROLINA'S NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the appendix, I include the results of my annual public opinion survey among residents of North Carolina's Ninth Congressional District.

Participation in the survey this year set a new record for the people of our district. A total of 21,479 responses have been received from the people of the ninth district. The previous record was set in 1968 when 17,000 citizens participated, so the performance for 1970 shows a 29-percent increase in citizen participation in this very significant survey of voter attitudes. This demonstrates, more than anything else I can think of, the concern of the American people over the critical issues facing this country today. As usual, many of those responding availed themselves of this opportunity to express themselves on these issues and others by way of comments elaborating upon their "yes" or "no" answers.

I make a special effort to keep abreast of the thinking of my constituents. The use of an annual questionnaire is one way, among many, that is used. I find this to be an effective way for the people down home to make their views known to me with the assurance that

those views will receive consideration. Thus they are able to participate in the process of government.

The responses to this questionnaire were tabulated by Data Management, Inc., of Springfield, Va. The results from this tabulation follow:

PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY OF NORTH CAROLINA'S NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT [Answers in percentages]

- Do you approve of the actions taken by President Nixon in Cambodia?

Yes	77.9
No	19.3
No answer	2.8
- Should the United States—

Continue the present policy of gradual withdrawal of troops and the Vietnamization of the war?	48.5
Begin immediately the total withdrawal of all American military forces from Vietnam and Cambodia?	22.5
Step up military activities as necessary to achieve a military victory in Vietnam?	27.0
No answer	2.0
- Do you favor converting to an all-volunteer force?

Yes	49.8
No	44.4
No answer	5.8
- Should 18 year olds be allowed to vote?

Yes	36.2
No	61.5
No answer	2.3
- Should spending for the Space Program be—

(a) increased?	10.9
(b) continued at the present level?	34.9
(c) decreased?	46.1
No answer	8.1
- Do you favor compulsory busing if that is required in order to achieve approximate racial balance in the public schools?

Yes	8.1
No	90.1
No answer	1.8
- To control inflation, would you favor—

(a) continuation of present policies?	19.0
Yes	15.4
No	65.6
(b) wage, price, and credit controls?	29.4
Yes	16.5
No	54.1
(c) reducing federal spending?	64.4
Yes	9.2
No	26.4
- Would you favor the federal government guaranteeing a minimum annual income to every American family?

Yes	14.9
No	81.8
No answer	3.3
- Do you favor increasing postal rates to reduce the Post Office Department's deficit—

(a) on first class mail?	8.6
Yes	37.9
No	53.5
(b) on other classes of mail?	54.3
Yes	16.5
No	29.2
(c) on all mail?	24.2
Yes	33.2
No	42.6

VIETNAM TROOPS SUPPORT PRESIDENT'S CAMBODIAN DECISION

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, my attention has recently been drawn to a letter that was written to the Valdosta Daily Times, Valdosta, Ga.

The letter, by Mrs. Sonja N. Bracewell, contains excerpts of a letter she received from her husband who was serving in Cambodia.

Mr. Speaker, of late those who had opposed President Nixon's decision to send troops into Cambodia have been strangely silent. Their silence, I feel, is due in large part to the success of the Cambodian incursion.

The success of this incursion is told by Captain Bracewell in his letter to his wife. He also tells of the rising morale of our troops in South Vietnam as a result of this offensive while deploring the actions of those in the United States who would "sell us out."

I believe his words will be of interest to all Members of the Congress, whether they support or oppose the President's action. Therefore, under leave to include extraneous material, I hereby enclose Mrs. Bracewell's letter to the Editor of the Valdosta Daily Times.

VALDOSTA, GA.,
June 11, 1970.

EDITOR,
The Valdosta Daily Times,
Valdosta, Georgia.

DEAR SIR: The following excerpts are from a letter, dated May 30, 1970, just received from my husband, Capt. James P. Bracewell, Headquarters & Headquarters Troop, 7th Armored Sqdn., 1st Air Cavalry, who is on his second tour of duty in Viet Nam. We read of so many being against the Cambodian invasion that I feel burdened to share his feelings with you and the Times readers.

"You're right about my outfit still mixing it up in Cambodia. You're also right about "B" troop. They've been hit pretty hard—but then we all have. Vinh Long (Capt. B's location) hasn't been attacked in nearly a month now. We're really hurting the enemy in this Cambodian activity. We're splitting their units, cutting off their supplies, and causing them so much confusion they don't know which way to turn. I sort of expect them to try to hit some of our bases pretty hard here in the Delta. They have to do something to try and draw us away from their sanctuaries in Cambodia. We're ready for them though, and they'll pay a heavy price if they hit us. I don't think they can afford to take the kind of loss we'll give them. In the past, they sustained heavy losses, but they always had replacements readily available just across the border. Since we cleaned out the "Parrot's Beak", we denied them a clear path for reinforcements and supplies. Honestly, this move into Cambodia has done more for the war effort than any steps we've taken before. We, who are over here, are a lot safer because of this decision, and most of us are thankful that our Commander-in-Chief has given us the opportunity to meet the enemy on our terms for a change. Some of us are dying for this cause, and now we're beginning to feel that it's not in vain. I only hope they don't stop us now that we are moving.

Since the beginning of the Cambodian

push, my opinion of some of the Vietnamese units has grown steadily higher. Watching the ARVN Armored Cavalry units in Cambodia brings to mind the thunderous charges made by the horse cavalry in the old days. The U. S. advisors have done a remarkable job of assisting these units, and they are the unsung heroes of this whole war. They are the men who are making the President's Vietnamization plan a success. Now I firmly believe that the Vietnamese people will be able to stand up against any aggressor much sooner than I ever thought possible. Of course, I can only speak for myself, but I believe that if the Vietnamese forces in the other parts of the country are progressing as well as they are here in the Delta, we will be able to withdraw our forces in total in the near future. Of course, we must continue to support these people with our advisors as well as our money for quite a while. What we, the soldiers, need most of all is the support and faith of the people of the United States. It is a terrible thought that our own people in our own beloved nation cannot see the absolute necessity of our being here—and staying here until the job is done. Many of my soldiers have returned to Vietnam from special leave in the States, and told me how they were afraid to wear their uniforms in the streets of America! You know how proud I've always been of my uniform, because I felt that it identified me as a member of a noble profession whose sole duty is to protect and defend the greatest nation in the world and all her interests. I cannot comprehend why a soldier, who has risked his life day after day for a year or more, must be subjected to ridicule and persecution in the very country he has risked his life for when he returns home.

What on earth has happened to patriotism? Where is that great American spirit of the past? We are looking like complete asses in the eyes of other countries all over the world! God help me to keep the faith I've always had in my country. I just pray that the people of the United States will wake up, and live up to the responsibilities of being the greatest nation of all!

I had to get this off my chest. I could have gone on and on!

Thank you Mr. Editor.

Sincerely,

SONJA N. BRACEWELL.

ONE HUNDRETH ANNIVERSARY OF LOYOLA UNIVERSITY

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1970, the House passed House Resolution 1036, commemorating the 100th anniversary of Loyola University.

This school numbered 37 students when classes started on September 5, 1870, with a faculty of four Jesuit priests. These Jesuits had the theory that a liberal education designed to educate the "whole man" was essential. We can be thankful that this same philosophy prevails today in the university's 11 colleges and schools which are located on six campuses. This is a university which can and does accommodate the individual, exposing him to all aspects of life.

The basic goal of this university was best summed up by Pope Pius XI when he said:

The true Christian, product of Christian education, is the supernatural man who thinks, judges, and acts constantly and consistently in accordance with right reason.

The man who always does what he believes is right is, unfortunately, becoming as extinct as the bald eagle. It is reassuring to have a school interested in conservation—the conservation of man.

It was Dr. Victor C. Ferkiss, a political scientist at Georgetown University, who recently shocked the scholastic world when he said:

My thesis is starkly simple: Modern civilization and perhaps the human race is on the verge of extinction. Meanwhile, the universities, supposedly civilization's torchbearers, are almost without exception standing passively by while mankind plunges heedlessly toward disaster.

It is my thesis that Loyola University is one of the last of "civilization's torchbearers." It is my hope that it will continue this noble crusade in the years to come.

Loyola University is the largest Catholic school in the country, and it has certainly helped the professional community of Chicago. Eleven percent of Chicago area attorneys have graduated from Loyola. The medical school is responsible for 20 percent of Chicago's doctors, and the dental school for 51 percent of Chicago's dentists.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to submit several newspaper articles pertaining to Loyola University and its many fine accomplishments over the years. I trust that my colleagues will find these articles interesting and stimulating:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 28, 1969]

**LOYOLA SETS CELEBRATION OF CENTENNIAL—
URBAN WOES PARLEY BEGINS TOMORROW**
(By Sara Jane Goodyear)

Loyola university will begin its official centennial celebration this week.

In the months ahead, thousands of the school's alumni and friends will attend academic symposiums and centennial dinners.

FOUNDED IN 1870

The Rev. Arnold J. Damen founded the university in 1870 on a plot of prairie more than a mile from the center of town. It was called St. Ignatius college then and was located at 12th and May streets, next to Holy Family Catholic church, which Father Damen had founded 13 years earlier.

When Father Damen welcomed the first class of 37 students, the new school had a faculty of four Jesuit priests whose aim was to give the students a liberal education designed to develop the whole man.

The school has attempted to pursue this philosophy thru the years as it has expanded to 12 colleges and schools on six campuses with a total enrollment of more than 13,000 students.

PREPARE TO MOVE

Preparations to move the school from its initial location began in 1906 when the school bought a 25-acre site between Sheridan road and the lake north of Devon avenue. The gradual relocation to the present Lake Shore campus took place in the next 16 years.

The building at 12th and May streets became St. Ignatius High School.

Expansion has continued at a steady pace as first one and then another of the university's campuses was established. There are five campuses in the Chicago area and one in Rome. Loyola has grown to become the largest Jesuit university in the United States.

SYMPOSIUM TO BEGIN

Observance of the centennial, which is focused on the theme, "Knowledge in the Service of Man," will begin with a major academic symposium, "Man in the Urban Complex," which will be held tomorrow thru Wednesday in the John B. Murphy auditorium, 40 E. Erie St.

Among those who will participate in this symposium on urban problems are Dr. Philip M. Hauser, director of the population research center and professor of sociology at the University of Chicago; Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers; John Kenneth Galbraith, Paul M. Warburg, professor of economics at Harvard University and former ambassador to India; and Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League.

The symposium is the first of five to be held as part of the centennial observance. Others are "The Brain and Human Behavior," to be held Wednesday thru Friday; "Current Evolution of Man's Sense of Values," Jan. 5 thru 7; "Freedom and the Human Sciences," Jan. 7 thru 9; and "Higher Education—Unity or Diversity," April 6 thru 8.

More than 1,200 alumni, honorary degree recipients, and guests are expected to attend a centennial alumni dinner Wednesday in the Pick-Congress hotel. This is the first of three major dinners which will be held in connection with the centennial. The Rev. James F. Maguire, university president, will deliver the main address.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 23, 1970]

LOYOLA'S CENTENNIAL

This spring Loyola university of Chicago rounds out its 100th year. We are glad to raise our voice in the chorus of congratulations to this highly useful Chicago institution, which has taken seriously its motto "Knowledge in the Service of Man."

The modest college which opened for the first time in September, 1870, at 11th and May streets survived the Great Fire with its physical plant unscathed. As early as 1874, THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE said of Loyola, "This valuable college is growing in numbers and is now one of the most prominent institutions of learning in the city."

By 1970 its growth has enabled Loyola to describe itself as the largest Catholic university in the country, and to claim more than half this area's dentists, more than a third of the area's social workers and public school principals, and a substantial proportion of our physicians and attorneys among its alumni. From freshman year thru a variety of professional schools, Loyola has provided the opportunities by which generations of Chicagoans have qualified themselves for influential and useful roles in society.

Among the names of Loyola alumni who have made a mark in government are Carter H. Harrison Jr. [mayor of Chicago], Judge Philip L. Sullivan, Judge Augustine J. Bowe, Judge Roger Kelley, Judge William J. Campbell, and Congressmen Daniel J. Ronan and Edward J. Derwinski. Men and women of comparable distinction have moved from Loyola's classrooms into a variety of careers. This many-sided institution has a physical presence on Chicago's far north side lake front, on the near north side, in Maywood, and even in far away Rome [where Loyola has the largest American study center in Europe]. An urban university serving a primarily local population, Loyola deserves grateful recognition from all Chicagoans.

A Jesuit institution, with its every president from the Rev. Arnold Damen to the incumbent Very Rev. James F. Maguire signing himself S. J. [Society of Jesus], Loyola university is both Catholic and catholic—a servant of a particular church and a servant of the entire metropolis. "This valuable college," as we called Loyola in 1874, can en-

ter its second century with pride in its achievements since its first 37 students assembled a hundred years ago. A little college has become a university big in size and service.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 21, 1968]

CENTENNIAL FETE READ BY LOYOLA UNIVERSITY—CELEBRATION SET THROUGH 1969-70 SCHOOL YEAR

Loyola university will mark its centennial year with a celebration to run thruout the 1969-70 school year.

Centennial plans were announced yesterday by the Very Rev. James F. Maguire, Loyola president, at a press conference in Mayor Daley's office. Also present was Chief Judge William J. Campbell of federal District court, chairman of the school's centennial committee.

Daley expressed confidence that Loyola's second hundred years would be "as great as her first century of leadership," adding that Chicago is "grateful to this university whose sons and daughters have contributed so much to the progress of this city, the state of Illinois, and the nation."

Father Maguire cited the university's founder and first president, the Rev. Arnold J. Damen, for showing "remarkable foresight when he chose Chicago as the center for higher learning. Time has proved how wise he was in his choice."

"The centennial year will be a time of commemoration and reflections," said Judge Campbell, "a time to determine how we can best continue to serve young minds as we enter the second century."

Theme of the centennial will be "Knowledge in the Service of Man," said Father Maguire.

The theme will be carried out thru five symposiums beginning next September. Titles are "Man in the Urban Complex," "The Brain and Human Behavior," "Current Evolution of Man's Sense of Values," "Freedom and the Human Sciences," and "Higher Education—Unity or Diversity."

Loyola opened on September 5, 1870 at 12th and May streets in a building which later became St. Ignatius High School. The university moved to its main lake shore campus by 1920.

LOYOLAS CENTENNIAL

That Loyola University of Chicago will observe its 100th anniversary during the coming academic year was announced at a press conference yesterday by Mayor Daley, the Very Rev. James F. Maguire, president of Loyola, and Judge William J. Campbell, chairman of Loyola's centennial anniversary committee.

Loyola University opened its doors Sept. 5, 1870, but, of course both that event and the observance of its centennial require extensive advance planning. Yesterday's press conference was but the public first step in a parade of events extending through the spring of 1970.

Thus today we have occasion to say what bears saying any day: that any city counts its institutions of higher learning among its most important blessings, and specifically that Chicago rejoices in looking back on a century of service by Loyola and ahead to more than a century of further significant service.

Especially notable at Loyola are its dental school (the oldest in the state, and the training ground of more than half of Chicago-area dentists); its school of social work (the first such school in an American Catholic university); its guidance center (one of the few accepting autistic children as outpatients); its institute of industrial relations, and its schools of medicine and nursing. Its creativity is by no means spent. In recent years Loyola has established a liberal arts center in Rome, a doctoral program in clas-

sical studies, and a new department of anthropology.

Loyola's new medical and dental center adjacent to Hines Veterans hospital in Maywood, to be in full operation by 1970, will be a third major site for Loyola, in addition to its campuses in Rogers Park and on the near north side at Lewis Towers. Candidates for the priesthood study at yet other campuses, in North Aurora and Niles.

"Knowledge in the Service of Man," the theme of Loyola's centennial, expresses the devotion of this Jesuit institution to service not only of a Catholic constituency but of society at large.

"JOE OESCHGER—ENDURANCE WAS HIS SPECIALTY"

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the longest baseball game ever played in major league history and this past weekend the gentleman from North Carolina; Mr. WILMER "VINEGAR BEND" MIZELL, and I had the distinct honor and privilege of paying tribute to the only surviving pitcher of that historic, recordingsetting game.

Mr. Joseph Oeschger, a very close, lifelong friend and constituent of mine from our hometown of Ferndale, Calif., holds the distinction and the world record of having pitched 26 innings in one afternoon—a game he did not even know in advance that he would be pitching. Joe was a starting pitcher for the Boston Braves and the "longest game" was played between the Braves and the Brooklyn Dodgers in Boston on May 1, 1920. Both Joe and Dodgers' pitcher Leon Cadore, now deceased, went the entire distance.

This past Friday evening, many of Joe Oeschger's friends, admirers, and fellow athletes met in Eureka, Calif., to recount that historic game and pay our respects to Joe. It was truly a memorable evening with congratulatory messages from America's No. 1 fan, President Nixon, Baseball Commissioner Bowie Kuhn, Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Sporting News, and many other sports and baseball "greats".

At O. H. Bass' Townhouse, over 250 people including most of Humboldt County's greatest names of yesteryear in the sports field were present to pay their tribute to Joe and his very lovely and vivacious wife, Nancy. Joe was obviously moved by the experience. His wife, Nancy, told me after the dinner:

Don, Joe has received many honors and a great deal of recognition throughout his career, but this program, tonight, was the crowning event of all.

And Joe Oeschger said:

It is very gratifying to know that people still recognize and appreciate your efforts for an event that took place 50 years ago.

Yes, Joe, we will always remember the event because, as "VINEGAR BEND" MIZELL said, "This is a record no one will ever break." But, more importantly we will

never forget the outstanding character and the great image you have projected to young and old people alike. You have been an extraordinary counselor and have provided inspiration to hundreds of thousands of people, and, in particular, the present Congressman for the First District of California.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of inserting in the RECORD today, an account of the "longest game" which I believe will be of historic interest to my colleagues and to those who read the RECORD regularly. I am also including the messages from President Nixon and Commissioner Kuhn.

At 78, Joe Oeschger is a hearty giant of a man—a man to match the giant Redwoods of Humboldt County where he makes his home. His has been a lifetime of service to people; especially young people with problems whom Joe has been helping ever since he left the major leagues, as he distinguished himself in a second career—that of coaching and education.

I am truly proud to be representing Joe Oeschger in the Congress of the United States.

The messages and account follows:

Mr. JOSEPH OESCHGER,
In care of
Congressman DON CLAUSEN,
Townhouse, Eureka, Calif.

Warmest greetings and congratulations on the 50th anniversary of your record pitching performance for the old Boston Braves, in an age when sports records are broken almost every day, it is not often that we have an opportunity to honor someone whose athletic achievements have endured for half a century. As a baseball enthusiast and as one who has enjoyed the experience of meeting you, I am pleased to join your many friends and fans in this tribute. Best wishes for a pleasant evening and for a happy 79th birthday next May.

PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON.

Mr. OESCHGER,
In care of
Congressman DON CLAUSEN,
Townhouse, Eureka, Calif.:

I am pleased to join your host of friends and admirers to pay tribute to you tonight in recognition of your superlative, iron-man pitching feat of 50 years' standing, a record that has withstood the test of time and onslaught of numerous pitching greats.

BOWIE KUHN,
Commissioner of Baseball.

[From the Sporting News, May 16, 1970]
50 YEARS AGO—LONGEST GAME EVER
IN MAJORS

(By Jack McDonald)

CHAPALA, Mexico.—This year marks the 50th anniversary of the longest game played in the majors.

On an overcast afternoon in old Braves Field, Boston, May 1, 1920, the Brooklyn Dodgers and Boston Braves battled 26 innings to no decision.

This memorable contest developed into a mound duel pitting Joe Oeschger against the late Leon Cadore. Both went the entire distance. After they had come within an inning of pitching three regulation-length games in a single afternoon, umpire Harry McCormick called it on account of darkness.

The score was 1-1. On the heels of the epic battle, an enterprising New York haberdashery firm put out a necktie which it advertised as "the longest tie in history." It had the inning score and the batteries stamped on it. The tie sold like hotcakes until the novelty wore off.

Fifty years later, Oeschger still gets letters from fans from all over the country asking for his autograph and sometimes for his personal reminiscences of the game. A good-natured guy, Joe has big stacks of box scores of the contest mimeographed and he signs each copy, but the supply of these sheets always runs out.

RECORDS, MORE RECORDS

Not only was this 1920 game a record for length of innings, but it created records within records. One of these was Oeschger's having held his opponents scoreless through the final 21 innings. In the seventh, he retired the side on three pitched balls, a great saving of strain on his arm. Earlier in the season, he had struck out the side on nine pitches.

Oeschger had come to the Braves from the Giants, who had traded him and Casey Stengel for pitcher Art Nehf. Joe was a big, strapping righthander over six feet tall and weighing over 200 pounds. He was 28, and had been pitching in the majors for seven years and was right in his prime when he pitched this game.

He is still a giant of a man, hale and hearty at 78, his broad shoulders still straight as a die. He now spends most of his time fishing and hunting around his home at Ferndale, Calif., north of San Francisco.

His German parents were early settlers in California. His mother, Marie, celebrated her 100th birthday last March 29 at Livermore, near San Francisco. Joe's younger brother, George, 68, once pitched for the Pirates. He was the fire chief in Weed, Calif., until his retirement.

Joe was a recent visitor to Mexico, where he helped his wife, Nancy, do research on a book she is writing. A graduate of the University of Madrid, Nancy authored a previous one called "Mothers of the Spanish Conquistadores," published in Spain and widely circulated throughout Mexico. It was while visiting the writer's home on the shores of Lake Chapala that Joe took time out to recall some of his impressions and reactions of the 26-inning game.

First off, he has been asked perhaps 10 thousand times in the last 50 years if his long pitching stint didn't damage his arm.

SOME GREAT WRITERS

"People started putting that question to me the very next day," the affable Joe said. "Boston had some wonderful baseball writers in those days—Bill Cunningham, Nick Flatley, Burt Whitman. They were an erudite group and I used to enjoy reading the Shakespearean vernacular they put into their baseball reporting. They all predicted I'd never pitch again. They said my arm wouldn't be worth a plugged nickel after the long strain I had just put on it."

But Oeschger did pitch again, eight days later, and he won.

"I missed a turn, yes," he said. "I would have been ready to work in rotation, but the next day I pulled a leg muscle running around the park and Manager George Stallings let me skip a turn. But my arm was okay."

And it is a matter of record that the following year, 1921, he had his best season, winning 20 games. He pitched five more years, retiring of his own volition because he wanted to teach school.

Nobody kept count of the number of pitches he threw in the long contest, but Joe doesn't believe it was more than 250, in what was tantamount to three regulation games in one afternoon. Only nine of these pitches became Dodger hits. Cadore, his opponent, gave up 15 hits, but Joe insists that pitching honors were about a standoff.

JUST A LITTLE WEARY

"I don't say I wasn't a little tired after those 26 innings, but I have been more fatigued in some nine-inning games, when I got

into a lot of jams," he said. "They are what wear a pitcher out. There weren't too many tight situations in this long game."

"Pitchers didn't work so much on hitters in those days. I mean they didn't go for strikeout records. The hitters guarded the plate more. I had a live fast ball and in this game I threw very few curves. And I rarely threw more than half a dozen warmup pitches. After about the 12th inning, I only took a couple."

Joe hadn't known he was going to pitch that day. Stallings often kept his starting pitcher a secret until time for batting practice.

"It rained most of the morning," Joe recalled, "and we didn't think there was much chance of the game being played. But there was a standing rule that we must report to the clubhouse, even if it was pouring. Leslie Mann, my roommate, and I had a leisurely breakfast in the old Brunswick Hotel of Boston's Back Bay section and then headed for Braves Field about noon. Our trainer, Jimmy Neery, gave me a rubdown."

"This game was played on a Saturday. Since I went to church every Sunday, Manager Stallings, very superstitious and a player of hunches, liked to pitch me on the Sabbath, figuring the good Lord would be on our side. But when he posted the lineup in the dugout, I was the starting pitcher. I was glad to get the assignment because in a previous start against Brooklyn I had lost, 1-0, in 11 innings, and I was eager to even things up, particularly since Cadore had been my pitching rival in that one and was to be my opponent again."

STALLINGS IN CHARGE

"Stallings was great on holding skull sessions and to this day I can remember our clubhouse meeting that day. The manager went over the Dodger lineup and batting order. It went something like this:

"Ivy Olson, second base—strictly a pull hitter, Bernie Nels, right field—Good fast-ball hitter and base-stealer. Jimmy Johnston, third base—Fast-ball hitter with dangerous base-stealing instincts. Zack Wheat, left field—Exceptionally good hitter with a tendency to pull ball to right field. Hi Myers, center field—Fast and a good bunter. Wally Hood, center field—Strictly a left-field hitter. Ed Konetchy, first base—Hits to all fields, slow runner. Chuck Ward, shortstop—No long-ball threat, but hits to all fields. Ernie Krueger, catcher—Good pull hitter; always play third baseman and shortstop toward the line. Rowdy Elliott, second-string catcher—Good fast-ball hitter."

The crowd this day was small because of the threat of more rain. The Dodgers went into the lead in the fifth inning.

"I was to blame for letting the run score," Joe said. "I started the inning off badly by pitching too carefully to Krueger, a good pull-hitter. I walked him. Cadore then followed with a sharp bouncer to the mound. In my anxiety to get the double play, I juggled the ball long enough to let Krueger reach second and had to content myself with throwing out Cadore at first base. Then, after getting two strikes on Ivy Olson, he got a broken-bat single just over the head of our shortstop, Rabbit Maranville. It scored Krueger."

"We evened the score in the next inning, the sixth, when (Wally) Cruise hit a terrific line-drive triple against the scoreboard in left field and scored on (Tony) Boeckel's single."

NO MORE SCORING

There was to be no more scoring throughout the long contest. The Braves had a chance to win in the ninth when they filled the bases with only one out, but Charley Pick hit into a double play, sending the game into extra innings. From here on it developed into an endurance contest, Cadore with his good curve ball vs. Oeschger with his fast one,

which he fired with full speed, especially in the final innings when it was getting dark.

"I think the most critical inning for me was the 17th," Joe went on. "The Dodgers filled the bases with only one out, but a great play by Hank Gowdy saved my neck. Elliott grounded sharply to me. I threw to the plate, forcing Wheat, but Gowdy's throw to first to complete the double play was wide. Wally Holke lost the ball momentarily and big Konetchy tore for home, but Holke recovered the ball and fired it back to Gowdy at home plate. Hank took the throw at full reach flung himself bodily across the baseline and tagged Konetchy out as he came barreling in. This brought the small crowd to its feet with a cheer that could be heard to the Charles River."

"I was beginning to feel a little tired by the 18th, but the players on our bench, particularly Maranville and Gowdy, kept buoying up my spirits by telling me, 'Just one more inning, Joe, and we'll get a run for you.' Stallings never did ask me if I wanted to come out, but if he had, my answer would have been an emphatic no."

Ball parks weren't lighted in those days and it was getting dark. After consulting the two managers, umpire McCormick called the game.

HITTERS WERE GRIPING

"It was the hitters who were squawking to end it," Joe said. "I certainly didn't want it to stop and I don't think Cadore did."

The game, which had started at 3 p.m., was called at 6:50—an elapsed time of 3 hours and 50 minutes for 26 innings. The longest game in modern times was the memorable 23-inning battle in 1964 at Shea Stadium between the San Francisco Giants and the Mets. This one consumed seven hours and 23 minutes. The rival managers, Casey Stengel and Alvin Dark, used a combined total of 41 athletes as against only 22 for the longer 1920 game. Stengel and Dark also used 10 pitchers while both Oeschger and Cadore started and finished.

Oeschger has a deep respect for Stallings, who in 1914 had brought his "Miracle Braves" from last place on July 15 to win the N. L. pennant by 13 games, then crushed the "Invincible" Philadelphia Athletics of Connie Mack in the World Series.

"I admired him for his leadership," Joe said. "His intense desire to win inspired his players. He was very superstitious. Bats had to be placed in exact order and kept that way, especially during a rally. The drinking cup had to hang just so on the water cooler spigot. He hated pigeons. Rival players used to torment him by scattering peanuts in front of our dugout and Stallings used to wear our arms out having us throw pebbles at the pigeons to chase them away."

A SHARP DRESSER

"He seldom wore his uniform in the dugout and was always impeccably dressed in street clothes. He was a real southern gentleman, a native of Haddock, Ga., near Macon. He was educated at VMI and Johns Hopkins and had intentions once of becoming a doctor. I think his father was a general in the Confederate Army."

Oeschger was a graduate in engineering of St. Mary's College when it was located in Oakland. He went right from the campus to the Phillies. After retiring from Organized Ball, he got a degree in education at Stanford University. For 27 years he taught physical education at Portola Junior High School in Butchertown, one of the poorer sections of San Francisco, where Lefty O'Doul was born and raised.

"I turned to physical education because I thought my baseball background was too valuable to throw away," Joe explained. "I liked working with kids. My compensation was that I might have helped, in a small way, to straighten some of these boys out. When I see the success many of them made, I feel more than repaid."

some day. My family and I will be going to Athens, Greece, next June."

A Northglenn, Colo., girl avoided the gender problem in a letter last January forwarded by E. M. Hale & Co.:

"Dear Shannon Garst: I am reading your book called *Crazy Horse*. I enjoy the book very much. I like the way the pictures are drawn. They make the book more interesting to read and look at.

"Sincerely yours, Patricia Alvarez, 1241 E. 105th Place."

Greg Boyd, 11, of Trenton, Mich., read *Red Eagle* and wrote: "I like your stories a lot. I'm going to read a lot of your books. I hope you will send a picture of you. I have one brother and two sisters."

Greg probably was surprised by the picture he got. His letter had been addressed to Mr. Garst. The Douglas lady says that she has never been told that someone was disappearing to learn she is female.

"I always tell them I'm a woman when I answer their letters and I hope they're not too upset," she says. "I really don't think the name Doris would have sold as much as Shannon. Man still prevails in our society—but we're slowly winning."

Mrs. Garst feels the wildly independent streak she found in the Western pioneers is out of place in modern woman. "I think women have overdone it in their pitch for equality," she says. "I don't think a woman will ever be President, but they will do quite well at other political offices."

Doris Garst was born July 24, 1894, at Ironwood in northern Michigan. Her German-born father, Julius Jensen, was a bookkeeper. Her mother was an Austrian with the colorful name of Zinta Anna Von Diltz. They moved to Denver in 1898 "because Michigan was so cold."

The father became manager of several gold mines in Colorado. When Doris was 17, the Jensens were divorced (her father was killed in a 1924 Central City mining accident). In Doris' third year at Denver's East High School, her mother married Wesley Shannon, a fruit rancher, and they moved to Hood River, Ore.

At 18 she was graduated from high school in Oregon and obtained a temporary teaching certificate good for four years. The first year was in a country school for grades 1 to 4. The next year she had 31 pupils and all eight grades. "That's when gray hairs started," she says.

At 20 she became principal and teacher of grades 5 to 8 in Estacada, a farming village in central Oregon. When her teaching certificate expired, she was out of a job. Finances had prevented her from attending college to qualify for a regular certificate.

She went to Portland, Ore., and got a clerking job at Gill's Book Store. After five months there, she passed a civil service exam and adventurously accepted an appointment as clerk at the U.S. Land Office in Douglas, Wyo.

Within a year she won a proposal from a dashing young Douglas lawyer named Joseph Garst and on Sept. 1, 1917, they went to Hood River to be married. She continued in the land office for another year before devoting full time to housewifely chores in the house the couple built.

Joseph II was born Feb. 8, 1920, and he's now a petroleum engineer in New York. Warren arrived Sept. 21, 1922. He's director of wildlife photography for NBC-TV's *Wild Kingdom* program and recently won an Emmy award. Mrs. Charles (Barbara) Spurlock was born May 29, 1924, and is a Lander, Wyo., housewife.

Doris' urge to write surfaced as the children got into school and permitted her time to attempt some short stories, selling a few "for not very much." She promoted her own education by taking summer courses in English and writing at the University of Colorado.

"I've done most of my research right here in our own county library, which is exceptional for Western Americana," she says. "I'd visit about the country when I could and my husband would go along on some trips, like to Annie Oakley's old stomping grounds in Ohio."

Annie Oakley and Amelia Earhart are the only women subjects among Mrs. Garst's 45 books. "Women didn't live such adventurous lives in the old days," she says. "It's much more exciting for women now."

Thomas Wolfe is her favorite author, "probably because his books are autobiographical and I love to read biographies of writers." Among Western characters she prefers Jim Bridger and Chief Washakie.

"Bridger didn't give up so quickly when fur trading died," she says. "He stayed on set up a trading post and lived among the Indians. He was a good friend of Chief Washakie who was a great and wise Indian and a true friend of the White man."

A distinctive feature of Mrs. Garst's books is an abundance of colorful dialogue among the leading characters despite the paucity of tape recorders and reporters among the frontiersmen and Indians of the 1800s. This resulted in a termination of relations with one publisher, Harcourt, Brace & Co., when it invoked a ban on direct quotations of imaginary conversations.

"I can't write a textbook," Mrs. Garst says. "I have to make the characters realistic. In researching history you can get so close to a character that you know what he was thinking and what he said."

"You think about the subject all the time when you're writing. In fact, I do some of my best 'writing' after I go to bed. In the morning I remember the 'conversations' and write them down."

It will come as a shock to Shannon Garst fans that the author of those rough-and-tumble tales of the Wild West has never shot a gun. And as for riding the range: "I've been on a horse three times and every time the horse ran away with me. I think they sensed I was scared to death. So I decided to write about them. That's safer!"

NIXON CHALLENGED ON BLACK APPOINTMENTS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the problem of Government credibility takes on special significance for black Americans. To a substantial extent we have yet to gain the faith of this segment of our Nation. Black Americans are justifiably disillusioned that they have—up to the present—received a series of public relations maneuvers masquerading as positive, concrete change.

On August 1, Clifford L. Alexander, former Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, issued a statement countering claims by Nixon administration spokesmen that more blacks have been appointed to significant positions by this administration than by Kennedy or Johnson. In his concise and well-documented statement, Mr. Alexander shows such claims to be simply untrue. I would like to set the record straight, so to speak, by including Mr. Alexander's statement in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE REAL STORY ON MINORITY APPOINTMENTS UNDER NIXON

President Nixon's flunkies for a year and a half now have tried to create an impression of progress where none in fact exists. They have tried to create for the consumption of the American public an idea that President Nixon has outperformed his predecessors in the appointment of blacks to significant positions in the executive branch of the federal government.

There are two very fundamental things wrong with the approach taken by Nixon and his minions.

The first, and most important, is that comparisons are not the way to improve the basic positions of blacks in this nation. Nixon or any other American president should strive to fill the gap that has been created by years of exclusion. It is clear evidence of a lack of good intentions to continually make comparisons to past administrations when talking about what one is doing today.

It, of course, is also true that President Kennedy and, after him, President Johnson, made the significant breakthroughs that caused any new hiring to be "easier" than it was in the past. Once the breakthrough is made, then the erroneous myths that stick in some white minds about "finding qualified ones" automatically disappear.

The second reason the Nixon people should quit saying they have outperformed Johnson and Kennedy is that they are lying.

Let me list now the categories of jobs where the Nixon administration has not made any appointments:

To this date President Nixon has failed to initiate any new and significant high-level policy positions for blacks. President Johnson named the first black to the cabinet, a housing expert, Robert Weaver. Thurgood Marshall was the first black named to the Supreme Court. Andrew S. Brimmer was the first black named to the Federal Reserve Board, which, in the field of economics, is equivalent to the Supreme Court.

I had the honor of being the first black named to head an independent commission, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

President Nixon has not nominated blacks to the cabinet level. To hear him talk, you would think that he was the innovator, but in fact he has not even come near keeping up with the record of his two Democratic predecessors—both of whom felt that more needed to be done than they accomplished.

In the area of judicial appointments, President Johnson in one day appointed four black judges. To date, in his 18 months in office, President Nixon has not even appointed four black federal judges throughout the United States.

More important, in an area where innovation would be helpful, President Nixon has not appointed a black judge in the South. Never in the history of this nation, where more than half the black population lives, has a black sat on the federal bench. If President Nixon were honestly interested in giving equal opportunity to blacks, he could do so tomorrow by placing a black on any federal bench in the South.

A year ago President Nixon virtually promised during a meeting with black publishers that he would appoint a black to the Federal Communications Commission. Here many decisions are made that affect America's picture of minority aspirations, but the President reneged in his promise to the publishers and appointed Dean Burch to the then-vacant FCC chairmanship. Several of the publishers and other black leaders wrote to the President when a new vacancy became open this year. Again, there were indications the President would appoint a black to the Federal Communications Commission. Unfortunately, as is typical of this

President and his spokesmen, the deeds do not equal the words. Instead, the President appointed a lawyer from HUD, Sherman Unger, to fill the vacancy of Kenneth Cox.

The regulatory commissions have not seen any blacks appointed under Mr. Nixon. He had an opportunity to make a black Republican, Howard Jenkins, head of the NLRB, but, no, though Mr. Jenkins has a distinguished career as a labor expert, as a commissioner, and as a Republican, a white was chosen instead. What Mr. Nixon and his crowd have done is to create an impression of progress where none exists.

In fact, there has been retrogression in the field of minority appointments. The total number of appointments to significant positions in the Johnson years is considerably higher than the 150-odd that the Nixon administration claims for its period in office. What is worse is that, of the 150 that Nixon claims, 24 are Foreign Service officers who take a competitive examination and are supposedly protected from political influence or patronage claims. Of the 150 he claims, almost half are holdovers from the Johnson administration. Of the 150 he claims, some are non-professionals, or secretaries, by anyone's definition, not policy-making positions.

To date, Mr. Nixon has appointed no black to the cabinet; none to the Federal Reserve Board; none to the Supreme Court; a total of only three to all federal courts throughout the entire United States and none to a regulatory commission. He has appointed fewer black assistant secretaries than Johnson and Kennedy. He has appointed no black undersecretaries in any department of the federal government. He has failed to place any black in a significant position in the White House.

Yes, Mr. Nixon, we are taking you at your word. We are watching your deeds, not your words. Your deeds are clear. They do not include the hiring of blacks in significant positions in the federal government.

MEDICAL PERSONNEL SHORTAGE

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, a number of us in this House feel that a medical crisis is upon this Nation; that we are desperately short of doctors and other medical personnel, and that the Federal Government's efforts and assistance in this field should be dramatically increased.

A short time ago an effort was made on the floor of the House to provide a substantial increase for medical manpower programs. Unfortunately, that effort failed.

At the present level of funding, shortage of doctors—and experts say we need an additional 50,000—will not decrease, but indeed will worsen.

Recently I received a letter from an old friend, Dr. Michael J. Brennan, president of the Michigan Cancer Foundation. I found his letter an eloquent exposition of the need for more and better trained medical personnel. I recommend it to my colleagues and ask that the pertinent portions thereof be printed in the RECORD:

JULY 28, 1970.

The Honorable JAMES G. O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I am vastly encouraged to read the speech which you made to the Congress

on the nation's manpower crisis in health and the general state of the health budget on Wednesday, July 8, 1970.

As you know, I have been involved in cancer research and in medical education for some twenty years, and now as the director of the Michigan Cancer Foundation, I find myself involved in public health activities of a very wide scope.

There is no question that we shall fail to achieve resolution of the problems of rising costs and inadequate medical services in this country without very substantial increases in available medical manpower. Our society and our economy will certainly eventually be seeing that only by increasing the rewards for the nursing and allied health professions will we be able to draw large numbers of young people towards them. So far as the medical profession itself is concerned, there never has been a lack of applicants, and of qualified applicants. The attraction of this profession exceeds the opportunities for monetary rewards which it provides. Men have been willing to make substantial sacrifices on their own part and for their children to make entry into this profession possible. It is, therefore, a great tragedy that we have never been able in this country to develop the training facilities required to match the high level of willingness to undergo the prolonged and demanding training as so many young men and women are willing to undertake. As we look at the projected health manpower needs of the country, we see that we are many thousands short of those whom we should be graduating, roughly 50,000 short in the present year, and even with the most optimistic projections, we shall continue to be somewhere in the order of 25,000 short ten years from now in the number of young people we should be graduating in medicine. Numerous consequences have flown from this, including parasitization by American society of poorer and less capable societies for medical manpower needs. Of all the world's nations, certainly America ought to be able to export physicians, and it could do a great deal of good with respect to its international relationships by expanding its medical training facilities and research support to the level where one could come here from other countries, take his training and return, bearing with him knowledge and commitments which become a part of one's life during the course of medical education and post-graduate experience.

Whereas many throughout the world now doubt the genuine humanistic concern of American society, nothing could do more to correct that impression than those steps which are within our reach and which are relatively straightforward and simple, and which could elevate our reputation in the care of the ill and our contribution to that work in other nations as well as in our own.

In my field of cancer research and treatment, we see before us a terrible shortage of men fully capable of giving high quality medical care to patients with neoplastic disease. This work is not an easy kind of work, and it is discouraging and demanding as few things are in medicine. Nevertheless, we have more young men applying for fellowships than we can find support to train.

As a member of the National Advisory Council for the Regional Medical Programs and as Chairman of the Michigan Association for Regional Programs' Regional Advisory Group, I see numerous opportunities and initiatives going to waste in the coordination of medical work and in the training of new people for this work, simply by reason of a lack of funds. It is not that the will is not there, or that the candidates are not at the door, but simply that we have never given the appropriate priority to these expenditures in the construction of our budget. I am Chairman of the Subcommittee of

the Regional Medical Programs which allots training fellowships for persons who wish to specialize in the treatment of cancer. We had twice as many applications as we could support this year for that kind of training, and I am sure that we would have had even more qualified applicants if there had not been such a state of discouragement throughout the academic and research field in cancer about the level of support that one can look forward to, and therefore the wisdom and worthwhileness of going to the difficulty of submitting applications and encouraging candidates towards this work.

We are anxious at the present time to apply to all of the poor in the metropolitan Detroit area the benefits of the Papanicolaou smear for the early detection of cervical cancer. There is no funding to help us to do this, and there is no funding available to help us to train more of the cytotechnicians we need in order to make this very useful procedure widely available.

We have recently identified the presence of a virus in human milk in young women which is identical in form and general character to viruses responsible for breast cancer in animals. To pursue this work properly requires the building now of a virus isolation facility in which we can with some safety raise large quantities of this virus from human milk. The development of a safe and competent facility for this work would take an expenditure of some \$450,000. Through the generosity of the people of metropolitan Detroit, we shall be able in the early part of next year, hopefully, to undertake construction of an additional laboratory for the Michigan Cancer Foundation that will help in some degree in the exploitation of the fine leads that we have now on the control of breast cancer. This \$4,000,000 project is going to have to be supported entirely by local funds and it is a tragedy that a community with the initiative to go to this length in support of cancer research cannot receive some help and assistance toward the development of new and appropriate additions to these projected laboratories from national sources, inasmuch as the work to be done in them is certainly not only in the interest of the Detroit community, but of the nation as well.

Many are at a loss to determine where we shall find opportunity for employment for so many young people, particularly those in the racial minorities. Who is going to be hurt most by the withdrawal of federal loans for medical students and nursing students? Certainly, my son who desires to go into medicine will be supported by us to the best of our ability and even undergo major hardship if necessary in achieving his goals. We have been blessed in having available to us the resources with which to make such an effort and to assist him, but certainly equally deserving and competent boys whose parents do not have the resources are now shut off from medicine by this economic barrier and that is especially true amongst people in the racial and national minority groups.

PROBLEMS OF STUDENT UNREST

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, when a prominent educator speaks out on the problems of student unrest and campus disorder which create fissures in the bedrock of society, it behooves us to listen.

This appeal to intellectual stability and reason was made by President George H. Williams, president of the American University, at the commencement of Northern Illinois University on June 6, 1970. I commend this address to my colleagues:

PROBLEMS OF STUDENT UNREST

One reliable indicator of the state of the nation may be the temper of its commencement addresses. If this is so, the gulf that divides our people is broader and deeper than at any time since Lincoln.

The voices of commencement should—and often do—reflect the concerns of young people, and, therefore, the concerns of our future. The voices of commencement this year are angry and, in many instances, unreasonable—or bitter.

But we had better listen. We had better understand what we hear. Only then can we maintain our ability as a nation to disagree without being disagreeable.

Americans, perhaps for the first time, are losing their collective sense of humor—not that there is humor in war or crime or poverty or pollution; but then a sense of humor is never really tested except in the face of desperate circumstances.

Americans, perhaps for the first time, are losing the sense of unity that has, in the past, drawn disparate people and philosophies together in the face of threatened disaster. Our commitment to common goals is being shaken by divisive disputes over better ways to achieve them. And the fundamental unity that has been our best guarantee against political violence and repression may be crumbling. And this is because many people point out the difference between the ideal of American life and the reality of our times, because many others assert their distrust of change or their disdain of methods that advocates of change pursue.

We have, as a nation, learned how to shout at each other, but we have forgotten how to talk to each other. We know how to hear, but we have lost the ability to listen. We are more preoccupied with the ideas of confrontation than with the confrontation of ideas.

Too often, we impugn the motives of those with whom we differ and attribute our differences to the lunacy of extremes at both ends of the political, social, or economic spectrum. We seem intent on tearing our nation apart. And it is all so purposeless and so self-defeating.

The accumulated bankruptcy of leadership that has brought us to this day cannot, and must not, be assigned to one man, to one party, or even to one institution. The roots are deeper than that.

Each Sabbath our churches are empty or nearly so. Those few that prosper in attendance attract and hold relatively few of the young, for the language and ritual of formal religion are not the language and experience of war and race and national priority that so preempt the concern of the young. Where have the churches failed?

Our colleges and universities existed until recently in relative isolation from the problems of the world about them. Our graduates have been more attuned to making a living than to making a life. The allegiance of university faculties has been less to enrichment of their students and more to advancement of a professional competence. Where else have they failed?

Our government, at all levels, which so many criticize and increasing numbers reject, is too often the private preserve of leadership by default, thriving on the inability or the unwillingness of dedicated men and women to pay the price of being involved. Meaningful political participation does not extend to those who seek to vote, as they are sought out to defend and to die

for their country. Too often they do not contribute to the definition of the urgent issues facing us, nor are they invited to challenge long-held and critically unevaluated premises on which political policy is formulated. Where else has our political process failed?

Business and the professions and the unions maintain a counsel of deception in which their public affirmation of opportunity for all is belied by a principle of no room at the top for minorities and, in some cases, not even room at the bottom. Concentration on quantity overshadows creative impact on quality of life. Material reward is the measure of success. Where else have they failed?

And the family, which in the final analysis is the place where the example of unity and love must be set, if ever it is, is disintegrating or radically changing in the influence it exerts. It is not permissiveness we have to fear, but the absence of love and consideration for all in the family—and for all in the family of man. Where else has the family failed?

Unless we recognize the failures of which these are but illustrations, we cannot hope to restore the confidence that must be the basis of constructive dialogue among our people—people who too often are equally right and equally wrong.

The need is not, as some suggest, for getting tough. Violence breeds repression, and repression begets violence. Together, they spell disaster for democracy.

What we have not tried fully and fairly is getting decent. Legitimate concerns will not be met by the violence-prone academic bullies on the campus any more than by the inflammatory rhetoric of those of the campus who play on fear or appeal to vindictiveness.

If America can resolve its differences by resort to reason anywhere, it is on the campuses of its colleges and universities. But we must remember that it is not only our colleges and universities that are being tested. It is a test of men and women who, at this time in their lives, are on those campuses.

As one reviews this campus year from the perspective of expectations, these may have been our finest or our worst hours—but more likely both.

When violence threatens to overwhelm reason at your university, or mine, or any other, there is no effective appeal except to the members of the university community itself if enduring results are sought. The glory of the university lies in the very defenselessness that makes it easy prey for those who seek to change its character by intimidation from within or from without. A university's commitment to truth and objectivity, and its determination to perform its educational mission may be guaranteed temporarily by transforming the campus into an armed bastion—but only at the price of sacrificing its nature as a university.

When none will rise to its defense and exert the power of moral persuasion that isolates and rejects violence, then that university has already been superseded by a new institution. Call it what you will, it is not a university. And so it is with our nation.

Our universities are not perfect—perhaps even the contrary. But the process by which a university grows and achieves is the process of reasoned judgment. Cowardice, lies, rocks, and bombs are natural partners in the assault on reasoned judgment; and only a few need to attack when the knowledge beforehand is that defense must not be in kind. And so it is with our nation.

But who will speak for the essential process of reasoned judgment? Too often, not even a few. They are possessed of a different kind of cowardice—seeking to avoid personal involvement at any cost, including the denial

or sacrifice of the values they pretend to revere.

For many, perhaps too many, confrontation is a physical thing—abuse and insult, bricks, fists, tear gas, or, in the extreme, bombs and bullets. All are to be deplored.

The real confrontation is intellectual, and it is much more dangerous. Rocks in the hands of petty tyrants may break windows and draw blood. But thus it has ever been. Windows may be replaced, juvenile slogans erased, and wounds healed. But the violence done to truth and objectivity and ideas cannot be so easily overcome.

For few, perhaps too few, the counsel of reason and of peaceful change is the course chosen against the alternative of intolerance and violence. The voice of moderation is too seldom heard and heeded, and, indeed, is all too often absent from our campuses and from our commencements. And so it is for our nation.

Others will come after you to this great university, and you can leave the fight for civility and reason to them. Your job is done when you receive the diploma you came to get—a kind of honorable discharge from the war against injustice and inequity. A modest annual gift to the alumni fund will more than cover what you owe. Or will it?

But some few of you, and if we are fortunate many, will go on to a quiet kind of greatness in which men and women are committed to a patriotism of peace and to the brotherhood of mankind and to enduring human dignity for all. Let those who think these goals unrealistic remember that they have not been tried and been found wanting. They have not yet been tried.

Perhaps if there is determination to try them, the time is not too far away when commencement addresses will signal a different state of the nation—in which anger is replaced by understanding and the turmoil of these times will give way to renewed confidence and achievement for a reunited nation.

GROWING PROBLEM OF NOISE POLLUTION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, last Friday three of our colleagues, Representatives ADDABBO, BIAGGI, BRASCO, and I held a hearing in Mineola, N.Y., on the growing problem of noise pollution from jet aircraft. We were seeking new approaches to this unhealthy and distracting noise that is especially bad in New York because of the proximity of two of the world's busiest airports, Kennedy and LaGuardia.

We heard from the following people: Martin Gach and Dr. John Powers for the Federal Aviation Administration; John Wiley for the Port of New York Authority; James Pyle for the Aviation Development Council and a number of elected officials from Nassau County.

Since the statements presented by these local officials were all to the point and all worthy of the Members' consideration I insert my remarks and include those statements in the RECORD. Also I wish to include letters received from certain village mayors who were unable to accept our invitation to the hearing but who did write briefly on this subject:

STATEMENT OF HEMPSTEAD TOWN PRESIDING SUPERVISOR RALPH G. CASO FOR JET NOISE CONFERENCE

Gentlemen: Forgive me if my words seem weary; I can't hide that numbness of fatigue and frustration that I feel when I address myself to the problem of jet noise. For the past 10 years I have been up to my hip boots in the enduring battle to eradicate jet noise. Pay a visit to the five towns area of my town—the town of Hempstead—and you'll know immediately that the struggle goes on.

We tried back a few years ago to legislate locally against jet noise but, as many of you know, the air interests dragged the Hempstead Town anti-noise ordinance excruciatingly through layer upon layer of courts until finally it was decreed that jet noise regulation is a federal prerogative.

So now we've begun to move on a national level to meet the problem of jet noise head on. More about that later. I am pleased to say that local efforts have not been abandoned altogether. Recently, at my request, New York State Attorney General Louis Lefkowitz announced plans to file suit against 58 airlines and the Port of New York Authority, operator of Kennedy International and La Guardia Airports. I hope to testify as a friend of the court in that suit which aims to have jet noise declared a public nuisance. A court decision in our favor will initially enable the beleaguered victims of jet noise to file suit for damages. In the long run, hopeful, it will convince the air industry of the economic advisability of developing a quiet jet engine.

That's really what I would like to discuss today. A few years ago a blue ribbon presidential panel investigated jet noise and concluded that the development of a quiet jet engine is technologically feasible; it was just a matter of money. Gentlemen, and I particularly point to the congressional representatives here today, I would suggest that the initiative for curbing jet noise must be seized by Congress. The federal government must, in concert with the air industry, appropriate sufficient monies to research, develop and install quiet jet engines. Let's face it, the aircraft is here to stay, it is a keystone of our nation's progress, and this is as it should be. I am no enemy of air transportation.

Where to find the money? Frankly that's a problem for the administration and the congressional leadership, but I would not hesitate to urge that you consider diverting the staggering sums appropriated for the development of the super-sonic transport, the SST.

To date more than \$623 million in federal money has been poured into the SST program and experts estimate the national commitment to this flying white elephant will total several billions before it ever gets off ground; and I mean that quite literally.

The threats that this plane poses to our environment—jet noise, sonic boom, pollution of the stratosphere—are staggering. I shudder to think of a huge plane streaking across the country leaving in its wake a coast-to-coast string of broken windows and shattered nerves.

Let's dump this ill-conceived project and use the money to come up with the quiet engine. And while you congressmen are at it, how about consideration being given to a longtime proposal of mine to give the U.S. surgeon general's office power to regulate jet noise? It's going to take a medically oriented agency to understand the significant physiological and psychological effects of jet noise on the helpless sufferers on the ground.

More than 60 years ago Dr. Robert Koch, Nobel Prize-winning bacteriologist, warned: "The time will come when man must fight merciless noise as the worst enemy of his health."

It would not be melodramatic to state that time is just around the corner.

The Federal Aviation Agency, which has scandalously disregarded the public interest to play ball to the air industry, has demonstrated total insensitivity to the problem and inability to solve it.

I also urge that further consideration be given to another old proposal of mine—the creation of a wetport five miles out in the Atlantic Ocean to take the traffic away from congested areas. And how about considering the construction of the metropolitan area's fourth major jetport at a place like Stratford Shoals in the Long Island Sound just off the Connecticut coast. Two projects that are breathtaking in scope but well within the realm of the American technological genius.

And finally, permit me to make a pitch for membership in the National Organization to Insure a Sound-controlled Environment—NOISE. Founded last year this group, which I head as national president, aims to act as a pressure bloc on the national level to speak with one voice for the millions in the country who daily suffer the intolerable burden of jet noise. Municipalities, organizations and individuals from coast to coast are joining our ranks. Several of the congressmen here today addressed our organization in Washington shortly after it was formed last fall, so you know what I'm talking about.

Gentlemen, the people who must live under the planes—and I notice that their numbers increase daily—are growing restless. The air industry has stated it feels it cannot survive if it must spend large sums on noise suppression. I submit to you that, if I gauge the mood of the people correctly, the air industry will not survive unless it moves forthrightly to curb the horrendous screech and roar of its jet engines.

STATEMENT OF GLEN COVE MAYOR-SUPERVISOR ANDREW J. DI PAOLA

Congressman Wolf and members of the congressional committee: As Mayor and Supervisor of the City of Glen Cove, which lies in a holding pattern for Kennedy Airport and in the flight path for LaGuardia Airport, I want to thank you for sponsoring this hearing to focus on the problem of jet noise pollution, which is affecting the physical and mental well-being of so many of our Nassau County citizens.

The whining scream of the jets, as they zoom hour after hour over our homes at minute-and-a-half intervals, as you well know, has made life in the summertime virtually intolerable for residents of many of our communities from the south to the north shore and across the breadth of the island. Our people are running out of patience and, I say to you, that the Federal Aviation Administration has run out of time.

Gentlemen, the Federal Noise Abatement Act, which you played such an important role in enacting into law, was signed by President Johnson on July 24, 1968, exactly two years ago. What has happened since this act decreed that the administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall prescribe standards for the measurement of aircraft noise and sonic boom and shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he may find necessary to provide for the control and abatement of aircraft noise and sonic boom?

The answer, as you know all too well, is exactly nothing has happened. The airlines insist that muffling jet engines is too costly and they will continue to fall back on that argument just as long as the governmental agencies with the power to order them to reduce noise refuse to exercise that power.

It took the FAA, until November, 1969, more than one year after the law was passed, and after considerable prodding from public officials such as yourself, to even admit that

it was technically feasible to reduce jet noise. At that time, the FAA promised to issue new regulations in 1970, limiting noise from the most widely used planes such as the 707. But Mr. John Shaffer, the FAA administrator, said that it would take two years to write such rules and another four years to fit these planes with noise suppressors.

At the same time, the FAA approved its first noise abatement regulations which would govern the new jumbo jets, with one very jumbo exception, the 747. The FAA said that noise regulations won't apply to them until January 1972 . . . at which time 90 percent of those on order will be already flying.

I say to you that the FAA is flouting the law of this land, the FAA has committed a betrayal of the public trust, it is apparent that the FAA has failed to regulate in the public interest. It is time for a full scale investigation of the FAA by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and by the Senate Commerce Committee. Mr. Shaffer's 8-year timetable for enacting a duly promulgated law of the land must be subjected to scrutiny and to re-ordered priority.

It is high time that regulatory agencies started to regulate the industries they are supposed to regulate in the public interest, and stop acting as apologists for them. The FAA is not the only regulatory agency that should come under congressional review. We must ask what has been the role of the port authority and of the civil aeronautics board in defending the public interest. Again, the answer is that the airlines industry is not complaining.

I would like to ask the representative of the port authority here today to tell us what criteria are used to determine if there is an over-abundance of service to a particular area. What is the need for three airlines running planes to Chicago every hour from all three airports, if there aren't that many passengers going to Chicago every hour? Why do we need so many half or three-quarters empty jets going to Miami during the summer months? Friends of mine who saw their son off on a teen-tour to the west, three weeks ago, told me that when they got to the airport the tour leader couldn't tell them exactly what flight the boy was going on, because they were going student standby to Denver. They needed a flight with 37 empty seats to accommodate all the kids. If they couldn't get on one, they would get on another, because there were so many leaving within one hour, mostly empty.

If the airlines are not going to be compelled to make their flights quieter. Perhaps they can be compelled to make them fewer. I can think of no quicker method of reducing jet noise than simply reducing the number of jets in the air, and at the same time serving the public, both on the ground and in the air, better. Why are planes now stacked a minimum of one-hour on almost every take-off and landing out of LaGuardia and Kennedy? Who is looking out for public safety and sanity? Why can't night flights be curtailed, as you have asked, and is done in so many other airports? Are these trips necessary?

The whole matter of C.A.B. assignment of routes should be re-examined. The C.A.B. demands that minimum service of routes be enforced, but what about maximums?

I call on the port authority to institute an immediate freeze on the number of flights in and out of the New York airports and to come up with a feasible reduction plan that would provide noise relief for people on the ground and relieve take-off and landing trauma for people stacked up in flights in the air. I ask that this be done before there is the kind of accident which the air controllers have told us could easily happen in the overworked skies above our heads. Let us investigate, for once, before a tragedy.

Obviously, long range solutions are needed,

too. The wetport, which has been talked about for the past few years, could become a reality, if we re-ordered our priorities and made it the must-do project it should be; a fourth metropolitan area jetport, if some nearby willing community can be found, would help, provided we did not again let every airline duplicate the services it is already providing at Kennedy, Newark and LaGuardia from the new port; and condemning land for corridors, as has been suggested along some of the Kennedy-Airport areas in Queens, could provide some long-range relief.

However, we cannot wait for these solutions, drastic action is required now. If the Federal Government is ready to spend billions in public money to develop a supersonic transport for the airlines, it ought to be able to compel the airlines to spend some money for homeowners who live under the flight paths to get a decent night's sleep; and it ought to be able to compel the regulatory agencies to see that the airlines do it.

TESTIMONY OF PETER A. KORN

Congressmen Wolf, Addabbo, Brasco and Biaggi. My name is Peter A. Korn, City Manager of the City of Long Beach, New York. I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before you to speak on the deafening and deadly problem of jet noise pollution.

Because of Long Beach's proximity to J.F.K. International Airport, jet noise pollution has become an alarming problem to our community. The greatest impact of the super-jet age is being felt in communities like ours, which are contiguous to Kennedy Airport, where the greatest number of domestic and international flights originate and terminate. By mid-1970, no less than 19 airlines will be operating out of Kennedy with "747" flights, in addition to fleets of 265-passenger tri-engine air buses.

This increased air traffic will intensify the disturbances currently plaguing our population and will cause even greater disturbances to television reception, schools, meetings and religious services and the basic process of living. It will also impair the sleep of countless Long Beach and South Shore residents, affecting their health and hearing and, quite possibly, as the meagre scientific knowledge is beginning to indicate, reduce their very life span.

In the City of Long Beach, our Jr. High School graduation was disrupted by overhead aircraft noises. Churches and Synagogues must interrupt their services, and judges have been unable to be heard while conducting court. People are being disturbed time and again by countless and continual noise attacks from planes. Sleep has become a nightmare. When jets approach Kennedy Airport, all thinking and living processes become suspended while sensory perceptions are tuned to the deafening sounds of the jet engine roar, and when that eases, we tune in on the distant roar of the next approaching plane 50 seconds away. The problem of jet noise pollution in Long Beach has become so prevalent that many individuals have requested something be done about it. One such individual said, "There are times when some planes, either by their size, speed, or altitude, create a sort of concussion when flying over our house—to the extent that we feel as though a blow has been struck on the roof." This condition is intolerable.

Many aspects of our society are to blame for this problem. Aircraft and engine manufacturers are at fault because they have spent more money and time on extending the life of the 707's and developing the 747's and subsequent jets, instead of refitting aircraft engines with silencers. Our Federal Administration is at fault for not creating and enforcing adequate laws, and eliminating unnecessary air flights.

Gentlemen, the time for studies, meetings and hearings is past. The time for immediate action by our Federal Representatives is here. I therefore urge you to initiate the necessary legislation for the effective control and abatement of jet noise pollution plaguing the City of Long Beach, all of Nassau County, and the rest of our Nation.

In conclusion may I say that we recognize we are three months away from the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November? All we ask is that you maintain the intensity of your devotion to this cause later in the year and in the years ahead. We only ask that you "love us in December as you love us in July."

Thank you for this opportunity to speak before you.

STATEMENT BY DONAL M. MAHONEY

We in local government are deeply concerned about the total assault of the human senses of all forms of pollution—be it odor, aesthetics, or noise. A growing pattern of complaint is coming into Town Hall from residents in many areas whose outdoor living style has been curtailed because of repeated noise bursts coming from low-flying jets, and who are finding their sleep disturbed because of the cacophony. Unfortunately we have no answers and no available genie to force airplanes to disappear.

The problem of jet noise is not one with which local government can effectively deal. We can certainly add our voice of complaint, and in so doing bring whatever prestige we may have to bear. But for some positive action and relief we must appeal to the Federal government in the form of the Federal Aviation Authority, and to our representatives in the United States Senate and Congress.

We urge that Federal monies in sufficient quantity be allocated for research that will produce engines much quieter than those now being used commercially. We do not feel cutting down on engine power in landing and take-off, as is reported now, is wise from the standpoint of safety of passengers.

We urge that immediate attention be given to the practicality of building landing and take-off strips out into the water, thereby removing the sound impact from the populated areas surrounding metropolitan airports on the eastern and western seaboard. In the process of investigating the feasibility of such action, we might also direct the attention of the Federal government to the use of inert refuse for creating the bulwark of such strips, thereby assisting not only in the battle against noise pollution but in the battle against waste disposal.

And we urge that the FAA come up with a pattern of landing and take-off which utilizes water approaches to the maximum and creates a fairly distributed radial pattern for the balance. No single community should be forced to bear the brunt of an ever-increasing air traffic necessary to our way of life.

In speaking as a representative of the Town of North Hempstead, I am well aware of the fact that a local municipality cannot offer substantial assistance in solving the problem. We do, however, wish to officially go on record in offering whatever positive assistance and governmental machinery we can. The assault on the eardrums and nervous systems of metropolitan area residents must be halted.

STATEMENT BY MAYOR WILLIAM R. FLEISCHER

The opportunity to address you gentlemen today is much appreciated. I have long desired to get all those responsible for our jet noise problems together in one room.

On Memorial Day weekend of this year, succeeding waves of aircraft, operating at intervals of 45 seconds to 1½ minutes and

at an altitude of approximately 1500 feet, proceeded to bombard the residents of East Hills and the Greater Roslyn area:

This bombardment continued for approximately 19 consecutive hours during the course of just one day and consisted of whining, shrieking, deafening, frightening, threatening, penetrating and shrill noises.

These noises were of such intensity that it was impossible to carry on a normal conversation in one's own home.

These sounds were of such intensity that any attempt at outdoor activity became an endurance contest, with our residents as sure losers.

These noises were of such intensity that we found it impossible to carry on normal living under these circumstances.

This intolerable condition proceeded on an almost continuous basis throughout the month of June.

In the past, East Hills and the Greater Roslyn areas have had more than their share of aircraft noise as a fairly steady diet. But we have never been subjected to such an incessant and concentrated barrage. This community is not requesting that we be isolated from jet noise at the expense of others. We have, however, asked answers to these specific questions.

Why, commencing with the Memorial Day Weekend, were we the target of hordes of aircraft flying at approximately 1500 feet? . . . this never occurred before.

Why have we been the target of identical occurrences at periodic times since then? . . . this never happened before.

Why has this community been selected? We are not in close proximity to Kennedy Airport. We were here long before the airport came into being. Our residents deliberately chose to move into East Hills and the Greater Roslyn area to achieve a peaceful, suburban atmosphere away from all forms of air pollution.

These questions are not unique to our area. These are the same questions that most cities and many villages are asking throughout the country.

We have received an explanation from the FAA with regard to why many more aircraft than usual appeared in our area. The explanation given was that a computer "fouled up", resulting in Runway 22, which immediately affects this area, being used as much as 19 consecutive hours during a 24-hour period.

The FAA, very recently, recognizing that we were getting more than our fair share of noise, has stated that they would attempt to reduce the use of Runway 22 to no more than 8 hours in any 24-hour period. While we appreciate this relief, this is small solace, Gentlemen. I submit, that accepting this pledge given us by the FAA in good faith, that 8 hours is far too much . . . that 4 hours is much too much . . . that any prolonged overflight of any duration is totally unbearable.

Obviously, then, the ultimate solution is not moving the noise from one community to another or alternating the noise pattern. This is not a local problem but is, in fact world-wide.

Let me quote from a recent letter to Senator Charles Goodell, written by George M. Garry, Director of the FAA:

"We have attempted during the past ten years to procedurally reduce the impact of aircraft noise on the communities and we find that we have practically exhausted any further major relief techniques than can be realized through such efforts. It is our belief that only through further technical advances at the noise source and through additional efforts by local officials in the management of efficient and compatible land use can further relief be forthcoming."

Gentlemen, you have the authority to require the airlines to retrofit present aircraft

and set a time period for its accomplishment. But how can you realistically set this standard when no such suppressant device exists at the present time?

Why hasn't the FAA and the Congress moved vigorously to develop a noise suppressant device in order to retrofit present aircraft? We fully understand that the 747 and the DC-10 are not quite as noisy as the older aircraft. However, the noise levels from these newer planes are still shattering.

Why hasn't the FAA and the Congress moved to develop a quiet engine for future aircraft? We have noted that under the auspices of NASA a quiet engine project is on stream and is supposedly to be accomplished by 1972.

In this context, the Congress empowered the Federal Aviation Administration in July 1968 to issue aircraft noise standards, stating further that any proposed regulation must be economically reasonable, technologically practicable and appropriate for the particular type of aircraft and aircraft engine. In November 1969 the FAA regulations were amended to limit the noise levels for future subsonic airplanes. The FAA has stated that they are preparing similar regulatory action to limit the noise from subsonic aircraft and the current jet fleet even though the latter may require extensive and expensive modifications. Let me quote from a letter written by Dr. John O. Powers, FAA Acting Director of the Office of Noise Abatement, written to a resident of East Hills:

"We realize that what we have accomplished to date does not reduce the noise you experience every day, but we have taken the first step forward to prevent further escalation of the aircraft noise problem and are proceeding toward reduction of the noise levels you are now experiencing."

I submit, Gentlemen, that all these are just beautiful words . . . that in fact you are bogged-down. . . . The procedure for noise abatement is going at a snail's pace and, at that, I am being extremely generous.

Continuing at this rate of progress, I predict that every citizen of the United States in the not-too-distant future would have to live underground in order to escape from the aircraft noise pollution.

Our population is on the increase.

According to the United States Bureau of Census, our current population as of May 1, 1970 is 205,022,000.

As of 1975, their projection is for 219,366,000.

As of 1980, 235,212,000.

As of 1990, 270,770,000.

The use of air travel is increasing by leaps and bounds. Efforts at placing a fourth jetport within the New York-Metro area and in fact, similar efforts at sites throughout the United States, have been stymied because people throughout our country are appalled at the destruction of our environment. Our citizenship cries out for an end to environmental pollution. This, inevitably, leads to one conclusion.

The FAA and the Congress must enact a crash program to develop a noise suppressant device to retrofit present aircraft and to develop a quiet engine. This must be done now.

It is past time for lip service. It is past the time when we can permit the airline industries to dictate our policy. The FAA, Congress, and all of our elected representatives, must assume the leadership role and insist that this emergency program be accomplished now.

You gentlemen, must put the muscle behind this request. Communities throughout the United States object vigorously to this crushing invasion of their privacy and request and, in fact, demand your immediate assistance and cooperation in obtaining prompt relief from this unendurable situation.

For our part, we intend to pursue this matter at every level until such time as our objectives are achieved.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM D. DENSON

I appear here as a Mayor of the Village of Lawrence, New York, a community that has been endowed by the good Lord with scenic beauties and natural facilities not possessed by other communities. In short, the Village of Lawrence is a most desirable place to live. It has but one detraction. It is within the path of the planes that take off and land at Kennedy airport.

Your continued efforts to alleviate the intolerable noise nuisance suffered by all of our residents demands my respect and the fervent hope that you will continue these efforts.

Kennedy International Airport—contiguous to our Village borders—represents a noise factor that menaces the health of everyone, regardless of age, in our community—but the greatest sufferers are the young school children and the aged, the former because of the constant and increasing din during their school hours, when teachers must pause every two or three minutes to allow planes flying overhead to pass, so that their pupils can hear. At night, their study hours are interrupted and their sleep disturbed. The aged, who certainly are entitled to the peace and quiet of their homes, are shocked out of their normal and needed rest hours. Conversation, meals and rest must be at the whim of the flow pattern of shattering aircraft noise, which emanates from the planes landing and taking off at two minute intervals.

Our open Board of Trustees meetings, held publicly in the Village Hall at stated times, must be governed by the constant interruption of airplane noise, and a meeting which should take not more than two hours, runs double that time because of the airplane noise which forces each speaker to await for the planes passing, so he can be heard.

We now know, through Mr. John H. Shaffer, the FAA Administrator . . . "that noise around major airports would grow steadily louder in the foreseeable future, despite the promise of quieter planes now in production."

Please believe that as the Chief Executive of Lawrence, I can testify to the fact that these noise levels long ago passed the bearable limits, and alleviation of this nuisance represents the firm resolve of all the municipalities who are so endangered. We seek the aid of any agency—private, governmental, or civic, in our attempts to combat the evil thrust upon us.

There was a time before the problem had been properly researched during which it was thought that no abatement of the noise level was possible without sacrificing safety. For this reason the Courts accepted the evil along with the supposed advantages of an air transport system. But now it is apparent that the progress of science has alleviated the noise condition by utilizing devices known as suppressors. These suppressors are expensive and according to the airlines are prohibitive when considered in relation to the return received upon the investment made by the airlines.

It is thus apparent that relief, to a large degree, is boiled down to a matter of dollars and cents. If it is *not true* that the employment of sound suppressors is economically not feasible, then the airlines should be required to equip their planes with these devices and end the intrusion made by the airlines upon the individual rights of the citizen to peace and quiet. On the other hand, if it is *true* that the utilization of noise suppressors is not economically feasible then the responsibility for relief lies at the door of the Federal Government, because the Courts have held that the control and conduct of the airlines

is a matter that lies exclusively within the province of the Federal Government and not subject to Town or Village control. Since this control is within the province of the Congress of the United States it is up to the Congress of the United States to alleviate the problem which it has seen fit to impose upon our citizens.

This relief may take the form of a Federal subsidy to aid these economically impoverished airlines to meet the financial responsibility that would be required to equip present planes of the airlines with the noise suppressing devices. This Federal aid is a small price for the Federal Government to pay in order to rectify the invasion of the private rights of the citizens of Lawrence and other areas adjacent to busy airports. This aid should be considered as a part of the price the government must pay in order to insure pre-eminence in the field of air transport.

The first thing required is for Congress to exercise a more direct control over the implementation of the legislation that has been passed to handle the noise abatement problem. The legislative process is not without teeth sufficient to achieve a consummation of the purposes sought by the legislation that it passes.

The second most important aspect of the solution to this problem is to require the airlines to utilize those scientific aids which have been developed to abate the insufferable noise presently emitted by the planes.

Finally, the third and perhaps the most important aspect of the problem is a sympathetic and fair disposition by the Congress of the apparent, but not real, conflict between the rights of the airlines and the rights of the individuals whose interest they are to serve.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM D. DENSON,
Mayor.

INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF GARDEN CITY,

Garden City, L.I., N.Y., July 28, 1970.

The Honorable LESTER L. WOLFF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLFF: Thank you for your letter of July 23, 1970 advising that you have scheduled a hearing at 9:30 a.m., July 31, at the Nassau County Board of Supervisors Chambers in Mineola on the subject of jet noise and inviting me to submit a statement in behalf of the Village of Garden City.

Although Garden City is not directly in the Kennedy or La Guardia Airport traffic patterns, deviation from those patterns often results in our Village being subjected to jet noise of considerable magnitude. My wholehearted sympathy is with the residents in those communities directly in the flight patterns and of closer proximity of those airports. It is my understanding that the jet noise problem will be compounded and become even more severe as larger planes are put into service.

The Village of Garden City joins with its neighboring communities in urging that Congress and the appropriate federal agencies bend every effort to bring about a solution to this serious problem of jet noise.

My best personal regards.

Very truly yours,

FREDERICK H. SCHNEIDER,
Mayor.

VILLAGE OF GREAT NECK ESTATES, Great Neck, N.Y., July 29, 1970.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,
Nassau County Board of Supervisors Cham-
bers, Mineola, New York.

DEAR MR. WOLFF: I regret very much my inability to attend the meeting on July 31. The problem of jet noise is one which has been

receiving increased attention in our village. We have had many letters complaining about the annoyance caused by the re-routing of air traffic to La Guardia.

Our village has been represented at several meetings of the Town-Village Aircraft Safety and Noise Abatement Committee held under the direction of Ralph G. Caso, Presiding Supervisor, Town of Hempstead and we are very much in accord with the goals of that organization. We heartily endorse the action which is being taken by the Attorney General's office against the Port of New York Authority and the various airlines.

With best wishes for success in the campaign against jet noise, I am

Respectfully,

JEAN MARGOULEFF,
Mayor.

VILLAGE OF NORTH HILLS,
Manhasset, N.Y., July 30, 1970.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,
156A Main Street, Port Washington, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLFF: Thank you very much for your letter of July 23rd, 1970 relating to the proposed hearing to take statements from the Federal Aviation Administration, the Port of New York Authority and members of the Nassau County Board of Supervisors relative to jet noise and its associated problems.

This is certainly a problem which we in the Village are deeply concerned about. However, unfortunately, the Mayor will be out of the country at the time of the hearing and will not be able to attend. He has asked me to write this letter to you and express his regrets.

Very truly yours,

JOHN P. CLEARY,
Village Attorney.

WHAT IS THE TRUTH?

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday morning I read in the newspaper that a former aide to President Kennedy claims that the President was ready to withdraw from Vietnam in 1963 but did not because he feared the political consequences here at home.

Mr. Speaker, that is indeed an interesting statement. It says, in effect, that President Kennedy was more interested in saving his political hide than he was in the lives of American soldiers.

I have been waiting for 2 days for someone to refute what Mr. O'Donnell has said. But the only thing we have is the public record, which shows that time after time President Kennedy said there was a need for the United States to support South Vietnam.

Are we to believe now that what the President said publicly was not so and that only Kenny O'Donnell knows the truth? And are we to believe that he has disclosed this out of a high-minded sense of history and not because he is running for public office.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure when President Kennedy made Kenny O'Donnell his closest confidant he never, never knew where Mr. O'Donnell's ambitions would take him. With friends like this, any President may be better off isolated.

SUPREME COURT NEEDS PORNOGRAPHY RULING

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, down in Texas our neighbors have become more and more concerned about pornography. As one good friend said the other day, "I can remember way back in public when air was clean and sex was dirty."

But sex in the public life, in the movies, on the newsstands, has no limits today.

Our forceful editor, Felix R. McKnight, summed it up forcefully in his analysis of July 22 in the Dallas Times Herald.

Here is McKnight's comment on pornography:

The other day in Boston Municipal Court a judge sentenced a defendant for selling dirty, pornographic literature—and the words of Chief Justice Elijah Adlow could be the catalyst of a national explosion.

Justice Adlow leaned over the bench to tell the defendant, and a nation, that, in effect, he didn't give a tinker's damn about U.S. Supreme Court decisions on obscenity.

"I refuse to live by rules made by men who have lost their heads by being elevated too high," he said. "The Supreme Court has put its endorsement on filth and we in this city will continue to entertain a little decency . . ."

Judge Adlow's defiance reflects a formal expression of the feelings and opinions of a vast number of American citizens.

A big majority of normal folk are being pushed around by endless court maneuverings built upon thin personal opinions handed down by some members of the Supreme Court.

It is this majority of five, sometimes more, that interprets "art" and "social value" into filthy films and dirty publications. It makes it all legal, even if clothed in see-through dress. And it breeds permissiveness that is gnawing at a nation's morals.

It is this sleazy, protective arm that gives arrogant "courage" to a young hippie couple sprawled on the University of Texas campus mall—"courage" to lie wrapped in a blanket, gaily toss it off to expose an act of sexual intercourse as a group of visiting high school delegates to a statewide meeting pass nearby.

It is the binding decision by the highest court that hammerlocks City Atty. Alex Bickley of Dallas as he attempts to rid the city of so-called "theaters" that show cheap, motel-made 16mm films that are nothing more than sordid shots of sex acts.

There are Bostons and Dallases all over the country going through the same frustrating experience of attempting to fight obscenity.

It takes direct, forceful action such as has been recently displayed by Dallas Dist. Judges Snowden Leftwich and Owen Giles to bring obscenity cases to the test stage.

Courts and juries should deliver the final decisions in orderly process of law. It is not for newspapers or private citizens to pre-judge or pre-empt constitutional rights. But we can applaud when a court enforces its contempt powers and also directs that evidence upon which to base decisions must be produced in the courtrooms.

Nor do we believe the high court will be unheeding to such a point. Some recent decisions have encouraged observers to feel that the Supreme Court itself may have felt that it has gone too far—may be ready to cut back on some of its more permissive rulings. It is about time.

GALLAGHER POINTS TO TWO EX- AMPLES OF RISING CONCERN OVER PRIVACY

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the Louis Harris poll released on Monday, August 3, states that 34 percent of the American people have concern about invasion of privacy. I believe that when I began my privacy studies in 1964, that figure would have been considerably lower, for as I have often stated, my fundamental purpose has been to create a climate of concern in which effective measures could be taken to protect this precious and, unfortunately, rapidly disappearing right. As an indication of just how much privacy Americans have lost, I take pleasure in inserting in the Record the cover story of the July 27 Newsweek, Entitled "The Assault on Privacy," it points out in compelling terms the extremely interdisciplinary nature of the privacy invaders. It also contains strong evidence for a major, fully funded, and fully staffed congressional effort in the area of preserving Bill of Rights guarantees. I have offered such a proposal: House Resolution 717 to create a Select Committee on Technology, Human Values, and Democratic Institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to read these two documents as additional reasons for the Congress to launch a major effort to assure that freedom will be the birthright of future generations of Americans, as it was the birthright of this generation.

THE ASSAULT ON PRIVACY

SNOOPS, BUGS, WIRETAPS, DOSSIERS, DATA
BANKS—AND SPECTERS OF 1984

At the age of 54, Sigmund Arywitz was a healthy American success story. He was making \$30,000 a year as executive secretary and treasurer of the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, his family was sound, his reputation high on all counts, and he had just finished eight prestigious years in Sacramento as state labor commissioner under Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown. But something was awry. In the space of one year, five Los Angeles department stores refused Sig Arywitz charge accounts, and a major car-leasing company turned him down for credit—even though he had a walletful of oil-company and other credit cards and had always paid his bills on time. "At first I was furious," Arywitz recalls. "I am in a sensitive job, the question of my reliability and integrity is important. I knew I had good credit. But after a while I relaxed. I figured that if the department stores didn't want my account, the hell with them. My wife wouldn't spend as much."

But the puzzle—and the cloud—persisted. An agent at a second car-leasing firm told him, "Well, with your job and salary, we'll take a chance on you despite your bad credit rating." What bad credit rating? "You've sure got a lot of lawsuits on file against you," the agent explained. Given that clue, Arywitz used his influence to pry loose from the car-leasing company the source of the credit slur. And then it all came out. During his eight years in Sacramento as labor commissioner, Arywitz had been listed for the record as the plaintiff or defendant in hundreds of lawsuits

filed by or against the state labor department. All this time, deep in the innards of a Los Angeles credit bureau, some benighted sleuth was sloping daily through the law journals, noting that a surpassingly feisty citizen named Arywitz had got jammed up in yet another colossal legal action. The credit bureau sold its "information" to every local institution that asked for a credit check on Sigmund Arywitz—namely the five Los Angeles department stores and two car-leasing companies.

In the circumstances, and given the happy ending, the whole incident could be looked at—and laughed off—as a mostly comical contretemps between modern man and his complex society. But encounters of the sort have proliferated to a point where the elemental right to privacy stands in serious danger—where some concerned Americans are in fact asking whether it may not be dying. Over the past twenty years, the U.S. has become (partly of necessity and mostly for good reasons) one of the snoopest and most data-conscious nations in the history of the world. Big merchants, little merchants, tax bureaus, police organizations, census takers, sociologists, banks, schools, medical groups, employers, Federal agencies, newspapers, motor vehicle bureaus, insurance companies, clubs, mail-order houses, credit bureaus, pollsters, advertisers, mortgage lenders, public utilities, the armed forces—every blessed one of them and scores of other organizations have been chasing down, storing and putting to use every scrap of information they can find about all 205 million Americans, singly and in groups.

The country could not function as it does without this activity. Poured into huge computers, swapped with mountains of other data from other sources, tapped at the touch of an electronic code button, these vast reservoirs of personal information make it possible for government to collect taxes, for banks and schools and hospitals to serve millions of customers and students and patients, for restaurants and airlines and stores to extend immediate credit to people they've never seen before.

But somewhere in the roil of expanding population, vast economy, foliating technology and chronic world crisis, individual Americans have begun to surrender both the sense and the reality of their own right to privacy—and their reaction to their loss has been slow and piecemeal. "The individual is being informationally raped," says Dr. Arthur Miller, a University of Michigan law professor whose career has been given over to the defense of privacy. "The government, credit bureaus, the police and others have their fangs in this guy. They each have their piece of information about this guy, and he doesn't have access to the information."

Rape, of course, is a scare word, and designedly so. But the case file is thick with data supporting Miller's view:

Stephen Blumenthal, a clerk at the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Richmond, Va., told the Senate judicial proceedings subcommittee recently that he and his fellow employees enjoyed listening in on subscribers' phone calls. "Some of the deskmen would cut in on the local chapter of SDS to see what was happening," Blumenthal said. "I liked to monitor whorehouses."

Leon Sanders, a 40-year-old radio newsman, was stuck with a bad-risk reputation in 1964, when the credit bureau of Greater Shreveport erroneously reported that his car had been repossessed—and kept on reporting it despite three letters to the contrary from the Ford Motor Co. Sanders left Louisiana and moved from Dallas to Waco to San Antonio, dogged at every step by the bum credit rap. In San Antonio, when a Ford dealer repossessed a car simply because he had heard about the earlier "repossession," Sanders sued him. But the dealer was a major ad-

vertiser on the San Antonio radio station where Sanders worked, and the station fired Sanders. Finally, Sanders gave up and moved back to Center, Texas, his boyhood hometown. "It's made it almost impossible to live in a contemporary society based on credit," he said last week. "We had to live on a pay-as-you-go basis. But I'm okay now in Center. People here have known me all my life and they take my word over that of some credit company."

Mrs. Tomlin Brown, head of the Avis G. Williams branch of the DeKalb County, Georgia, public library, was approached two weeks ago by a man with Internal Revenue Service credentials and asked to identify "users of certain militant and subversive material"—books on explosives, for example, or biographies of Che Guevara. Mrs. Brown replied that her records were kept on microfilm and that it would take hours to pull out a few names. Well, could she keep a record in the future by "flagging" certain dangerous books? "At that point I hit the roof," Mrs. Brown said. "People who come into my library are not going to have to worry about somebody telling Big Brother." IRS denied that its men had ever requested names of readers of "subversive" material, or that the agency was conducting some kind of national reading surveillance. But librarians in Milwaukee, San Francisco and Kansas City soon came forward to say that they had been asked for similar information either by IRS or their local police. "The library's records are public," an Atlanta IRS man argued, and T-men routinely consult public records. Had IRS stopped to consider whether it was invading anybody's privacy? "It never even occurred to us," said the IRS man. "We've done so much of this in comparable situations, and there's never been this kind of furor."

The list of abuses swells. In recent months, whole new mountains of dossiers have piled up alongside the older, quasi-legitimate lodes of information. The U.S. Army was discovered to be keeping a file of ostensible potential disturbers of the peace (Joan Baez, Dr. Benjamin Spock, the NAACP) in addition to its 7 million routine files on the loyalty and criminal status of every present and former soldier, civilian employee or contractor. In California, Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Co. declined last week to say whether it was monitoring more or fewer calls than the 27 million private calls it monitored in 1965. The Retail Credit Co. of Atlanta, which is mostly in the business of supplying confidential reports to employers and insurance companies, fattened the total number of files in its inventory to 70 million; the Hooper-Holmes Bureau, Inc., which concentrates without exception on derogatory information, keeps 9 million dossiers.

Even these compendiums may prove to have been small, rather primitive beginnings. TRW Credit Data, a computerized subdivision of TRW Inc. based in Anaheim, Calif., is adding 50,000 new files a week to its present hoard of 40 million and expects within five years to have a dossier on every American who ever applied for credit anywhere. And in Washington, NASA has awarded Honeywell, Inc., a contract to develop a laser-storage technique that will allow one 4,500-foot magnetic tape to record and instantaneously feed back the equivalent of twelve pages of information apiece on every single person in the U.S. "In a very short time everyone's life and history will be available at the flick of a computer button," says Prof. Andre Moenssens of Chicago's Kent College of Law. "We may end up with 1984 long before we actually get there."

The traditional, largely unarticulated Anglo-American notion of privacy has been threatened repeatedly since the end of World War II, not because Big Brother has been getting surlier but because the technology has been getting more acrobatic. Three separate information-gathering tools—elec-

tronic-eavesdropping equipment, psychological testing and the electronic computer—have come to maturity in the past two decades, and each of them opens up a new box of heretofore unavailable data.

Or at least generally unavailable data. Repressive governments have been snooping on their citizens from the time of the Spartan secret police and the Roman Empire's *frumentarii* down through the Inquisition, Napoleonic France and on to today's totalitarian states. It has always been possible for a government (and more recently a corporation, or an angry wife's lawyer) to put together a remarkably complete dossier on an individual—by tailing him, searching all records, talking to his friends and enemies. But this process is enormously expensive and time-consuming. And one used to feel a bit flattered and *distingué* to rate a dossier.

In the past two decades, good old American ingenuity and know-how have democratized the process and brought the dossier within reach of the common man—and his wife. Along the way the U.S. has badly clouded its position as a nation whose citizens have always been automatically guaranteed certain large measures of privacy. The Constitution itself makes no mention of any right to privacy, but the highest courts in the land have always assumed it: the Supreme Court in 1880 forbade even Congress from looking into "the private affairs of the citizen," for example, and much more recently the Warren Court used the unwritten doctrine of privacy to void state laws prohibiting the dissemination of birth-control information.

There is no libertarian so staunch, however, that he does not recognize that the claims of privacy change with society. "The idea that privacy can't be invaded at all is utopian," says Charles Fried, a professor at Harvard Law School. "There are amounts and kinds of information which previously were not given out and suddenly they have to be given out. People adjust their behavior and conceptions accordingly."

The central question is whether Americans have been pushed and cajoled into changing their behavior and conceptions too much too soon for their own good—whether they have succumbed too pliantly to the debatable charms of wiretaps, in-depth questionnaires and other up-to-date invaders of the body private. It is a subtle matter. "There is no great mastermind putting this together for some malevolent purpose," says New Jersey Democratic Rep. Cornelius E. Gallagher, the House's foremost defender of privacy, "but the tendency with rising technology is to use it."

The government-approved telephone tap, cautiously employed during World War II to keep track of spies and saboteurs, is thought to have become so common a police and FBI practice by the late '50s that it was used against every corner bookmaker. Libertarians reacted with some indignation to these secret taps—especially after it got out that J. Edgar Hoover had kept a steady ear on the late Martin Luther King Jr.—and Congress specified in 1968 that the Justice Department, FBI and state and local police could use electronic surveillance only with a court order. Attorney General John Mitchell disclosed last week that his department has more than doubled the previous year's total of 33 court-ordered taps, but this figure is next to meaningless. State and local police also run their own taps: New York authorities alone admit having had 191 of them last year. The Federal government, moreover, reserves the right to tap secretly in the interests of "national security," and nobody (not even Hoover) has any idea how many phones are bugged in all in violation of the law. The only real protection for personal privacy is a spreading mistrust of telephones.

The advent of psychological testing was

another large postwar dubiety. It certainly seemed a good idea for schools to screen the hordes of bright new faces for signs of emotional trouble—if only to get help for those who needed it. It also made apparent sense for employers to weed out the zanies before they got on the payroll, if possible, and for the Air Force to keep the Strangeloves out of SAC. All this the test-givers promised to be able to do, as well as predicting which man could withstand stress, lead his troops through a coffee break and stay out of trouble with his secretary.

For a while the psychological accountants seemed ubiquitous, extending their services beyond the schools and business into government—where they ran into trouble. Congressional bulldogs—notably Gallagher in the House and Sam Ervin of North Carolina in the Senate—began getting wind of tests in which NASA employees were asked how often they shined their shoes and job applicants at two other agencies were quizzed on whether they had ever had sexual relations with animals. Form 89, a standard application blank, asked about bed-wetting; a State Department secretary was called upon to discuss her own constipation, if any, and possession by evil spirits.

Partly as a result of this sort of exposure—and partly from the discovery that psychological testing doesn't predict a man's performance terribly well—there has been a sharp curtailment of testing by government. In addition, several state governments have surrendered some important jurisdictions they used to assume—legal controls over the sexual lives of adult homosexuals, for example, are gradually being loosened, and abortion is rapidly becoming a private practice, not a criminal one. Largely because of Sam Ervin's wrath, the executive branch of the Federal government under Lyndon Johnson stopped twisting the arms of Federal employees to get them to buy savings bonds, and department heads stopped the practice of putting pressure on employees to give their free hours to designated worthy causes.

All of this represents a fairly enlightened decade's work on the barricades of privacy—and it leaves most persons that much less prepared for the massive flanking attack by that much-paragraphed miracle worker and friend, the electric computer. The computer itself is no enemy—merely an incredibly spacious, incredibly fast adding-machine-cum-filing-system. Without it, the whole nation would have choked on paper by now—or would have had to gear its prosperity back to the number of business transactions that could have been handled by nonelectronic means. Computers are superefficient, in their way. Santa Clara County, Calif., installed a central computerized system for county records, and found that certain property records were duplicated in no fewer than thirteen different county departments—at who knows what cost.

Unhappily, it is the very speed and range of the computer that has made it such a menace. A computer can store—and call up at an instant's notice—billions of items of information, and this is equally true whether it is doing high-speed calculations for astronomers or (through recently developed computer "languages") keeping files on the personal idiosyncracies of thousands of business employees. And it is the nature of an institution, government or private, to use this kind of capacity just because it's there, in a kind of spiral of self-justification. "As information accumulates, the contents of an individual's computerized dossier will appear more and more impressive and will impart a heightened sense of reliability to the user," Professor Miller has written. "A computerized file has a certain indelible quality."

Just how indelible is the stuff of hundreds of contemporary horror stories. An agent for Atlanta's Retail Credit Co., the largest of the rent-a-dossier companies, testified to a Sen-

ate subcommittee in 1969 that he was expected to complete sixteen investigations a day, allowing 10 to 15 minutes per file on such questions as whether the subject is a heavy drinker, whether he takes part in "radical movements and demonstrations" and other information of a highly subjective nature. Despite the likelihood of errors, Retail Credit has always done its best to prevent subjects from correcting (or even seeing) their own dossiers. Until 1968, businesses or insurance companies had to promise not to reveal where they got their information. After some embarrassing hearings before Gallagher, Retail Credit deleted that clause from its contracts but wrote a letter with its new contracts saying blandly: "We, of course, are not suggesting any substantial departure from established business practices. If people were sent to us indiscriminately, this would impose a considerable problem and need of additional time."

Some victims of these self-assured dossier companies have been scarred for life. Mike Goldgar, now 51, was chairman of two companies, including a string of Southern retail stores called Dejay Stores Inc., nine years ago, when Dun and Bradstreet put out a misleading credit report on him. When D&B continued to circulate the reports, Goldgar phoned the company president in New York—thereby calling down a vendetta on himself by infuriating D&B agents in Atlanta. A memo saying "He really started something by calling Brackett" (D&B's president), went into D&B files in Atlanta, and by the end of 1962 D&B had finished Goldgar.

When Goldgar took a Caribbean vacation, Dun and Bradstreet hinted that he would not return. They wrote a false letter to New York University requesting information under the guise of a "national security" check. Finally they engineered a phony bankruptcy petition against Dejay, in effect ruining the company's reputation so thoroughly that it really did go bankrupt in late 1962. Goldgar and his companies sued and finally won \$6,610,000 when the case came to trial last year, but Goldgar's health is bad, his savings are badly depleted, and Dun and Bradstreet is still fighting the verdict in court.

Even without the sort of malice that came down on Goldgar, thousands of citizens are harassed, humiliated and victimized by the failure of computerized companies to keep up the human side of their rapidly expanding operations. An electronic billing error by a credit-card company or an oil company inevitably draws a protesting letter from the customer, but these firms have clerical resources for dealing with only a fraction of the complaints. So the questions go unanswered, the computers keep spinning out the same unjust bills (automatically enclosing ever rougher threats as time goes by) and finally the whole thing gets turned over to collection agencies whose only function is to get the money. One credit-card holder, a 38-year-old Boston psychiatrist, just concluded a three-year battle with a major credit-card company over an entirely ectoplasmic \$3,000 charge. The company's agents telephoned the doctor scores of times while he was seeing patients, they sent a threatening telegram and numerous dunning letters. Even after he hired a high-priced lawyer, it took the lawyer eight months to get a straight reply from the company's lawyer—and even after the company acknowledged that the whole three-year nightmare had been its fault, it weasled (until after a reporter made inquiries) on paying the doctor's legal fees or promising him a written acknowledgment of its error.

Although computer foul-ups at the credit-card companies are common knowledge and large in number (Newsweek Sept. 15, 1969), local and regional credit bureaus routinely accept whatever information the credit-card companies give them—and the companies never seem to acknowledge error. Once the

deadbeat mark goes down against a citizen's name, it stays there, following him from state to state, summonable in as little time as fifteen seconds from the memory banks of the computers. What isn't summoned is the all-too-frequent explanation—that somebody mixed up two names or forgot to record a payment, or that the computers went bonkers.

With a few exceptions, the major credit bureaus have resisted attempts at regulation, have decried the proposal that they send out copies of credit reports to those affected (as British companies are routinely required to do by law), and have discouraged anything that would allow victims to come in and correct their own files. While residents of Illinois can delete wrong information if they happen to hear about it—and the New York and California legislatures are considering similar "fair credit" bills—in most states the bureaus still go unregulated and unchallengeable.

The miraculous speed and capacity of the computer are good for recording a great deal of information other than a man's credit-card bill. The average American trails data behind him like spoor through the length of his life—school records, health, tax and Army records, employment records, mortgage and business records, marriage and divorce records, legal records, sometimes even a few newspaper clippings. In earlier, less cluttered days, all these measurements of a man's performance were compartmentalized, scattered and most likely incomplete, and he could leave a bankruptcy or a nervous breakdown well behind him if he chose. The computer complicates that. To demographers, sociologists, cops, statisticians and government planners of all kinds, the computer seemed to radiate a data-filled dream, an informational Valhalla in which everything that was known about everybody would be consigned to one purring bank of magnetic tapes, tended by the priests of computer systems analysis. This also happened to be a dream that gave most libertarians and members of Congress the runaway trembles, however, and the proposal for a National Data Center was fairly forcibly laid to rest in 1967.

The matter is trickier than that. Even Ralph Nader, who pays for his hotel rooms by cash when he checks in rather than own a credit card, speaks up for the government's right to collect data. "With a complex society we can't make intelligent policy decisions without information," he says. "We've got to have data. The issue is to separate individual names from simple data." With and without separating the names, government on all levels has in fact been linking up computers in many different departments and agencies. Twenty-five states exchange computerized tax data with IRS; the National Crime Information Center runs a two-way information flow with state police in 48 states and with most large cities. The FBI also takes 25,000 reports a year from private credit bureaus, and IRS the same number. "Government has greatly increased its use of computers," says Professor Miller, "and they have pushed toward compatibility. In point of fact, we do now have a National Data Center."

As critics feared, government everywhere has been less than tender with the rights of citizens in its files, especially in the essential matter of removing names from data. The FBI transmits "rap sheets"—criminal bookings—between local and regional law-enforcement centers and FBI headquarters. "Some 30 to 40 per cent of the FBI's rap sheets show arrest records, but not reversals or court acquittals," says Arthur Miller. "As far as the rap sheet is concerned, the man has a record. And the way things work even now, credit bureaus can get their hands on those rap sheets." Ironically enough, the one government agency that has always been scrupulous in regard to privacy is the Census Bureau, but even Census ran into heavy

criticism for its long list of questions this year, notably the one about bathroom facilities. The criticism is perhaps a mark of the times; the question on plumbing is not only a valid one (it gives the best measure of the nation's standard of housing) but also appeared on the 1960 census without disturbing anyone at all.

State governments seem to be even less fastidious than Washington. The California Department of Motor Vehicles sells for 40 cents an item to all comers most everything it knows about California autos and the people who own them—name, address, age, sex, physical description, marital status, driving record, make and license of car, even whether the driver needs glasses. Eleven private California firms take space in the DMV building (three of them, including Bank of America, rent-free), and some of them are in the business of sort of pretending to be state agencies—reselling 40 cents information for \$2 an item. Auto-insurance companies also make enthusiastic use of these records.

Many private information-gathering agencies are as slipshod as the worst government bureaus, of course, and some are a good bit more venal. One Chicago outfit, called the American Security Council, keeps a card file of 6 million names, including "peaceniks, draftcard burners, pseudo-intellectuals"—all in all, according to its brochure, the "largest private collection on revolutionary activities in America." (Maybe so, maybe not: the Church League of America, based in Wheaton, Ill., says it has a million more names on file than ASC—a treasure trove including anyone who ever "wrote an article attacking and ridiculing a major doctrine of the Christian faith or the American way of life.") ASC is tax-exempt and abnormally respectable—its members include National Airlines, Inc., Sears, Roebuck and Co., Quaker Oats Co., at dues up to \$1,500 a year—but its real business is blacklisting. "Some of our members have contracts to the Department of Defense, and they have to be able to show that they have done the proper checking on their employees before they are hired," says ASC administrative director William Lambie. Despite the damage it can do to purse and reputation, ASC refuses to let subjects see their files or correct mistakes. Says Lambie: "It would drive us absolutely nuts if we had people coming in all the time to check their files."

All these public and private Everests of unchecked, unchallenged and mostly unregulated personal records call out clearly enough for some sort of cogent set of standards and guidelines to operate by. "Eventually we have to set up an agency," says Sam Ervin, "to regulate the computers like the ICC regulates transportation—an agency that can regulate what goes in, who has access, standards for removing derogatory information." A tough new bill in the House, sponsored by Missouri Rep. Leonor Sullivan, would correct many credit-bureau abuses, but it may be too tough to get out of committee. Gallagher himself has two vigorous bills before the House, but it would be a help in the meantime if his colleagues would just vote him some money. He has fought the lone fight for privacy for five years on a single Congressional appropriation of \$65,000, the most economical campaign since Joshua's at Jerico. Several private institutions have study projects going on the subject—notably one headed by Columbia University Prof. Alan Westin for the National Academy of Sciences.

It may be that privacy will turn out to be an irresistibly clean political issue, like environment. "A civil libertarian is just as interested as a states'-rights man like Strom Thurmond," says Arthur Miller hopefully. Whatever the politics, the essential nobility of the cause shines clearly enough. A man needs to know, as the late legal philosopher Edmond Cahn wrote, that there is a private

place where he "can resume his native stature . . . away from the haughty state, the frown, the putting forth of the finger, and the oppressive policings of social order. He can open his collar there and can give vent to his own particular daydreams, his mutterings and snatches of crazy song, his bursts of obscenity and afflatus of glory."

HOW TO STOP WORRYING AND LOVE THE COMPUTER

In an endearing little book called "The Analytical Engine," published six years ago, the physicist and science writer Jeremy Bernstein recalled the career of Charles Babbage, a wondrous nineteenth-century English mathematician, engineer and genius of sorts who devised the cowcatcher and the speedometer and who once wrote to Lord Tennyson: "Sir, In your otherwise beautiful poem ['The Vision of Sin'] there is a verse which reads

*Every moment dies a man,
Every moment one is born.*

It must be manifest that if this were true, the population of the world would be at a standstill. In truth the rate of birth is slightly in excess of that of death. I would suggest that in the next edition of your poem you have it read—

*Every moment dies a man,
Every moment 1 1/8 is born . . .*

I am, Sir, yours, etc."

Such a man was heaven-sent to invent the high-speed digital computer, and in fact Babbage did his best. He spent the last four decades of his life in a monomaniacal attempt to build an Analytical Engine that could perform every single arithmetical function without any human guidance except the feeding of instructions and the throwing of the switch. For all the ungainliness of its gears, levers and cranks, Babbage's machine was almost unbelievably sophisticated. Like most modern computers, it was designed to have four interconnected parts—a memory bank, a computation section, a control center and what we would call an input-output system. And the whole thing was to be programmed with punch cards, a method that a Frenchman had devised to control the machine-weaving of rugs.

Babbage's thinking had outraced the world's technology; what he really needed to make his engine go, was the vacuum tube—which wasn't invented until 1906. Even then, the tube sat around unheeded by mathematicians until the urgency of complex war projects led them to try to put together a machine that would do huge computational jobs at unprecedented speeds. The vacuum tube was ideal because its circuitry is changed from charged to uncharged, from "one" to "zero," in a millionth of a second—and a large enough number of these changes, in controlled sequence, could manage any computation. ENIAC I appeared in 1946, and Sperry Rand's UNIVAC I made the computer famous when NBC used it on election night in 1952 (and called the result on the button).

Bits: In 1954, the world's first business computer (a UNIVAC) was delivered; today the worldwide total is probably more than 100,000 (two-thirds of them in the U.S.). Computers still deal only in two numbers—one or zero—but the giant new machines approach speeds of 1 billion "bits" per second, a hundred thousand times faster than UNIVAC. Miniaturization has enabled the machines to store incredible amounts of information on small magnetic disks or tape, and computer "languages" permit them to "talk" to human programmers on punch cards and to handle complex sequences of instructions.

Computers almost never make mistakes on their own, but they are helplessly dependent on the reliability of the information

and instructions fed into them. When the Beachslick Oil Co. sends you a wrong bill, the reason is that the computer got fed a punch card carrying wrong information—either because the key-punch operator made a mistake or because he was misinformed. When you then write back to protest, Beachslick's keypunch operators can only search your envelope for your check—if any—and punch the amount you've sent into the machine. The machine matches your payment against what it had been told earlier you owed; if you haven't paid up, the machine spews out another bill the next month. All your arguments fall on deaf ears, because neither the computers nor the key-punch operators have been programed to deal with them.

Ploys: Still, you are not quite helpless. A cabal of computer mathematicians at Harvard has worked out several ways of wiping out the machines entirely, plus a couple of gentler ploys adaptable to general use. It does no good to jump up and down on the punch card in your golf shoes before you send it in, because the operators will just punch another card. But, some dataphobes suggest tearing the card in four pieces and stapling it to the corner of a letter sent by registered mail to Beachslick's president. More subtly, say the Harvardmen, you can simply make a couple of random holes in the punch card, exactly the same size and shape as the other holes, and send it back as usual. The computer, they say, will check your altered card with its own memory tape, will notice the discrepancy and will get very nervous. If your friends are all doing the same thing to their Beachslick punch card, so much the better. Move the extra holes around from month to month, say the thinkers; the idea is to create an impression of many random, nonpersistent errors in the computer. Says one of the Harvards: "They'll get paranoid. Many random mistakes are the industry's Achilles' heel. This system will work to destroy them."

It may even work so well that Beachslick Oil will hire some real humanoids to answer your letters.

INVASION OF PRIVACY WORRIES 34 PERCENT: POLL

(By Louis Harris)

One in three Americans (34 per cent) feels that his privacy is being invaded, that people are trying to find out things about other individuals that "are not any of their business." Heading the list of suspect practices are "computers which collect a lot of information about me," "businesses which sell things on credit" and "the government when it collects tax returns."

The issue of the invasion of personal privacy has become the subject of Congressional investigations and widespread comment. It has been claimed that with growing computer storage capabilities, dossiers on individuals could in effect be kept on a whole roster of information, thus threatening basic rights guaranteed under our system.

A large majority of the public (62 per cent), however, does not share these apprehensions. The minority in a nationwide cross section of 1362 who expressed worry did so over a widely diverse list of alleged invasion of privacy, differing considerably among persons in various walks of life. (The remaining 4 per cent were "not sure.")

The groups in the population who complain most of their privacy being violated can be found in the South, among men and among those with the most education. Persons in smaller towns tend to be concerned more than those in big cities. Here are some of the principal areas in which some Americans said that they felt their privacy was being invaded:

One in five (19 per cent) answered in the affirmative to the question whether he felt his privacy violated by "computers which

collect a lot of information about you." Computer data banks are a worry mainly among the affluent sector, those with a better education who live in the suburbs.

On the other hand, businesses which demand information before giving credit, a source of worry to a comparable 19 per cent, are singled out to a much larger degree by low-income whites and blacks.

Peeping Toms, "people looking in your windows," are a source of discomfort to 17 per cent of the public, but mostly to young women who live in cities and in suburban areas.

Highest concern about possible government prying through tax returns, singled out by 17 per cent, can be found among those with higher incomes and older people.

But "people listening in on your telephone conversations," suspected by 15 per cent of the public, is most worrisome to young people who live in rural areas where party lines are still used.

The U.S. Census, which is being taken this year, is viewed as an invasion of privacy by 14 per cent of the public, but is particularly a concern of Negroes and persons who live in small towns.

Public opinion poll-takers are thought to be a threat to privacy by one in ten, but particularly trouble Southerners and voters who classify themselves as independent in their politics.

Social Security forms worry 8 per cent of the public, but are believed by blacks to be an invasion of privacy much more than among white people.

To determine specific concerns over privacy, people were asked: "Do you feel your privacy is being violated by the following?"

SPECIFIC VIOLATION OF PRIVACY

[In percent]

	Is violated	Not violated	Not sure
Computers which collect a lot of information about you.....	19	71	10
Business which sells you things on credit.....	19	75	5
The Government when it collects tax returns.....	17	79	4
People looking in your windows.....	17	80	3
People listening in on your telephone conversations.....	15	81	4
People overhearing your conversations with other people.....	15	81	4
The Government when it takes a census.....	14	84	2
Employment interviewers.....	11	83	6
Neighbors who gossip about your family.....	10	86	4
Public opinion polltakers.....	10	86	4
The Government when filling out social security cards.....	8	86	6
Hotel and motel phone operators.....	6	80	14
People over you in your work.....	5	90	5

SENATOR KENNEDY'S ROLE IN SETTLING THE GRAPE STRIKE

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY's work in achieving an amicable settlement to the California grape strike is just now becoming public knowledge. Senator KENNEDY's contributions were many, ranging from getting grapes back on the shelves of chain supermarkets to providing medical atten-

tion for the strike leader when a back disorder took him out of negotiations.

A column by Richard Stewart, published August 2 in the Boston Globe, outlines Senator KENNEDY's role in ending the strike.

Mr. Speaker, I put Mr. Stewart's column in the RECORD at this point:

KENNEDY ASSIST FOR GRAPE PICKERS

(By Richard Stewart)

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Edward Kennedy has quietly played a behind-the-scenes role as a mediator between the table grape growers and grape pickers in California.

Partly through his efforts, a large percentage of the grape growers in the state have now signed contracts with Cesar Chavez, grape pickers allowing for collective bargaining, raising wages and contributing to health and welfare funds.

Through his contacts in the business community, Kennedy has also encouraged several of the major food chains to once again display on their counters the table grapes that are shipped in boxes marked with union labels.

The key to whatever success can be attributed to Kennedy's work in the negotiations is the fact that he had friends on both sides of the issue.

One was Chavez himself. When Chavez was bedridden with back problems and unable to take an active role in the grape strike, Kennedy dispatched Dr. Janet Travell, former physician to President Kennedy, who got Chavez back on his feet.

The other was one of the state's biggest, and most successful table grape growers Lionel Steinberg of Riverside, Calif. Steinberg, a Democrat, had been active in President John Kennedy's election campaign in 1960.

It was Steinberg, who had long felt that the grape pickers had a right to collective bargaining, who first enlisted Kennedy's aid in May, 1969. But that initial effort failed when some of the pickers feared that a contract signing with only 10 growers might give the public the impression that the grape boycott was over. Chavez never did attend the month-long negotiations with a Federal mediator.

This spring, Steinberg decided to try to make a break-through on his own and enlisted Kennedy's aid for a second time. Kennedy appealed to Chavez to negotiate with Steinberg alone.

At 3 a.m. on March 30, Steinberg and Chavez signed the first table grape growers contract with labor.

Reached at his California office, Steinberg acknowledged Kennedy's role in the dispute. He said "Kennedy's knowledge of me and his understanding of the background in the strike probably contributed to Chavez' interest. He also established my credibility with Chavez."

Steinberg said Cong. John Tunney (D-Calif.) also figured in getting both sides together.

Soon two or three other growers agreed to sign and by the end of the growing season last month about 85 percent of the growers in the Coachella Valley in Riverside County had signed labor contracts.

Chavez' grape strike, Steinberg acknowledged, was "the most effective boycott in labor history." It had destroyed the Eastern markets at a time when inflation had imposed a cost-price squeeze on the growers.

The combination of the two had reduced the number of table grape growers from 250 in 1963 to 85 in 1969 and reduced the growing acreage from 13,000 to 8000 acres.

Another 700 acres have been taken out of production this year.

Convincing the large chain stores to once again sell the grapes—they were under con-

stant pressures from outraged citizens—posed another problem.

The chains feared they would be caught in a squeeze between the union and non-union growers and were reluctant to order the grapes. One of the biggest chains in the Midwest, the Jewel Co., refused to take any grapes.

But Kennedy initiated telephone calls to executives in several of the major chains such as Stop & Shop and A & P and they eventually agreed to take grapes packed in boxes with union labels.

Enough markets have now opened to union growers that this year grape growers were able to make a small profit.

The problem that remains is to educate the housewife to the fact that those grapes she now sees on store counters can be bought without any moral pangs.

And if she isn't sure, she can always ask. Kennedy aided Chavez again in June during a strike by Chavez forces against the cantaloupe growers.

The strike was being nullified because Mexican laborers were being used to harvest the crop despite the fact that the state of California had certified that a labor dispute was in progress.

Chavez enlisted Kennedy's aid to block the use of the Mexican "scab" workers.

Kennedy called the Immigration department and within one hour every port of entry from Mexico was closed to Mexicans destined for the cantaloupe fields.

TEACHER'S DAY ESTABLISHED

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most significant factor in the future of our Nation is education. Teachers play a major role in shaping the thoughts, ideals, and goals of our youth; they shall, to that extent, determine the direction of our society. The city of San Jose and the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors have made a significant gesture toward the recognition of the critical role played by teachers in our society by setting aside a day to honor our teachers for the contributions they are making to our national welfare every day of the year.

The following are the resolutions passed by these bodies setting aside September 28, 1970 as "Teacher's Day:"

TEACHER'S DAY COMMITTEE,
San Jose, Calif.

Mr. EDWARDS: Here are two copies of proclamations by city & county. If you do not already have and would like additional information, please let me know.

SUE HUGHES,
Teacher's Day Coordinator.

PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF SAN JOSE

Whereas, Teachers are the engineers of the future of our nation, who are entrusted with the important job of formulating the thoughts and ideals that help determine the future of our children; and

Whereas, They are responsible for the guidance and direction influencing the desires, ambitions and goals of young minds; and

Whereas, Because of the great responsibility facing teachers, we feel that recognition for their outstanding work among the young people of today is long overdue;

Now, therefore, I, Ronald R. James, Mayor of the City of San Jose, do hereby proclaim September 28, 1970, as "Teacher's Day" and urged the citizens of San Jose to recognize the contribution that teachers are making to our national welfare.

RESOLUTION OF THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Whereas, the teachers in our public and private schools have the immense responsibility in our society of educating the youth; and

Whereas, the quality of this education is primarily dependent on the ability and dedication of the teachers.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Clara that it does hereby proclaim September 28, 1970 as Teachers Day in order that this community may honor its teachers.

GEORGE SZELL—1897—1970

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the greatest conductor since Toscanini is dead. George Szell has joined those musical immortals whose heartstrings are a lute. He had only to raise his baton to erase for his listeners, through the magic of music, the sorrows and troubles of the world.

Tributes in many languages and from men and women in all walks of life are pouring in to honor George Szell's memory. We in Cleveland who took such tremendous pride in having this man of genius in our midst find it difficult to reconcile ourselves to the loss of one who made music a rampart against the cacophony of these strife-filled times.

Both of our Cleveland newspapers have been eloquent in honoring his memory. I am pleased to associate my own sense of bereavement with their impressive eulogies:

[From the Cleveland Press, July 31, 1970]

SZELL LET MUSIC SPEAK FOR HIM

(By Frank Hruby)

We heard of George Szell's death as we drove home from Blossom Music Center last night where the Cleveland Orchestra under his colleague, Pierre Boulez, had just completed another of its Blossom Festival concerts.

It seemed unbelievable that the man who had put Cleveland on the musical map of the world and who had been so very active until just a few weeks before his death, was gone.

My last conversation with him, one of several during the orchestra's concert tour of Japan in May, was typical both of his directness and his confidence that his music would speak for itself.

As we stood in the lobby of the Hotel Osaka Grande (I was about to leave for Cleveland while the orchestra finished its tour) I asked him if he had a word or two for his public back home.

"No," he replied without a moment's hesitation, "your reviews of the orchestra and its reception here will say all that is necessary."

In his last press conference—in front of about 15 Japanese newspapermen and another 10 photographers—he appeared somewhat tired. But then, so did everyone else,

for the orchestra's overseas plane had been three hours late the night before, then landed at another city, requiring a two or three-hour bus ride into the small hours.

Even so, he fielded the questions gracefully. Whenever a question came along that involved a value judgment of his own work, he deftly avoided it by referring to someone else in the Cleveland party.

He appeared to be in particularly good form for the opening Japanese concert in the Osaka Festival Hall. It went well, as has been reported, and this was reflected in his demeanor as the concert drew to a close.

As he came back for encores and bow after bow he was delighted that his orchestra had moved the usually stolid Japanese to a standing ovation.

It was a good sign, he said after the concert, that the tour would be an artistic success, which it was.

Thus George Szell goes to his reward, the sound of his success and that of the orchestra almost literally still ringing in his ears. It was a success he carefully masterminded for the orchestra during his 24 years here.

A grateful Cleveland which watched him change a fine orchestra into a great one will indeed miss him.

GEORGE SZELL—A MASTER BUILDER

(By Jim Frankel)

George Szell was a builder in both the spiritual and physical senses. His particular gift was his ability to do both so well.

On coming to Cleveland in 1946 his first task was to rebuild the orchestra, which had been experiencing instability following the departure of Artur Rodzinski.

But painstakingly and, perhaps to some, ruthlessly, he built a new orchestra man for man.

He expected virtuoso performances from each player, because only through superb musicianship could he faithfully convey a composer's intentions to the listener.

And thus the Cleveland Orchestra began to acquire the reputation it has today.

"The so-called Cleveland sound is a homogeneous, chamber-music sound—a classically noble string tone perfectly blended with singing woodwinds and exquisitely clear brasses," wrote Joseph Wechsberg in the New Yorker magazine two months ago.

"Szell has so forcefully emphasized lucid phrasing and clear articulation that these have become second nature for his orchestra," Wechsberg added.

The passion that guided Szell was the highest fidelity to the composer's truth. He never ceased studying scores, always searching scores, always searching for the essence of the composer's meaning. It was a rare combination of intellectual power and emotional sensitivity.

This was Szell, the spiritual builder.

But George Szell also was canny enough to know that good music needed audiences, and that to build audiences, organization was important.

After succeeding in fashioning his vast symphonic instrument, he decided a permanent chorus was necessary. So he imported the nation's top choral conductor, Robert Shaw, who developed the Cleveland Orchestra Chorus. This expanded the repertoire, added glamour and musical excitement—and produced sell-out crowds.

Then there was the interior of Severance Hall. Acoustically it was unacceptable to Szell in the age of phonographic high fidelity. So the faded blue carpet was removed and the stage reshaped so the sound of music would have the highest fidelity possible. It was a wondrous change.

Szell also was mindful of the next generation. He felt that the children deserved the same high standards as he set for adults. So he changed the leadership of the famed children's concerts.

This was one of Szell's more painful acts

in Cleveland, but in his search for musical truth he felt it was necessary.

Finally, there is Blossom Music Center—the great physical monument to Szell the music builder. It was just two years and 10 days before his death that he conducted the opening concert in what has been described as the most sophisticated summer music pavilion in the world.

It is a fitting house for the orchestra that Szell built.

George Szell died on a Thursday night—the orchestra's big night of the week—while his men were performing at Blossom.

Even in death, George Szell was the master of precision and timing.

[From the Plain Dealer, Friday, July 31, 1970]

FEAR, ADMIRATION, AWE STIRRED BY

SZELL'S BATON

Dr. George Szell was the last of the old maestros. He was the last survivor of the Beecham-Koussevitzky Reiner-Toscanini generation of stern orchestral disciplinarians who earned from their players admiration for their musicianship along with fear, respect and awe for their tempers.

Dr. Szell was born in Budapest June 7, 1897, to an upper middle-class Hungarian-Slovakian couple. His father was head of a company that provided private-police protection for the city's gentry.

His interest in music showed early. It was said that at four he would slap his mother's wrist when she struck a wrong note on the piano. It is certain that he began serious study at 7, and soon was known by the admiring nickname of "The New Mozart."

He studied in Vienna and Leipzig with such greats as pianist Richard Robert and composer Max Reger. One of his fellow students under Robert was the youthful Rudolf Serkin, who later became a favorite Szell partner in concerto performances.

Szell made numerous public appearances as a child prodigy pianist and already was beginning to compose music, too. Then one summer when he was 16 he was at the summer resort of Bad Kissingen when the conductor of the visiting Vienna Symphony fell ill. The young Szell, who had been hanging around the orchestra, was asked to conduct. He did, and continued for more than 57 years.

It was composer Richard Strauss who persuaded the teen-age Szell to take up conducting as a career. Strauss also opened doors for him, securing for him his first post as conductor at Strasbourg in 1917. There followed posts in Darmstadt, Dusseldorf and finally Prague.

Most of his own compositions date from those days. There was a symphony, lyric overture, piano quintet, rondo for piano and orchestra (which he played in public at the age of 11) and, most notably, a set of variations for orchestra on an original theme (his wife later was to call this one "very Straussian and well put together.")

Szell reached the conducting big leagues with a post as assistant conductor at the Berlin State Opera, which he held from 1924 to 1929. In 1927 he began teaching in Berlin's Hochschule fur Musik, and was, at the same time, guest conducting all over Europe.

His career as a pianist had not been neglected. At 17 he had played the Beethoven "Emperor" Concerto with the Berlin Philharmonic and he was becoming increasingly known as a Mozart player.

In 1929 he accepted a post as head of the Prague German Opera and held it for eight years, gradually widening his guest conducting appearances. He had made his American debut in 1930 as guest with the St. Louis Symphony.

Like so many other German musicians, Szell felt the political pressure building up with the rise of Hitler to power. He went to Glasgow in 1937 to assume leadership of the Scottish Orchestra, and never lived year-round in Germany again. (He never saw his

parents again, either. Presumably they died in a Nazi concentration camp, since the Szells were Jewish).

The Scottish Orchestra disbanded after about a year, and Szell spent the 1938-39 season conducting in Australia. He drifted back to the United States and was marooned there by the start of World War II.

These were lean years for the Szells. He had married Helene Schulz in 1938. It was his second marriage, a previous one having ended in separation.

To keep alive Dr. Szell accepted a teaching job in the opera workshop of New York's New School for Social Research and also taught theory at the Mannes College of Music.

His big break came when Toscanini invited him to guest conduct the NBC Symphony. It was the first assignment in America to match Szell's growing international stature. From that point his career traveled in an uninterrupted upward path.

His next big break was his debut on the podium of the Metropolitan Opera House. The opera was "Salome" by his former patron, Strauss. The date was Dec. 9, 1942. He stayed at the Met for four years, giving widely acclaimed readings of Wagner and Strauss, plus fine performances of "Boris Godunoff," "Don Giovanni" and "Otello."

In 1946 when Erich Leinsdorf, after completing his Army service, decided not to seek reappointment as conductor of the Cleveland Orchestra, Dr. Szell, who had made a deep impression in guest appearances during Leinsdorf's absence, was offered and took the job. He left the Met's regular staff, though he continued guest appearances there until 1954.

He saw the Cleveland position as an opportunity to take a good orchestra and mold it into exactly the type of ensemble he always had dreamed about.

This he proceeded to do after first demanding and getting complete artistic carte blanche from the orchestra's board. He increased the group's size over the years from 82 to 110 and relentlessly drove it until it broke into the Boston-New York-Philadelphia axis of America's top orchestras. He lengthened the Winter season from 18 to 26 weeks and brought to the orchestra the Szell hallmarks of absolute clarity of texture, perfect balance among the choirs and fidelity to the printed note.

Stories about his temper are legion—and many of them are true. His career path was marked by squabbles and the acid comments of those who had run afoul of him. His final break with the Metropolitan in 1954 was typical. He simply sent a letter to Rudolf Bing stating that under "present conditions" he did not wish to continue there, and that was that. The exact nature of the "conditions" never was explained publicly, but the break-off has been held up by critics of the Met as a perfect example of the company's failure to retain top-flight conductors.

Someone once remarked to Bing that "George Szell is his own worst enemy."

"Not while I'm alive," the quick-witted Met Opera manager replied.

In 1962 Szell started a transcontinental feud by abruptly breaking off a guest conducting stint in San Francisco and denouncing the city's cultural climate ("the worst I have seen in 50 years as a conductor.")

When culture-proud New York asked his opinion of the then spanking-new Philharmonic Hall, he called it "an insult to music" and suggested it be torn down. He once halted a concert at Severance Hall in mid-measure and scolded his audience for coughing too much. Only when the coughing subsided did he start over. He once caused a minor flurry at Severance by condemning as "trash" the music played at concerts for school children.

He did not hesitate to fire, on the spot,

the orchestra's well-respected first oboe, Marc Lifschey, after a rehearsal spat over Lifschey's intonation.

Szell sometimes was criticized for the conservative cast of his programs. He had, in his time, conducted a good deal of modern music, including the world premieres of operas like Rolf Liebermann's "Penelope" and Wener Egk's "Irish Legend", but he always relied heavily on the 19th-century Central European classics of Beethoven, Brahms, Dvorak and the like.

He once declared that it was his specialty not to have any specialty, but always to adapt himself completely to the intentions of whatever composer was before him. Once he remarked happily, "Every day new people come to life who have never heard Beethoven's Fifth. They are a small benefit of the population explosion."

Artists who played with and under him testify unanimously to his complete musicianship. A magazine once characterized him thus: "He remains an Old World personality, bridging two cultures and finding imperfect footing in the new one whenever he runs into anyone less serious and dedicated than he is himself."

He made a specialty of sight-reading at the piano the full orchestral scores of new music, a feat he drilled into the young conductors he brought to Severance Hall for training.

Each spring, as soon as the Cleveland season ended, Szell would head for Europe where he mixed golf and relaxation with a few guest conducting appearances. By arrangement with a string of hotels on the continent he got the same rooms each summer. For years he was a summer fixture at the famed Salzburg Festival.

Dr. Szell became an American citizen in 1946 and a resident of Shaker Heights in 1951. He enjoyed cooking, but found little time for it, and liked to refer to himself as a "suburbanite" and a Clevelander. Said he once: "We musicians are very fortunate, for we make our living doing the thing we like best to do."

When Szell took over the Cleveland Orchestra there were many who felt Cleveland would be a mere stepping-stone to the conductorship of the New York Philharmonic. His frequent and lengthy guest conducting engagements with that orchestra and the fact that he maintained an apartment in New York kept that rumor alive during his entire Cleveland tenure.

But he enjoyed nothing more than showing off his Clevelanders to sellout crowds of cheering New Yorkers on annual Eastern tours. When Leonard Bernstein resigned as conductor of the Philharmonic, Szell's name figured prominently in gossip about a successor. Szell did consent to become interim musical adviser to the Philharmonic pending selection of Bernstein's successor, but he never wanted the top job itself. It eventually went to Pierre Boulez, who also held the concurrent title of principal guest conductor in Cleveland.

Szell led the Cleveland Orchestra on four triumphant foreign tours—in 1957, 1965, 1967 and 1970. The greatest of these was the 1965 trip, a 10½-week journey through Russia and Europe. The three-week 1970 tour earned the orchestra great acclaim in music-hungry Japan at the Osaka World's Fair.

In his early years in Cleveland Szell made many public appearances as a pianist, but these were abandoned after about the middle 50s. Then in 1968 he suddenly appeared as pianist on a widely-acclaimed recording of Mozart sonatas with violinist Rafael Drachmann, his concertmaster at that time. The record showed that his gifts as a pianist were intact.

Szell's complete command of the Cleveland Orchestra muted any talk of an eventual successor. At various times in recent years the names of Stanislaw Skrowaczewski and

Boulez have been suggested, but both appear to be fully occupied with their own international careers.

Szell had been extremely active over the years as a recording artist and he leaves a rich legacy of recordings with the Cleveland Orchestra, the London Philharmonic, Vienna Philharmonic, London Symphony, Czech Philharmonic, New York Philharmonic, Berlin Philharmonic, the Concertgebouw of Amsterdam and other groups. A prized rarity of many collectors is a recording of two Mozart piano quartets in which Szell appears as pianist with members of the former Budapest String Quartet.

David Woolridge, in his 1970 book "Conductor's World," calls Szell "a musician to whom all compromise is utterly alien... But for all his dispassionate objectivity, there is about Szell a quality of the intellectual which is very engaging, and he will on occasion permit himself a certain dry humor which betrays a sharp sense of wit."

Perhaps the shrewdest summing-up of the Szell impact was made in this sentence by former Plain Dealer music critic Herbert Ellwell: "His reputation for being a severe disciplinarian has not brought him the kind of affection received by personalities of a warmer, more lenient nature, but nobody ever achieved distinction without rigorous standards."

SZELL'S DEATH CALLED LOSS TO MUSIC WORLD

Clevelanders last night mourned the death of Cleveland Orchestra director George Szell.

"The world of music has lost a great master," said Frank E. Joseph, chairman of the Musical Arts Association, who was with Dr. Szell when he died at the Hanna House of University Hospitals.

"The Cleveland Orchestra has lost a great conductor and I have lost a great friend."

Thomas Vail, publisher and editor of The Plain Dealer said, "Dr. Szell was a giant in the world of music and was the principal architect in making a fabulous orchestra one of the greatest in the world."

"His death will be deeply felt but the orchestra he helped to build is so great that it will continue on its high level as a tribute to him and to the people of Cleveland who supported him."

Mayor Carl B. Stokes said he was "deeply saddened by the death of one of Cleveland's finest and most renowned citizens."

Stokes said "the loss of Dr. Szell is most tragic, not only for this city which drew (upon) his talents and became internationally recognized as the home of the world's finest orchestra, but also to the world of classical music in which he so magnificently performed."

The mayor said "the heritage he has left us in musical enrichment will be an everlasting monument to this city and to his memory."

"I'm sure we all realize this is a great loss not only to Cleveland but to the entire world," said Francis A. Coy, president of the May Co. and a member of the board of trustees of the Musical Arts Association. "I'm going to miss him as a warm friend and an outstanding figure in the musical world."

"It's almost like living in 1865 when someone asks you about Lincoln's assassination," said Walter M. Halle, board chairman of the Halle Bros. Co., and Musical Arts trustee.

"This is one of the greatest losses to this community in its cultural area that we've had. He's a loss to the world as much as he is a loss to Cleveland."

"He has a most extraordinary influence from every point of view. His great forte was understanding and transmitting that understanding through his music. He had a way of imparting this to people he was directing which was unique in his field."

"It will be a terrible job to fill his place," said Walter K. Bailey, vice president of the

Musical Arts Association. "It's a great loss to the orchestra and to the city."

SZELL: HE TASTED GREATNESS

Few men did more to enhance Cleveland's reputation than did the late George Szell. To many people around the world he and the Cleveland Orchestra symbolized the city.

Szell brought musical greatness to Cleveland and he put that greatness on display every time he stepped on the conductor's podium in Severance Hall or in a concert hall anywhere.

Of all Cleveland's attractions, its symphony orchestra has ranked among the highest. Szell, more than any other person, was responsible for this standard of excellence.

His reputation was that of a stern taskmaster, a demanding conductor who would settle for nothing less than the best. This approach did not win him endearment, but it resulted in musical perfection. His flawless craftsmanship was widely admired.

In his 24 seasons as conductor of the Cleveland Orchestra, Szell rebuilt the ensemble according to his own rigorous specifications. Before coming here in 1946, he already had earned acclaim in his native Europe as a conductor and pianist.

Szell represented a link with the great maestros of the past. He was part of a generation of musical giants who have all but disappeared. His own career as a conductor was very much influenced by the famous composer Richard Strauss, who helped him get his first position.

Szell will be best remembered for what he leaves behind—the Cleveland Orchestra. Seldom has a richer legacy been left to a city.

[From the Cleveland Press, July 31, 1970]

PUBLIC SERVICE TO PAY TRIBUTE TO GEORGE SZELL

As a crescendo of tributes to George Szell from the world's musical greats were pouring into Cleveland today, plans for a public memorial service Monday at 4 p.m. at Severance Hall were being made.

Words of sorrow were expressed today by such music notables as Leonard Bernstein, Pierre Boulez, William Steinberg and Eugene Ormandy.

The full Cleveland Orchestra, which Szell so flawlessly maneuvered to world fame, will play at the memorial service.

The Szell funeral and burial will be private, and the family has suggested donations to the orchestra's pension fund instead of flowers.

Dr. Szell, 73, died at 9:50 last night at University Hospitals where he had been under treatment for a heart attack.

Though it was known that he had been ill since returning with the orchestra from a triumphant concert tour in Japan, news of his death while the orchestra was playing at Blossom Center last night stunned musical circles.

William Steinberg, the 71-year-old conductor of the Boston Symphony said, "The music world has suffered a great loss in the passing of George Szell, who was my life-long friend and colleague.

"We always were in close touch wherever we were. His utmost characteristic was that his was the greatest musical integrity and he did not hesitate to put this forth in whatever he undertook. His representation of the classics belongs to the exemplary expressions in our weird times in which musical values get shakier every day."

Steinberg will include the funeral march from Beethoven's Eroica Symphony in tonight's Boston Symphony Concert at Tanglewood, Mass. as a tribute to Szell.

Tonight's performance by the Philadel-

phia Orchestra of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony at Saratoga, N.Y. will be dedicated to Szell, Stanislaw Skrowaczewski will conduct.

Eugene Ormandy learned of Szell's death after conducting the Philadelphia Orchestra at Saratoga last night. Friends say Ormandy took the news very hard and had a difficult night because of it.

Ormandy said today, "The world has lost one of the great musicians, one of the great conductors and one of the great intellectuals of our time. And I personally have lost a dear friend."

Former secretary of state Dean Rusk said, "The loss of George Szell is a grievous one, not only for the people of the United States but for the entire world. He and his orchestra gave us an unforgettable evening in Washington when he came to help celebrate United Nations Day. It was only one of many rich contributions he made to the life of this nation."

"The world of music has lost a great master. The Cleveland Orchestra has lost a great conductor. And I have lost a great friend," said Frank E. Joseph, president of the Musical Arts Assn.

"We are all extremely saddened," said Associate Conductor Louis Lane.

"What Dr. Szell has meant to us as individuals will certainly be something we will want to live up to as long as we play," said Concertmaster Daniel Majeske.

"Dr. Szell's death means a great loss to the world of music; also, I have lost personally a good friend," said Pierre Boulez, the orchestra's principal guest conductor. "He helped my conducting career greatly." Boulez is now conductor of the New York Philharmonic.

HURRICANE CELIA

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I think everyone in this room should commend the Federal Government for the action it took in responding to the emergency situation created in Corpus Christi, Tex., by Hurricane Celia.

At the time the hurricane struck, Secretary of Commerce Stans, Small Business Administration Administrator Sandoval, and Chairman Castillo of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunity for the Spanish Speaking were in El Paso, Tex., attending a conference on minority business enterprise. President Nixon appointed Secretary Stans and Administrator Sandoval as his special emissaries and they were among the first to reach the scene.

Mr. Sandoval immediately declared the area an SBA disaster area. He called 75 people to the scene from other SBA offices. In addition to the regular office in Corpus Christi, four other offices were opened in the area. All were put on the alert to handle these special claims.

Secretary Stans immediately put full Economic Development Administration emphasis on helping the people in the area solve the problems caused by the hurricane. By special order, applications for EDA funds from the area were given privileged status.

Both Secretary Stans and Administrator Sandoval promptly reported their

findings from the inspection trip to President Nixon who immediately labeled the area a national disaster area enabling the people in and around Corpus Christi to benefit from all of the Federal Government's disaster assistance programs.

Further, Secretary Stans contacted Secretary Romney who dispatched HUD personnel to the site to help with the housing shortage and dislocations ensuing from the disaster.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my remarks today is to commend these two men and their agencies for the speed with which they responded to the needs of the people in the Corpus Christi area in this emergency situation. Needless to say, other agencies of the Federal Government, such as the Coast Guard and the Treasury Department, are doing a remarkable job in aiding victims in the area. But, these two agencies—Commerce and SBA—gave, it seems to me, exceptional assistance to the situation, at the very highest level, which I feel should be given recognition by the Congress and by the people of Texas.

ACCENTUATING PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, to cope with the problem of an increasing crime rate among the young, the suggestion has been made from time to time that the parents be held legally responsible for the violations of their offspring. One community, Madison Heights, Mich., a suburb of Detroit, has enacted such a law, and to date the results are promising.

The Baltimore Sun of August 1 carried an Associated Press story on the new approach in Madison Heights which I am inserting at this point in the RECORD:

JAIL THREAT TO PARENTS CUTS YOUTH CRIME

MADISON HEIGHTS, MICH., July 31.—Police are getting better co-operation from parents and the number of youthful repeat-offenders seems to have dropped since passage of a law making parents legally responsible if their children commit two crimes a year, say officials of this Detroit suburb.

Upon conviction, parents can be given a maximum penalty of 90 days in jail and a \$500 fine.

No parents in the middle-income community have been prosecuted since the law was passed in January. But, police, city and school officials say the effects of the ordinance are noticeable.

Police said they had no statistics yet, but that the law has produced a greater co-operation from parents whose children break a law.

Patrolman Bernard Michrina, in charge of the Police Department's juvenile detail, said that parents "who before came in my office and gave me greater resistance or refused liability for what their children have done, now seem to take better control of the family situation."

Patrolman Michrina said of the 100 juve-

niles brought into his office in a month, he warns the parents of about 5 of them about the law and the need to better control their children.

REPEATERS REDUCED

"My repeaters seem to have dropped off considerably," said Patrolman Michrina, who said that only one family had faced the possibility of going to Municipal Court on the charges.

The youth involved had committed some vandalism and then had been involved in a firecracker incident. The second charge, however, was not brought against the youth.

Mr. Michrina said after several talks with the parents, it ended up by them "saying they were glad we had" the ordinance.

Mr. Michrina said parents and youngsters disagree about the law.

"I found parents herald the law as wonderful and the majority of students think the ordinance is unjust and should be banned," he said.

Mayor Monte Gerald said he knew of no other city in the nation with such an ordinance.

NADER GROUP CITED

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, in the 5 years that I have been privileged to serve in this distinguished body, I have had the pleasure of working toward the same goals as Ralph Nader on several important projects.

Four years ago, our mutual concern was automobile and tire safety. Congress passed legislation requiring certain safety features on cars and minimum Federal safety standards for tire construction and durability. Ralph Nader was one of the leaders in that fight.

More recently, a project which I have worked on and which Mr. Nader has championed is the "air bag," an inflatable occupant restraint system, which protects riders in an automobile collision. His focus has continued to expand with the creation of the Center for Auto Safety and the Professionals for Auto Safety.

Mr. Speaker, Ralph Nader has continued to press forward with his efforts to represent the average citizen, the little man, who has at best a weak voice in Governmental regulatory processes. But more than that, Mr. Nader has worked to instill this constructive, public interest orientation in the youth of our Nation. An article in the Asbury Park Press for Sunday, August 2, 1970, offers an excellent insight into Mr. Nader's young people and their work. I wish to include this in the RECORD as a tribute to Mr. Nader and his "Raiders," but more importantly for perusal by my fellow Members:

NADER'S RAIDERS ARE INTERNS IN SERVING THE PUBLIC INTEREST

WASHINGTON.—Here comes the Nader's Raider, girded with justice and armed with virtue, rallying out to succor the Citizen in Distress. The knavish bureaucrat thinks on his misdeeds, and fear turns his bones to jelly.

Any young applicant who nurses that fan-

tasy about Ralph Nader's Center for Study of Responsive Law is put straight in a hurry. The crusader image gets in the way of work and the organization wants to shake it.

"It's not simply a matter of good and evil. You want to go beyond just catching somebody sleeping on a couch or stealing \$10,000," says George Locker, 20, of Ardsley, N.Y., who in the center's terminology is not a Raider but a summer intern.

He is one of 200, mostly students, who have been chosen from 3,000 applicants to spend 10 weeks or more scrutinizing big corporations and government agencies to see how well they serve the public interest.

But the center, a nonprofit institution with Nader as managing trustee, general overseer and adviser, has more in mind than studies. It aims to train and foster what amounts to a new profession, the public interest specialist.

"We expect these three summer months to be not simply an exciting interlude in the life of the student, but the beginning of a career of involvement," says a statement defining the program.

After a summer of digging, interns, project directors, and center staff members will compile reports on what they have found. Previous reports have often been sharply critical, but the center insists it is not after scandal.

"We don't go in looking for faults. That would destroy the spirit of objective research," says Phillip Volland of Buffalo, N.Y., an Oberlin College junior and an administrator for the summer program.

"We try to evaluate, and to be as objective and truthful as possible."

It is a sober approach, not attractive to the romantically inclined. An intern's day has all the drama of 16 hours with a government document, and often it amounts to just that.

Take the day of Locker and his roommate, Peter Adams, 22, of New York. They are friends from the State University of New York at Stone Brook, and both are working on one of the 15 summer projects, a study of the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation. Like many interns, they receive no pay from the center. They make do on \$600 each from a study grant.

Work begins with a visit to headquarters, a four-story brick house replete with turrets, staircases, and odd corners that recall some of the gothic governmental arrangements some researchers are probing. Then it's off to government buildings in search of books, pamphlets, files, and occasionally an interview with an official.

Like most interns, they find most officials and staff friendly and cooperative, sometimes a little professorial. The interns try not to alarm them.

"I introduced myself to one very nice gentleman and he said, 'Oh, what did we do wrong?'" says Locker.

"They sort of feel you're a cop. But I haven't met any openly hostile people."

"There is a lot of cooperation within the agencies," says Volland. "The people in the agencies are generally interested in finding out how effective they've been."

But the interns are told also that attitudes may change over the summer. Growing trust may encourage one official to open up; another may feel the researchers are getting too close for comfort.

A typical afternoon for Locker and Adams is devoted to digesting material gathered in the morning. One day's harvest for Locker, whose assigned specialty is the Reclamation Bureau's involvement in planning and building hydroelectric dams and generators, includes:

A two-volume Federal Power Commission survey, a copy of the FPC 1969 annual report, a treatise entitled "Federal Regulation of the Electric Power Industry" by the FPC, Proceedings of the National Electric Power Policy

Conference, a copy of the Federal Power Act and a statement of the FPC chairman before a Senate subcommittee.

In the evening, Locker and Adams read some more, compare notes and get to bed around midnight. That goes on seven days a week.

"The main difference between the weekend and the rest of the week is that you don't have appointments," says Locker.

One day for Barry Wilner of Short Hills, N.J., might begin at nearby Rockville, Md., talking with the man who lets research contracts for the National Air Pollution Control Administration. Wilner, a second-year law student at Georgetown University, and five other young lawyers, a scientist and a girl who knows mass transit, are framing a study of the government's dealings with "think tanks"—outside consulting firms.

The man gives Wilner a fat computer tabulation of contracts and a vacant office to sit in. Wilner picks 30 or 40 titles that look interesting, then goes into the contracts themselves.

Perhaps "Analytic Studies in Air Pollution," \$289,913, to IRW Inc., or "Study of Reaction Kinetics of Limestone-Dolomite with Sulfur Dioxide in a Disperse Solid Contractor," \$385,340, to Battelle Memorial Institute.

Wilner is not interested in the chemistry, but in the anatomy of the contract; how did it go to the contractor; how much was bid by whom; what kind of facilities and staff does the contractor have; what kind of record?

After four or five hours with the legal jargon, he goes home, writes a memo on what he has learned, any ideas he has had. Later in the evening, at 8 or 9, there is a project conference.

"I'm going to be living with this project much more intensely than I would with any subject in school," says Wilner. "It's a happy summer doing the work, but there's so much material to cover you really don't have time to do anything else."

What looks to the uninitiated like a small, well-defined area of inquiry has a way of mushrooming, Locker explains.

Starting cold in mid-June, Locker soon found he would have to learn not only about the Reclamation Bureau and power but about how the state and federal governments sell power, who pays how much for electricity, practices of the private power industry, licensing practices, the Tennessee Valley Authority. And he is just beginning.

"To master the whole thing is the equivalent of doing a Ph.D. dissertation in 10 weeks," Locker says.

"We'll be pretty tired by the end of the summer," says Adams. "There's always a nagging doubt that we're biting off more than we can chew."

The center itself has undertaken an ambitious summer. Two years ago there was one small task force; last summer there were 105 workers and five major projects. This year there are 200 interns, 15 projects in Washington, D.C., California, Georgia, Maine, and New York, and a budget of \$150,000, most of it in grants from small foundations.

How good are the reports? Detractors chuckle at what they see as a futile attempt to get to the bottom of a complex situation in a few months with a handful of relatively inexperienced personnel. They point out how easy it is for some organizations to cover up—either by withholding information or by offering it in such volume that it is impossible to go through.

A spokesman for the Food and Drug Administration, whose agency was accused in a recent report of laxness in enforcement and of general subservience to the food processing industry, said "another half year of researching and editing and they might have had something."

"In general, we think the report has a lot of things in it that were valid, a lot of things that were changed a long time ago, a lot of things that were being changed when the report was made and a lot of things that were just plain not true."

Asked for specific examples, the spokesman said he could not recall any.

Defending the reports, Theodore Jacobs, executive director of the center, says: "As far as not being able to do an in-depth study in 10 weeks, that's not our purpose. Experience has proven that we can get sufficient information to do an important study in the time given."

"There is so much available to say, that merely skimming the cream is enough to yield a sufficient and valuable study."

Observers point out that the FDA study whatever its limitations, brought to light many such items as the pigeonholed internal memo on cyclamates—dated about nine months before restrictions on the artificial sweeteners were imposed—in which an FDA scientist called strongly for curbs on their use.

Even critics acknowledge that the studies perform a service in informing the public, and charges of inaccuracy are rare. Nader himself points out that in his position he can't afford to be wrong.

The complaint heard most often is of moralizing and rhetoric in the reports, which at times lapse from clinical language.

A study of the federal air pollution agency, for example, characterizes President Nixon's support of a controversial proposed bridge over the Potomac as irresponsibility "almost on a par with the nomination of Judge G. Harrold Carswell to the Supreme Court."

But it takes more than simple scientific curiosity to attract intelligent people to months of slogging through data for a maximum sum of \$900 and an average of \$450. It takes a sense of mission.

"Something must be done," says Wilner, echoing the words of other interns. "Something has to be done to investigate this tremendous growing bureaucracy that's mismanaged with such consistency."

On the other hand, the interns are far from revolutionary madmen.

Interns are chosen for analytical ability, personability, awareness of social problems, expertise in some area and proven ability to work hard—including grades. Wilner is a Phi Beta Kappa, Locker, a B-plus student with varied outside interests. About 80 percent of the interns have done or are doing graduate work. They are interested in how things run.

"It's the structure that perpetuates what's wrong or what's right in America, rather than any individual political career," says Wilner. "You have to know how the structure is set up."

Wilner likes "dealing with concrete things rather than ideology. It's not going down in front of a bureau and demonstrating—although that has its efficacy. But I feel more comfortable working here."

The career pattern of public interest advocate has not yet emerged fully. But Wilner expects he will be dealing with something like urban affairs; Locker plans to go to law school and thinks of forming an organization similar to the center.

"Nader's working on social change in 10 to 20-year terms," says Adams, who is going on to graduate school in public administration. Most activist students, he says, "even the ones who are doing political action now, with some exceptions they aren't getting into political organizations for the long range."

"Nader is trying to persuade people that there are things that can be done—that change is not only not impossible but really not all that difficult."

"If you can learn to do this in 10 weeks," Adams says, "you can do it again."

LOUIS "SATCHMO" ARMSTRONG

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, at the recent Newport Jazz Festival in Newport, R.I., thousands of jazz lovers gathered from all over the world. They came to delight in and to enjoy this indigenous American music and also to celebrate the birthday of one its foremost practitioners, Louis "Satchmo" Armstrong.

Louis Armstrong was born in New Orleans, La., in 1900. For 70 years, almost, he has been playing the trumpet and earning the admiration and affection of millions of people all over the world. He is, indeed, our "Ambassador of Good Will," and it was fitting that he celebrated his 70th birthday at a jazz festival, with a trumpet in his hand, in the company of his many friends and admirers.

I am inserting in the RECORD several articles describing the birthday celebration of this gifted artist from New Orleans:

SALUTE TO SATCH

(By Leonard Feather)

Just as Louis Armstrong's contribution to jazz has been a source of inspiration to millions, the occasion of his 70th birthday has brought the world a little closer together, in gratitude for his arrival at this milestone and for our fellow-membership with him in the human race.

To a few who salute him here at Newport, Louis is a contemporary. To others, those in their middle years, he is a generation removed yet central to the memories of adolescence. Neither of these groups need be told what Satch has meant, still means, always will mean in terms of the very foundation of jazz as an art form.

Accordingly, one addresses oneself to those who constitute a majority of the present constituency. To them, Louis Armstrong is a figure seen on late night television, chatting with Carson or Cavett, singing Mame or Hello Dolly, mopping the most famous brow in the world, then sitting down and telling stories that make young whites blanch and young blacks mutter, while older viewers smile understandingly, because Louis is a product of a certain America which, in his own oblique way, he has helped to make a little more livable for all of us.

To the young, Louis may be a father or grandfather figure, an historic image to be respected, a clown to be put down, or perhaps a coalition of all these. It is regrettable that those to whom even Miles Davis is an elder of jazz cannot make their way, as some of us happily could, through the long time tunnel that began with Louis, then evolved through the Red Allens and Roy Eldridges to the Hacketts, Gillespies, Terrys, Newmans and the thousands more whose debt to Louis is beyond calculation.

Heard in the dazzling sonic context of today's cornucopia of sounds, Armstrong's music is simple and negotiable enough not to seem to require any examination. Yet to mature record collectors, students and historians, to trumpeters (yes, and saxophonists and pianists and singers and arrangers) who had to go through Louis to arrive at themselves, his magisterial horn and nutmeg-grater throat reveal hidden subtleties just as meaningful, just as relevant even today, as the busiest solo by the most abstract and exploratory innovator of the decade now upon us.

Jazz was still essentially a folk music, barely beginning to take on an air of urban sophistication, when the Armstrong of the classic Hot Five blues records in the late 1920s, followed closely by Louis the renovator of popular songs in the early '30s, turned the music world around. It wasn't just the sheer-silk purity of sound, nor the totally personal phrasing, nor the way he grabbed that high C in West End Blues and held on to it for four slow-tempo measures. It was a certain mystique that grew up around Louis, that elevated him even in the shoddiest of musical settings to the rank of genius, the first improvising genius in the history of jazz. More than that, it was his power to create out of elementary chord sequences a new and utterly entrancing melodic line. Once committed to records, it would be imitated note for note by musicians from San Francisco to Stockholm.

I once observed that there are in fact three Louis Armstrongs. There is Louis II, the incomparable musical influence, a catalyst who represented the zenith of the improvisatory art. This was the Armstrong of Gully Low Blue, Struttin' With Some Barbecue, the original Basin Street Blues, and in due course Ain't Misbehavin' and I Can't Give You Anything But Love and all the others that took him from Chicago to Harlem to Broadway to Piccadilly. Better known, of course, is Louis III, the show-business personality, the symbol to whom the adjectives beloved and inimitable are invariably applied, the wide-eyed character whose antics were immortalized on the screen when he teamed up with Bing Crosby for Pennies from Heaven in 1936, and the dozens of movies that later perpetuated the stereotype while affording us a small and eagerly received measure of the music.

Less familiar to his public, not well known even to those who believe they have pierced the facade of Louis III, is the human being, Louis I, a black American born back o' town in New Orleans, the family man, the idol of his neighbors.

The scene at which I became fully aware of Louis I was the Mardi Gras Parade of 1949, at which he realized his lifelong ambition to become King of the Zulus in the black segment of the parade. Two days before Shrove Tuesday, Louis and his combo, with Fatha Hines and Jack Teagarden and Sid Catlett, played a concert at Booker T. Washington Auditorium. During the show several dignitaries of the Zulu Social Aid and Pleasure Club crowned Louis king. It was the first time in the 33 year history of the club that the Zulus had reached out to bring a nonresident member home for coronation, instead of crowning the usual undertaker, merchant or porter.

On the morning of the parade, a motley group gathered outside Louis' hotel, many of them in tattered clothes, clearly hoping for a handout (and few of them waited in vain).

While Satch took care of the indigent well-wishers, the streets were lined solidly with blacks and an occasional white. The balcony projecting from the funeral home, a major stop en route, was packed to the last square inch, since it overlooked the grandstand that was to receive the king. The babble in the streets grew to pandemonium as the parade came into view and Louis' float arrived.

After waving to the wildly cheering multitude, the King was helped off the float. He wore traditional blackface makeup (still acceptable in 1949), a crown, a long black wig, a red velvet tunic trimmed with gold sequins. A big cigar was stuck in his mouth; he carried a silver scepter. As he edged slowly through the mob to the upper echelons of the funeral home, a frail little old lady hugged him. This was Mrs. Josephine Armstrong, Louis' grandmother. She bore her 91

years with pride as newsreel cameras whirred and the spirit of the celebration reached its height.

This was not the Louis who had played for Europe's royalty, nor the Satchmo for whom they had lined the streets of Tokyo with flowers. This was Louis I, the kid who used to run coal carts along the back streets, the cat they called Dippermouth back when he went on up to Chicago in 1922 to join King Oliver's band and start on the upward spiral. For the real, humble Louis, it was a hero's homecoming.

It is necessary to understand this Louis in order better to appreciate what went into the creation of Louis II the jazzman's idol and, perhaps inevitably, Louis III, the global conqueror.

Because of public demand, it was logical that in due course Louis would concentrate more on his singing and offer us less of the matchless horn than musicians and critics would have wanted. But Louis the pragmatist has long known what the public loves most and has long provided them with his guttural transmutations of popular songs of the day.

Blowing a horn on long strings of one-night stands, sometimes in unbearably hot or excruciatingly cold foreign climates, is not the most comfortable way to spend one's advancing years. Time dully caught up with Louis and in 1968 he fell ill. Far sicker than most of us knew ("We almost lost him," says Lucille Armstrong), he emerged from a harrowing year of convalescence and resumed, a few months ago, a pattern of occasional appearances as a singer.

Whether or not the golden horn is ever blown again in public, whether he works or uses the leisure he has long deserved and too long postponed, Louis has long since earned our lasting love and respect; he has no more dues to pay.

Many years ago Murray Kempton wrote of him that "He endures to mix in his own person all men, the pure and the cheap, clown and creator, god and buffoon . . . like the Mississippi, pure like its source, flecked and choked with jetsam like its middle, broad and triumphant like its end."

Happy seventies, Louis.

MUSICAL EVENTS: NEWPORT NOTES

Friday, July 10th: Newport, as Henry James discovered, can make a philosopher of anyone. Its contrasts do it: airborne eighteenth-century houses within calling distance of bloated, eighteen-nineties mansions; CinemaScope skies, capable of simultaneously displaying a line squall and a clear three-quarter moon; a rocky, blowing coast and acres of asphalt parking lots; oceanic meadows and jumbled back streets; and those venerable opposites—Trinity Church and Touro Synagogue. All of which led me back this evening to the philosophical speculation about every fat man's containing a thin man struggling to get out, which immediately suggested the Newport Festival and its resident thin man, jazz. For sixteen years, the Festival has continued to put on pounds, with its increasing number of acts (many musicians bitterly resent this assembly-line programming and, economics willing, have long since forsworn the Festival), its longer and longer concerts (no ear can intelligently absorb more than three hours of uninterrupted music, but some Newport concerts last six hours, its growing gaggle of m.c.s., and its many do-nothing groups. And yet every once in a while the thin man escapes. He certainly did tonight. The evening was designed as a celebration of Louis Armstrong's seventieth birthday, on July 4th, but it was a lot more than that. (The only eulogistic claims came from Senator Claiborne Pell, who appeared to forget Armstrong's name at the climax of his encomium, and from Armstrong himself, who,

in the middle of singing "Just a Closer Walk with Thee" with Mahalia Jackson, suddenly switched to "Hello, Dolly!" to Miss Jackson's consternation.) The ten-strong Eureka Brass Band, from New Orleans, opened the evening. Its members had room to roam around the stage as if they were marching, and the acoustics suggested the group's glorious reverberations when it parades through one of the narrow streets in the French Quarter. Cap'n John Handy, the irrepressible seventy-year-old alto saxophonist, who seems to have absorbed everyone from Sidney Bechet to Charlie Parker, was on hand, and there were a snare drummer (Cicé Frazier) and a bass drummer (Booker T. Glass) who between them managed sliding boomplay-boom patterns that any bebop drummer would admire. Bobby Hackett brought on a faultless quintet (Benny Morton, Dave McKenna, Jack Lesberg, Oliver Jackson), and it was a delight to hear Hackett's Armstrong-Belderbecke bells alongside Morton's climbing, worrying melodies. Then a beguiling group called the New Orleans Ragtime Orchestra appeared. It was put together earlier this year by Lars Edegran, a Swedish pianist who has been working in New Orleans for the past four or five years, and it consists of trumpets, clarinet, trombone, violin (William Russell, the great New Orleans jazz scholar), and the leader's piano, bass, and drums. It is a facsimile, right down to the arrangements, of the ragtime band led by John Robichaux in New Orleans before the First World War. (Ragtime, an elegant, complex, non-improvised music that flourished, mostly in the form of piano music, from 1900 to 1920, was one of the mainsprings of jazz.) It is a warm, gentle ensemble music (there are no solos) that moves along in waltz time or two-four time and accomplishes that spooky trick of making one feel nostalgic for an era and place and way of life one has never known. Particularly memorable among the numbers played were "St. Louis Tickle" (1904) and "Creole Belles" (1900). The Ragtime Orchestra was followed by six sterling trumpeters who in various ways were brought into being by Armstrong—Joe Newman, Hackett, Jimmy Owens, Wild Bill Davison, Ray Nance, and Dizzy Gillespie. ("Louis Armstrong's station in the history of jazz is unimpeachable," Gillespie announced before playing, "and I would like to thank him for my livelihood.") Each, in top form, played two numbers, backed by McKenna, Larry Ridley, and Jackson, and the finest moments were offered by Gillespie in a slow, languorous "Ain't Misbehavin'" and in "I'm Confessin'," in which he sang an affectionate mock-parody of Armstrong; by Hackett's "Thanks a Million;" by both of Davison's numbers (he is, I suppose, wholly out of fashion, but, in his rampaging, bent-note way, he is admirable); and by Owens' superb "Nobody Knows the Trouble I've Seen," in which he played the tune in the low register, unobtrusively changing a note here and an accent there, which resulted in a first-rate piece of improvisation that sounded like straight melody. After Nance's second number, Armstrong himself appeared, and sang three numbers, accompanied by the rhythm section and Hackett's glancing obligatos. Armstrong is still recuperating from a nearly fatal illness and he is not allowed to play his trumpet for more than an hour a day. But he looks fit and composed, and he was in excellent voice. The ovation was tumultuous, as was fitting for the man who made jazz a majestic music.

After the intermission, the Preservation Hall Jazz Band, made up of the nucleus of the Eureka Brass Band, played five stirring numbers, then gave way to Mahalia Jackson, who sang magnificently, thereby raising a curious point of musical physiology. Small singers are apt to sound delicate and even

remote, while large ones are almost always formidable. The last time I heard Miss Jackson, three years ago, she had lost a great deal of weight and her enormous voice had dwindled to a magisterial whisper. Now she has regained most of that weight, and with it her voice. Her first six numbers were stunning, and when she got to "Just a Closer Walk with Thee" she became almost savage. Her statuesque stage presence is celebrated, but in "A Closer Walk" she charged back and forth, growled, danced, shouted, and clapped her hands, and when Armstrong joined her she almost swallowed him. And after the "Hello, Dolly!" aberration had been swept aside and the two of them began "When the Saints Come Marching In," the results were empyrean.

Saturday: This afternoon's concert started at noon and ended, about fifteen hours later, around six. The first three sets were in "workshop" form, and they involved two violinists, four trumpeters, and four drummers, who played and then answered questions, most of which went like "Are you planning any more albums?" or "Did you go to music school?" Of the violinists, Jean-Luc Ponty and Mike White, Ponty was by far the more impressive. A classically trained player, he has the tone and technique that most jazz violinists lack, and his reading of the old "Yesterdays" was, with its John Coltrane colorings, rich and assured. The trumpeters (Owens, Gillespie, Newman, and Nance) played onstage while the drummers (Philly Joe Jones, Elvin Jones, Jo Jones, and Chico Hamilton) played at the back of the field, and after the trumpeters' first number, a good "Sunny," I went over to hear the drummers. They were, with the exception of Philly Joe Jones, who was neat and forceful, in a desultory, self-absorbed mood. Jo Jones appeared baffled, Chico Hamilton was stiff, and Elvin Jones was inconclusive. The trumpeters were followed onstage by a Rocklike Japanese quartet, led by Sadao-Watanabe, whom George Wein, who runs the Festivals, described as the Charlie Parker of Japan. Elvin Jones' quartet and Chico Hamilton's quartet went by, and so did a quintet led by Gary Burton. Keith Jarrett was on piano with Burton, and in the first number he played a fascinating, out-of-tempo solo that touched on Debussy and Schubert and Bill Evans. By this time, it was five o'clock and my battery was dead. Still another group was scheduled, but I went back to my hotel to recharge and watch the swallows, relish the openness of Newport, and bring on the evening.

The thin man got out for a while tonight, and it was exhilarating. Kenny Burrell, accompanied by Ridley and Lenny McBrowne, opened the proceedings, and then acted as a rhythm section for Dexter Gordon, the forty-seven-year-old tenor saxophonist, who has spent most of the past decade in Europe. Absence sometimes jams the memory, and I had forgotten how persuasive Gordon was in the early fifties, when, combining elements from the styles of Coleman Hawkins and Lester Young and Charlie Parker, he constructed the model later followed by Sonny Rollins and John Coltrane, who in turn brought along almost every tenor saxophonist who has appeared in the last fifteen years. Gordon has the ironwood tone that is now commonplace among tenor saxophonists, and an equally familiar amelodic way of phrasing that is made up of pitching runs, espaliered blocks of notes, and chameleon rhythms. There are few open places in his solos, which, with their cathedral-like intricacy and weight, are difficult to absorb at one hearing. He is a consummate musician who goes after the mind and not the emotions. He was, according to the hair-raising logic that governs most of the programming at the Newport Festivals, allowed only two numbers, but they were just about perfect. (The irrelevant Japanese group that played this

afternoon had more time.) The second one, "Darn That Dream," was closed with a stately, winding coda that recalled some of the weighty proclamations Coleman Hawkins liked to end his slow ballads with. The violinists, augmented by Ray Nance, reappeared, and Nance, playing an unabashedly soaring blues and a "Summertime" that was so intense it leaned on the listener, took the cake. Dizzy Gillespie's new group played five pre-digested numbers, and then accompanied Don Byas, the fifty-seven-year-old master tenor saxophonist, who, like Gordon, has long been based in Europe. Byas, who is one of the most proficient admirers of Hawkins' operatic side (Hawkins was myriad; mere facets of his style often provided entire foundations for other players), was also allowed just two numbers, but they were spacious enough to reveal his curving melodic lines, his Southwestern tone (a yearning, big-bellied quality shared by Herschel Evans and Buddy Tate), and his ability to swing very hard. He also demonstrated that innate, dowagerlike assurance and poise that seem unique to the best of the musicians who came up in the thirties. Next, Nina Simone, who has become more interested in the message in her songs than in the singing of them, posed here and there about the stage for a half hour, and then made way for a blessedly short set by Herbie Mann, a flutist who is also good at posturing, and his group. The evening was closed by the Ike and Tina Turner Revue, a funny, churning ensemble that consists of a nine-piece band led by Ike Turner, who plays guitar; the Ikettes, a female trio that dances and sings; and Mrs. Turner, who is beautiful and a fine shouter. The materials were gospel-soul-funk-blues, and I lost track of them when I got to watching one of the Ikettes, a tall, angular girl who liked to turn left when her compatriots turned right and who kept her mouth in a steady O, either because she was out of breath or because of sheer astonishment at finding herself where she was.

Sunday: There are always one or two please-the-people-and-make-a-buck concerts at the Newport Festival, and tonight was a dandy. Eddie Harris, a fashionably hard tenor saxophonist, started things, and then backed a young and extremely talented composer named Gene McDaniels, who sang a couple of his own songs. He is a sharp, eloquent lyricist, and the best of his songs, "The Silent Majority" (pronounced "majoratee"), had, among other necessary things, a couplet about the silent majoratee "gathering around the hanging tree." Les McCann, the pasha of soul-soap music, came on. He was followed by Leon Thomas, the singer and yodeller. Thomas should attempt "The Star-Spangled Banner;" the results might be definitive. More soul soap, this time from the Adderley Brothers, and then Buddy Rich appeared. He looked gray and tired and his band sounded the same. He did, though, get off a series of stunning four-bar breaks on a medium blues. They knocked one's wind out, and few drummers have known how to do that. Ella Fitzgerald finished the program, and she provided further proof that a singer's weight is to the voice what yeast is to bread. She has slimmed down considerably and so has her voice. It was the high, bobby-sox quality of her "Tisket-a-Tasket" days, and it made all her songs, which ranged from "Satin Doll" to "Raindrops Keep Falling," sound piping and pale.

Most of this afternoon belonged to the thin man, but not until the appearance of Roberta Flack, a singer-pianist in her late twenties. She is a handsome, poised performer, she has a rich, steady contralto, her phrasing runs in the gospel tradition, and she has an electrifying sense of dynamics. Her first five numbers were roomy and subdued, and then she let loose on "Reverend Lee," a funny, affecting song by Gene Mc-

Daniels about God's sorely tempting a preacher. Her handling of the words "Reverend Lee," repeated a dozen times during the song, was magic. Each time they came out differently, but in the best version she made the two words into ten, jamming some syllables together, separating others, and all the while granting almost each letter a different note. It was a goose-pimpling display of melismatics. Then Bill Cosby, one of the champion people, brought on his twelve-piece Badfoot Brown and the Bunions Bradford Marching and Funeral Band. It is made up largely of Los Angeles musicians, and includes a tenor saxophonist, a trombonist, two fender bassists, three guitarists, two pianists, an organist, and two drummers. In the first two numbers, the band accompanied Shuggie Otis, a sixteen-year-old blues guitarist and the son of Johnny Otis. He played a slow blues and a medium blues, and they were spectacular. The first was full of yearning and misery and pain (he is a motionless performer who smiles steadily, and the contrast between his coolness and the passion pouring out of his guitar was hilarious), and the second was a glistening celebration of cheerfulness and good feeling. Then the Bunions Bradford came on, and for forty-five minutes played one number, apparently arranged by Cosby, that was, though too long, comic and ingenious and unique. It also swung as hard as anything I've ever heard. Most of the instruments were electronics, and the piece, which was blues-based, included samplings of just about everything good that has been invented in the past decade and a half by the "new thing" school, by Charlie Mingus, by the Modern Jazz Quartet, by John Coltrane, by Miles Davis, and by the best rock groups. The tempo went up and down, there were dozens of slamming breaks, there were improvised duets, mountainous organ-chord climaxes, snatches of wild blues shouting (by the organist, Stu Gardner), a walking-bass passage, and a section in which the organist sang and played a rheumy, a-cappella "White Christmas," which was startlingly interrupted several times by drum duets. Cosby conducted the piece with such intensity and precision and humor that one had the impression that he was *playing* the band.

Monday: Over forty thousand people attended the Festival, despite uncertain weather and despite its being one day shorter than usual. Even better news is that the audience was made up largely of kids, who had come not to be sociological but to listen. Maybe the end of the tunnel is in sight.

[From the Washington Post, July 23, 1970]
TEN THOUSAND HONOR "SATCH" AT NEWPORT JAZZ FESTIVAL

(By Hollie I. West)

NEWPORT, R.I.—Louis Armstrong brought 10,000 shouting and clapping persons to their feet last night as he walked on stage to open the 17th annual Newport Jazz Festival.

It was a happy crowd, vociferous in its admiration. The night was all Satchmo's.

Musicians from all over the country were on hand to pay tribute to Armstrong, who turned 70 on July 4. Celebrations have been held in several cities since his birthday and others are planned.

The world's best-known jazzman and frequently called America's greatest ambassador of good will, Armstrong sang three songs, "When It's Sleepy Time Down South" (his theme song), "Pennies From Heaven" and "Blueberry Hill."

He came back to close the program with Mahalia Jackson. As they sang "Just a Closer Walk With Thee," there was a torrential cloudburst.

The downpour lasted five minutes. The crowd, soaking wet, stood fast and shouted for more. A jubilant Satchmo, joined by a host of New Orleans musicians, gave them "Hello Dolly" and "Mack the Knife."

He performed all with a gusto that belied the kidney infection he suffered almost two years ago and that has kept him from appearing in public recently. As expected, he did not play his trumpet because of his convalescence.

Armstrong looked trim and immaculate—conservatively cut brown suit, yellow shirt, a rust tie.

Accompanying him were cornetist Bobby Hackett, pianist Dave McKenna, Bassist Jack Lesberg, and drummer Oliver Jackson.

Hackett described himself as the "number one Louis Armstrong fan" before playing "Thanks a Million," an Armstrong hit.

Joining him in a trumpet tribute were Dizzy Gillespie, Wild Bill Davison, Jimmy Owens and Ray Nance, all of whom played two pieces, each associated with or written by Armstrong.

Gillespie said: "Louis Armstrong's station in jazz is unimpeachable. If it hadn't been for him there wouldn't be none of us."

The formal program got underway last night with the Eureka Brass Band, a New Orleans street and funeral ensemble, marching on stage. The group, led by trumpeter Percy Humphrey, performed "St. Louis Blues," "High Society" and several other classics in jazz history.

The New Orleans jazz tradition, in which Armstrong started performing more than 50 years ago, held center stage. Armstrong was born in the Crescent City, as was Mahalia Jackson who joined in the salute last night.

Also performing were the Preservation Hall Jazz Band, the New Orleans Classic Ragtime Band, and the Cap't. John Handy Band.

The skies above the festival field were heavily overcast this morning, but George Wein, the show's producer, brushed off a gloomy weather forecast of rain.

In a quip that agured the enthusiastic response of the crowd last night, Wein declared: "Even if it does, those will be just tears of happiness from heaven for Satch."

[From the Providence Journal,
July 11, 1970]

"SATCHMO" ARMSTRONG HONORED AT
NEWPORT

(By James T. Kaul)

Jazz made its annual long pilgrimage to Newport last night, this time from its far-off ignition point in New Orleans, home of the renowned Louis Armstrong.

The tribute to "Satchmo" Armstrong drew more than 7,000 listeners to Festival Field for the opening night of George Wein's 17th annual jazz festival.

Although the figure of 5,000 was posted by festival officials early in the evening, the seating sections appeared to be filling constantly as the concert wore on, until about half of the 15,000 seats appeared to be filled.

The mixture in the hillside amphitheater was one of an unusually coherent musical program, midsummer muggy weather and a restrained, well-behaved crowd.

Last night belonged to Louis Armstrong, who caused the same electric thrill among the audience as he did in his first festival appearance in Freebody Park 15 years ago.

Now, Armstrong is 70 years old, plays the trumpet only infrequently, but is still the same vigorous showman.

That gravelly, growly voice, unlike any other on the face of the earth, gave a long drawnout chuckle of greeting as Armstrong strode onstage last night while a chorus of trumpeters was running through his favorite tunes.

As one, the audience rose in an ovation. Losing no time over sentiment, Louis croaked his way through "Sleepy Time Down South," "Pennies From Heaven" and "Blueberry Hill."

The occasion was a belated observance of his 70th birthday, which fell on July 4.

Thus far, on the basis of one night, the 1969 experience of occasionally unruly crowds appears to have receded. Newport Police Chief Frank Walsh and his assistant chief, Jeremiah D. Sullivan, said the first night throng was peaceful and orderly. Not a single arrest at the field was reported as of late last night.

But the police officials added that it was too early to judge what the whole three-day festival would bring.

One thing it brought was "soul food" for the first time: red beans and rice sold by a New Orleans restaurant at the festival refreshment stands.

And it brought a delegation from the volunteer civic group, entitled Together, which offers help in Providence with drug problems. Three young people staffed an information table on the grounds.

During the program, a telegram of greetings from Governor Licht was read by Mr. Wein.

Sen. Claiborne Pell continued a tradition originally set by the late Sen. Theodore Francis Green and welcomed the fans to Rhode Island, paying particular tribute to Armstrong, whom he called "the maestro of us all."

The New Orleans vein predominant all night was continued by the Preservation Hall Jazz Band which has its headquarters in a hall that is dedicated to preserving the best of the oldtime music.

Billie Pierce on piano and DeDe Pierce on trumpet provided the spark and Cie Frazier on drums set the pace for a long, well-received set.

Then it was time for Mahalia Jackson, the gospel singer who has not appeared in Newport since the festivals were located in Freebody Park. But this was an occasion when she could offer her own soulful homage to a friend and fellow-artist.

Wearing a floor-length blue gown, Miss Jackson ignored some temporary microphone troubles as she filled the night air with religious laments and songs of joy.

Armstrong returned with the entire company for a finale.

Just as Satchmo joined Miss Jackson, a sudden, very brief spurt of rain began to send many of the audience home.

He sang "Hello Dolly" and ended with "When the Saints Go Marching In" as the massed musicians played behind him. Notable among the newcomers at this juncture was trombonist Tyree Glenn.

The concert ended at 11:40 p.m., an unusually early windup for the marathon Newport shows.

Highlighting the first half of the program was a "trumpet choir," partly heavenly and partly diabolic, which paid steadfast honors to Armstrong. In fact, the whole night showed more attention to a single theme—the roots of jazz—than any Newport jazz night in memory.

After an all-together run on "Sleepy Time Down South," Bobby Hackett played an Armstrong favorite, "Thanks a Million," which was heard, if recollection can be trusted, in one of Louis' early movie appearances.

Joe Newman spoke gracefully of his debt to "Satchmo" and gave a silvery-toned, beautifully-phrased version of "Way Down Yonder in New Orleans."

Dizzy Gillespie, muttering, "Who's going to follow that?" as Newman stepped Bach, proceeded with a side-splitting parody of the Armstrong vocal style on "I'm Confessin'," and wound up with a piercing high trumpet call.

Wild Bill Davison on "Dem Dere Eyes," Jimmy Owens, who said he was the youngest Armstrong-worshipper in the "choir," and Ray Nance followed with solos.

With this group and earlier with Hackett's

own quintet, pianist Dave McKenna emerged as one of those unsung heroes who seem to crop up in Newport every season. He is a big man with an extraordinary "sure" and thoughtful way of playing, either in brief solos or in accompaniment.

Far from incidentally, McKenna is a Rhode Islander, too, and was born in Woonsocket, it was learned in a backstage chat with him.

The Hackett quintet, featuring a trumpeter who was raised in Rhode Island, also included Benny Morton, trombone; Jack Lesberg, bass, and Oliver Jackson, drums. All won merit badges.

This was sophisticated jazz, but Hackett chose every number for its association with Armstrong and New Orleans. Among them were rarely-heard pieces such as "Swing That Music" and "Some Day You'll Be Sorry."

A Newport first of extreme antiquarian interest was the New Orleans Classic Ragtime Band, directed by, of all persons, a young Dane, Lars Edergran, who succeeded in reviving this almost-lost music recently. Ragtime plus gospel music made up the earliest jazz as producer George Wein told the audience. It was a sound that Armstrong heard as a child.

William Russell, an old New Orleans violinist, furnished the lead, with a brass and woodwind ensemble filling in the harmonies.

The tunes were from the early 1900s, played from sheet music and bearing evocative names: "St. Louis Pickle," "Dusty Rag" and "Creole Belles."

The night began with a part of the New Orleans jazz canon as pure in its own way, as a Shakespearean sonnet. The meter was in four beats, however, and the sound was from the Eureka Brass Band, led by a strutting, sash-wearing grand marshal, Willie Humphrey.

This is one of the traditional street marching bands that plays somber music on the way to the graveyard and a rollicking dance of triumph on the way home.

Percy Humphrey on trumpet was the leader, waving his platoon into action on "St. Louis Blues," "Bourbon Street Blues" and a two-four march which was ensemble playing at its best.

Jim Robinson on trombone was among the standouts.

All in all, it was a Newport jazz evening to rank among the better festival shows—and, as producer Wein had said earlier, one in which music, played and listened to, was the sole and whole purpose.

FESTIVAL FACTS

What—The Newport Jazz Festival.

When—Today and tomorrow, July 11-12.

Where—Festival Field, Newport, Rhode Island Today, noon to 6 p.m. *Trumpet workshop*—Dizzy Gillespie, Joe Newman, Jimmy Owens, Clark Terry. *Drum workshop*—Art Blakey, Chico Hamilton, Elvin Jones, Tony Williams. *Violin workshop*—Mike White, Jean-Luc Ponty, Ray Nance.

Today, 3 p.m.: Concert with Gary Burton, Keith Jarrett, Sadao Watanabe Quartet, Chico Hamilton Quintet, Tony Williams Lifetime, Elvin Jones Trio.

Today, 8 p.m.: Ike and Tina Turner, Nina Simone, Herbie Mann, Kenny Burrell, Dizzy Gillespie, Don Byas, Jean-Luc Ponty, Ray Nance.

Tomorrow, 1:30 p.m.: Bill Cosby with Badfoot Brown and the Bunions Bradford Marching and Funeral Band, Roberta Flack, Albert King, Shuggie Otis, The Fourth Way.

Tomorrow, 8 p.m.: Ella Fitzgerald, Buddy Rich and His Orchestra, the Les McCann Trio, the Eddie Harris Quartet, the Cannonball Adderley Quintet, Leon Thomas Quartet.

Tickets—Prices for evening concerts at \$4.50, \$6, \$7 and \$10. The Saturday afternoon session is \$4, all seats. Sunday afternoon prices are \$4.50, \$5.50, \$6.50 and \$10. Parking on festival grounds is \$1.

[From the Newport (R.I.) Daily News, July 11, 1970]

SEVEN THOUSAND JAZZ FANS AT OPENING OF FESTIVAL CHEER "SATCIMO"

(By William F. A. Bryant)

Afternoon showers yesterday and the threat of rain last night kept paid attendance at the opening night of the 1970 Newport Jazz Festival at about a third of the field's 18,000 capacity, but it was a night to remember for Louis "Satchmo" Armstrong, fellow jazz performers and an estimated 7,000 spectators.

Although the festival box office reported a paid attendance of only 5,000, festival impresario George Wein termed last night "the greatest musical night we have ever presented." The festival paid a "New Orleans Tribute to Louis Armstrong" who celebrated his 70th birthday July 4.

Some ticket agencies did not report their sales in time for last night's attendance figures, Festival Treasurer Arnold London said today. The festival box office posted a 5,000 paid seat attendance early last night, but spectators kept entering in a steady flow until an estimated 7,000 persons were inside Festival Field.

Sales for tonight's performance are "fairly brisk," London said this morning. He added that based on this morning's sales, he does not expect a sellout crowd tonight. The threat of rain may keep some persons away, as it did last night.

The night's only shower during the festival was a sudden three-minute cloudburst that announced Satchmo's appearance for the closing numbers of the performance. Thunder and loud ovations proclaimed Satchmo as the undisputed jazz ambassador to the world.

Spectators huddled together in the rain as they stood to get a better view. Rain didn't hamper their enthusiasm as they heard Satchmo sing numbers like "Hello Dolly," "Mack the Knife" and "When the Saints Come Marching In."

Some of New Orleans' greats were there with him. Mahalia Jackson, Dizzy Gillespie and Bobby Hackett honored "The Satch." The Eureka Brass Band, the New Orleans Classic Rag Time Band and the Preservation Hall Jazz Band joined in last night's tribute.

Gillespie, Hackett, Joe Newman, Wild Bill Davison, Jimmy Owens and Ray Nance got together to form a New Orleans gospel favorite, "Just a Closer Walk With Thee."

Police and festival security men reported the crowd was orderly. All reported a "very quiet night." Police reported four arrests last night, two of them downtown.

Middletown police reported only one arrest and it was for a motor vehicle violation. State police reported no arrests. Security Director John West reported "no major problems."

A few minor problems were encountered in the Girard Avenue area. Perimeter lighting went off during the first hour of the performance but was restored about 9 a.m. During the darkness a few spectators outside the field who wanted to get inside without paying grabbed the chance. They clambered over the outside chain link fence and scrambled over a wooden fence to enter the field.

A festival spokesman explained the lights went out because a new switching system had caused some confusion. He emphasized the lighting equipment was not faulty.

No drug problems were reported last night. A Providence based Drug Crisis Information Center, named Together, reported numerous inquiries but no incidents. A non-profit organization started in April, Together had a small tent set up in the concession area of the field.

Together is run by volunteers who have had training or experience with drugs. The organization's policy is not to take a stand on drugs, but to inform persons of the facts and let them make their own choice. "We

had no problem cases tonight," a spokesman reported, "but we expect we will be able to help someone before the festival is over."

Besides distributing information on marijuana, stimulants, narcotics, tranquilizers and hallucinogens, the organization tries to help persons having "bad trips."

Lt. William Janes of the Newport Police Department summarized the feelings of security men and police last night when he said, "If we get three days like this, it will be great."

This afternoon's festival schedule, from noon to 6 p.m., includes Violin, Drum and Trumpet Workshops until 2:30 p.m. and performances by the Sadao Watanabe Quartet from Japan, the Elvin Jones Quartet, the Chico Hamilton Quartet, the Gary Burton Quartet and Keith Jarrett, and Tony Williams Lifetime.

Tonight's schedule, starting at 8 p.m., includes Ike and Tina Turner, Nina Simone, the Dizzy Gillespie Quintet, the Kenny Burrell Trio, the Herbie Mann Quintet, Dexter Gordon, Don Byas and the Fiddlers.

Sunday schedule, starting at 1:30 p.m., includes Bill Cosby and Badfoot Brown and the Bunions Bradford Marching and Funeral Band, The Fourth Way, the Roberta Flack Trio, Shuggie Otis, Albert King and the Nucleus.

Sunday night's schedule starting at 8 p.m., includes Ella Fitzgerald, Buddy Rich and his Orchestra, Cannonball Adderley Quintet, the Eddie Harris Quartet, Les McCann Limited, and the Leon Thomas Quartet.

About 1,000 Rhode Island youngsters will attend the Jazz Festival afternoon performances through the cooperation of the Governor's Youth Opportunity Council and Mrs. George Wein.

Samuel L. DiSano Jr., coordinator of the council, said the 12-16 year-old youths were selected on a statewide basis from various Community Action Program Agencies. These include Progress for Providence, Tri-Town, Blackstone Valley C.A.P., Inc., Cranston C.A.P. Committee, Inc., Self-Help, Inc., New Visions for Newport County, Warwick C.A.P., and the East Providence Mayor's Commission on Youth. These agencies will provide transportation and supervision.

[From the Newport (R.I.) Daily News, July 11, 1970]

THEN THE RAINS CAME: OPENING NIGHT HITS JAZZ HIGH NOTE

(By Jane Nippert)

Last night's opening performance of the 17th Newport Jazz Festival was truly a memorable occasion, an evening of pure enjoyment, with no discordant notes to mar its perfection.

Its ending was a bit sooner than expected, because of the rain. It had fallen earlier in the day and the skies were threatening much of the evening. Into each festival it seems some rain must fall, and fall it did—suddenly and heavily—near the end of some wonderful gospel singing by the magnificent Mahalia Jackson. She was singing a song she dedicated to Louis Armstrong, who was what the program was all about, when the skies opened up.

Armstrong, she had told the audience, had given America and the world jazz, and her song was "Just a Closer Walk with Thee." She poured her whole wonderful self into the song. Her hairdo came undone, but she remained oblivious to even that portion which fell in front of her face.

As the rains came, so came Armstrong back on stage and slowly each of all the other wonderful performers for a grand finale consisting of such famous Armstrong numbers as "Hello, Dolly," "When the Saints Go Marching In," "When It's Sleepy Time Down South" and "Mack, the Knife."

While the evening was a tribute to Louis Armstrong, so was his performance a tribute to his public, which has held a special place

in their hearts for him for years. He is a performer of the old school, that exerted its personalities as well as its musical talents to entertain audiences. When he beams that wonderful smile of his—which is almost constantly—he makes the audience feel happy.

As we noticed the happy mood prevailed throughout the evening, we thought of all the conflict and strife that beset our country and the world and decided if Schlitz could go on contributing to such programs as that of last night in enough places, many of the present tensions would be overcome. Of course, we'd all have to drink more Schlitz—which could perhaps produce a near-beer for the minors—but we could all sit there together—young and old, of various colors and tongues—and enjoy something together.

Especially poignant to those of us in the audience last night who consider ourselves friends of festival producer George Wein and his lovely wife was the all too possible fact that this festival may be the swan song of the Newport Jazz Festival. As Sen. Claiborne Pell pointed out last night, the festivals gather together the young people. The Jazz Festivals gather those of all ages, many of whom don't care to tour mansions and can't afford a yacht to race, but they bring money into the community.

Back to the program, it consisted chiefly of New Orleans musicians playing their type of jazz, with quite a lot of Satchmo's own compositions.

First we had the Eureka Brass Band, directed by Percy Humphrey, trumpet leader. Their numbers included "St. Louis Blues" and what we think was "Bill Bailey" but in real Dixieland style. The band members included 78-year-old Jim Robinson, a trombonist; Lionel Ferbos, trumpet; Orange Kellin, clarinet; Capt. John Handy, saxophone; Paul Crawford, trombone; Alan Jaffe, bass horn; Cie Frazier, drums; and Booker T. Glass, bass drum. They were joined by Billie Pierce, who not only plays a mean piano but gave forth with some fine vocal numbers during the evening, and DeDe Pierce on the trumpet.

Quite a few of the performers played with more than one group during the program. The Eureka Brass Band and the Preservation Hall Jazz Band had much the same performers. Willie Humphrey, the grand marshal of the former, did his bit by strutting and dancing around on stage.

Then there was the Bobby Hackett Quintet with Hackett on cornet, Benny Morton on trombone, Dave McKenna on piano, Jack Lesberg on bass, and Oliver Jackson, drums. They started off with "Undecided" at a fast pace, then a nice slow "Some Day You'll Be Sorry," and then "Swing That Music." Hackett, by the way, was born in Providence, right here in Yankeeland, but he's spent most of his life playing in Dixieland bands.

Then came "The New Orleans Classic Rag Time Band" led by a most youthful looking Lars Edergran on the piano. Wein said the band had never been heard at any festival outside New Orleans. Their music was quite different, unique. One song sounded a lot like a schottish. William Russell, no youngster but can really make the violin swing, announced the numbers and said most were composed about the turn of the century. Their appearance showed the good programming on the part of the producer, as they were quite a switch on what had gone before. James Preoust played bass with the group, which included others from the Eureka Brass Band.

The Trumpet Choir followed. Wein said trumpet players really owed it all to Armstrong. This group paid more tribute to Armstrong than any others. They played his numbers, each soloing in one or more numbers by Satchmo. First there was "When It's Sleepy Time Down South," just wonderful and great for reminiscing. Then Hackett played his favorite, "Thanks A Million," be-

fore Joe Newman played a fantastic "Way Down Yonder in New Orleans." Newman recalled his father had been a piano player and he used to crawl under the piano as a little boy and fall asleep waiting for Armstrong to come on to play. And then there was Dizzy Gillespie, practically a festival fixture, clowning around as usual.

Dizzy said on his tour for the State Department he had played Armstrong's "I'm Confessin'." He later played the tape for Armstrong, who "rolled on the floor." When he started to sing it, one could understand Armstrong's reaction. His trumpet playing was really phenomenal, especially as he kept blowing higher and higher notes, as urged by the others.

Wild Bill Davison played his favorite, "Them There Eyes." Jimmy Owens, much younger than the others, played his really jazzed up version of "Mack, the Knife," Dave McKenna on piano, Larry Ridley of bass, Oliver Jackson on drums, Benny Morton and Tyree Glenn on trombones lent him fine support. Then Ray Nance followed at a slower pace and sang, "I'm in the Market for You." "Heebie Jeebies" and "Jeepers Creepers" followed before a truly beautiful "Nobody Knows the Trouble I've Seen."

When Armstrong made his first appearance, he received a standing ovation just for walking on stage. When he started off with "Sleepy Time Down South," one could almost picture the South of years ago when steamboats piled up and down the Mississippi. It's a plaintively beautiful song anyway you look at it. He also sang "Pennies From Heaven" and "Blueberry Hill."

After intermission came the Preservation Hall Jazz Band and it was marvellous with the players enjoying it as much as the audience. They played for a long time with no let-up of interest on the part of the audience or themselves. George Wein himself joined them on the piano for a slow, bluesy number.

Then there was Mahalia Jackson, clad in a long-sleeved aqua gown trimmed with white jeweled design. Giving her excellent support were Gwen Lightner on piano and Cleveland Clancey on organ.

It certainly was a wonderful evening.

THE MEDICAL PERSONNEL SHORTAGE

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have cosponsored a bill to relieve the shortage of physicians, dentists, and other medical personnel in small communities and other medically deprived areas.

This bill provides that the Government will repay the entire educational debt to any physician, dentist, or optometrist who agrees to work for 3 years in an area which lacks sufficient medical personnel.

As critical shortages in other medical fields are established, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could add new categories to the original listing.

The annual cost of such a program could not be immediately gaged but that if every 1969 medical school graduate were to enroll in the program the cost would not exceed \$130 million.

If one of every 10 graduating physicians, dentists, and optometrists enrolled in this program there would be more than 3,000 new medical professionals dis-

persed in medically deprived areas at the end of 3 years.

This would not only benefit the areas themselves, but it would afford graduating doctors the chance to begin practice debt-free.

The bill would be especially applicable to West Virginia which has a desperate need of physicians and the ones she does have are concentrated—47 percent—in four counties: Cabell, Kanawha, Monongalia, and Ohio.

It would take at least a doubling of our present number of 1,515 doctors to bring adequate medical care to all West Virginians. Only 476 of the State's physicians are general practitioners.

MYLAI, KATYN, AND DACHAU

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, why the disproportion in the publicity given Mylai as contrasted with such horrors by the enemy as Auschwitz, Dachau, or Katyn Forest? Captive nations bear witness to the loss of freedom by millions of good peoples.

The American presence in Vietnam is in the cause of freedom for its people. It honors a solemn commitment breached by Communist aggression. Mylai was a tragedy, but it should neither be overplayed by the news media nor construed as an indictment of the American presence there.

In this connection, the following editorial from the Manchester, N.H., Union-Leader of July 22, 1970, is significant:

KATYN AND MYLAI

We find it rather intriguing that the "liberal" news media that are relishing every report involving atrocities allegedly committed by GIs in South Vietnam are the same news media that are ignoring the fact that this is Captive Nations Week—with the painful thoughts of man's inhumanity to man that the occasion summons forth.

None are more painful than the memory of a horrendous crime which occurred exactly 30 years ago in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk. The "liberal" media, with their now legendary political myopia, can cluck their tongues over the killing of a few hundred South Vietnamese civilians and attribute guilt—before all the facts are even established—but they do not now, and never have, concerned themselves with the Communists' massacre of some 10,000 Polish officers by direct order of Soviet authorities in 1940.

The "liberal" media, of course, have no hesitation about reciting the litany of Nazi war crimes—nor should they hesitate on that score—but they seem to prefer to doubt any similar crime when attributed to the barbarians on the Left, just as they demonstrate a cavalier attitude toward Communist atrocities in Vietnam—the discovery of the mass graves near Hue, for example.

The Nazis, of course, would have had no compunction over murdering 10,000 Polish officers, had it served their purpose at the time. After all, they sent more than 3,000,000 Polish Jews to their death in the gas chambers of Oswiecim and Majdanek. But the facts just happen to demonstrate that the Katyn Forest crime, which Moscow blamed on the Nazis, was perpetrated by

the Communists when Smolensk was under Russian control.

Atrocities are indefensible regardless of who commits them. But during this Captive Nations Week, we urge all Americans to turn their attention to the "liberal" news media's double standard in this regard.

For that matter, many Americans who are forced—by reasons of geographical location—to rely solely on the "liberal" media probably are unaware that this is Captive Nations Week by act of Congress and presidential proclamation—and we wonder how many Americans, who parrot whatever they are told about the shocking events at My Lai, have ever even HEARD of the Katyn Massacre, one of the most barbarous official acts authorized by any government in the history of mankind.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HIS EXCELLENCY CHARLES LUCET

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the fine address delivered by His Excellency Charles Lucet, Ambassador of France to the United States, at the presentation of the Cross of the Legion of Honor to Astronaut James A. Lovell, Jr., on July 29, 1970, at the French Embassy in Washington, D.C., before a distinguished company.

Ambassador Lucet's remarks on this fine occasion recall to each of us the remarkable flights of Gemini VII and Gemini XII in which Commander Lovell took part in exciting new space firsts, and on Apollo 13 lunar flight in which Commander Lovell acted as commander.

This high honor is fitting for the commander of Apollo 13, who demonstrated the leadership, courage, and presence of mind that helped bring that amazing flight safely to earth and a successful conclusion.

The address follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HIS EXCELLENCY CHARLES LUCET

It is a great and signal honor for me to have received instructions from the President of the French Republic to present to you today the insignia of the Chevalier of the Legion of Honor and thereby to introduce you to our highest national order.

You are aware, Commander, of the admiration, anxiety and fervent attention with which people in France, all French people, followed your exploits as they did those of the earlier astronauts.

As pilot of Gemini VII, you and Colonel Borman succeeded in making the first space rendezvous in December 1965. You were to do still better in November 1966 on board Gemini XII when you successfully took the first photos of a solar eclipse seen from space.

Then came the time of the Apollo missions. Allow me to tell you humbly that I was at Cape Kennedy on December 21, 1968 for the firing of Apollo VIII. The first manned space vehicle launched by the Saturn V rocket. I shall always remember the unforgettable sight of this majestic take-off into space. A frequent visitor to Cape Kennedy. I was there again in July 1969 for the count-down of Apollo XI, a historic date for mankind—man's first steps on the moon.

Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins are also Chevaliers of the Legion of Honor.

I also want to say, Commander Lovell, and the French people agree with me, that we all thought the flight you commanded, that of Apollo XIII, was just as remarkable and just as admirable.

You and those who accompanied you, Haise and Swigert both had to face the greatest crisis that men have ever known, the explosion of the two oxygen tanks that happened midway between the earth and the moon.

We have always admired in all circumstances American efficiency and the unbelievable precision of American technology. But, in that case, it was something else. It was no longer a question of machine but of man's courage, sang-froid and presence of mind.

With the help of mission control at Houston and all the services of NASA and I would like to pay tribute to the head administrator, Dr. Thomas Paine, you were able, in the face of unbelievable danger, to bring back the capsule and its occupants to the appointed area at the appointed time. We were extremely concerned but your calm and achievement were beyond compare. Sometimes half failures are greater than victories. You have given us an unforgettable lesson. Even, when in space exploration all machines, product of our industry showed themselves as fallible as we are ourselves, you have proved that whatever the circumstances, man, man's boldness and sang-froid can have the last word.

From your example, like that of the astronauts who went before you and those who will come after you, we know that space can be conquered and explored and, in a way, the moon, dreamstar of poets, the first step in this exploration, is now the suburbia of the earth and very soon will be the starting point of new ventures.

You have opened unparalleled perspectives to fire the imagination of men who will always want a new frontier to conquer. This frontier, thanks to you, is now named the starry sky.

Of course, the prodigious conquest has not changed from one day to the next, man's state of mind and his smallness. There are still conflicts among us, wars and violence. But we know, and it is literally true, that it is sufficient to look up to the sky to see where our destiny lies, to know where the reconciliation of mankind may be made. Space with all its dangers seems to us all now an unlimited field for true international cooperation.

You have shown us the way. You have shown greatness in adversity. Please accept the heartfelt thanks of us all.

This is why, in the name of the French people and the French Government, whose admiration for you and your colleagues is boundless, I shall now say the traditional words.

DISCONTINUE USE OF DRAFTEES IN INDOCHINA

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. MIKVA, Mr. Speaker, of all the absurdities of an absurd war, the least justifiable is the policy which continues sending draftees—involuntary conscripts—to fight an undeclared war while volunteer, professional military men are assigned to duty in the United States and to noncombat areas overseas.

Recently the idea of prohibiting the

further use of involuntary draftees in the war in Indochina has been gaining support. Last year our colleague from New York (Mr. RYAN) offered an amendment on this subject. Earlier this year in the other body, Senators HUGHES, CRANSTON, GOODELL, and MCGOVERN offered Senate amendment No. 651 to H.R. 17123 which would bar the use of draftees in any combat area unless Congress specifically declares a national emergency, or unless the draftee had volunteered for combat duty or had voluntarily extended his tour of duty in the Armed Forces. Later Senators NELSON, PROXMIER, and HUGHES offered Senate amendment No. 754 to H.R. 17123 which would specifically bar the use of draftees in South Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia.

But the support for this eminently fair and rational idea is not limited to Democrats or to liberals. Earlier this week the Senate minority leader himself, Senator SCOTT, took the floor of the Senate to announce his support for the idea of prohibiting the use of draftees in Indochina. Senator SCOTT mentioned that the noted conservative columnist, Mr. William Buckley, had also endorsed this idea. On July 30, my colleagues from Michigan (Mr. BROWN, Mr. McDONALD, and Mr. VANDER JAGT), from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), and from Puerto Rico (Mr. CORDOVA) sponsored H.R. 18719, to prevent assignment of draftees to involuntary duty in combat areas.

I would hope that this idea is one on which all of us—Democrats and Republicans, liberals, conservatives and middle-of-the-roads—can agree. We should agree that however much longer troop withdrawals will take, the remainder of this war should be fought by professional volunteers, not by involuntary conscripts.

There are three recent developments which make it possible realistically to consider a congressional ban on the use of draftees in Indochina, a ban which will not hamper or impede the President's withdrawal or negotiating plans. First, the administration has already announced that by next April we will have withdrawn another 150,000 troops. Second, the number of draftees serving in South Vietnam was already well below this 150,000 figure in March of this year—before the President announced his most recent withdrawal plan. The figure then was 111,000, and it is probably considerably lower today. Thus, by April of next year, we will have withdrawn at least 40,000 more troops than we now have draftees serving in South Vietnam. We can withdraw all our draftees and then some.

Finally, the President has already announced to the Congress and the Nation his intention to seek \$2.5 billion in annual salary increases for military personnel as a first step in the transition to an all-volunteer Armed Forces. These pay increases are principally for servicemen with less than 2 years' service and will presumably result in an increase in the number of volunteers—as opposed to draftees—in the Armed Forces. Thus, their availability for service in Vietnam will also be increased. This ought to make the use of draftees there unnecessary.

President Nixon has said that his policy is one of disengagement. Events since May of this year have shaken the confidence of the American people that this is, in fact, the direction of our policy. Passage of some kind of limitation on the use of draftees in South Vietnam would reaffirm the commitment of Congress to the President's announced objective of disengagement. It would simultaneously remove one of the most agonizing aspects of that war: the involuntary service—and death—of military conscripts who have not indicated their willingness to serve in Vietnam and who are often vehemently opposed to our involvement there.

It is my hope when the military appropriations bill is considered by this body later this year, that we can work out some mechanism to effect this momentous and salutary policy change which is now gathering ever wider support. I believe that all Members who favor this idea should mention their support for such an amendment to our colleague from New York (Mr. RYAN), who has already announced his intention to offer an amendment to the defense appropriations bill to limit the use of draftees in Vietnam. I am most hopeful that with the growing support which this idea has had, we will be able at least to bring an end to the involuntary service of military conscripts in this undeclared war.

POLITICAL BROADCAST ADVERTISING

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent WWDC editorial discussing the political advertising legislation which is scheduled for action this week.

This editorial makes the very valid point this bill will not limit political advertising, only political broadcast advertising. If this body truly wants to limit and reform the expenditure of campaign finances on political advertising, then, I believe, we should take a closer look at the pending legislation and broaden the scope of its effectiveness before it becomes the law.

The editorial follows:

POLITICAL BROADCAST ADVERTISING

Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC Vice President and General Manager William S. Sanders was on July 25, 1970. We welcome comments.

There is a bill before the House of Representatives which would serve to reduce the cost of political advertising on radio and television, and perhaps limit the amount that could be spent by candidates in broadcasting.

The rationale behind this legislation is that campaign costs are too high; but, the bill does not limit political advertising, only political broadcast advertising. Is there any doubt that campaign dollars not spent in broadcasting will simply be spent in other media, which, remember, are not limited in any way. No doubt in our mind.

We were therefore not surprised to note some newspapers in other cities editorially endorsing this legislation. After all, not only

is their ox not being gored, but to continue the metaphor, their calf is about to be fattened.

But the worst of it is not that broadcasting is being discriminated against, nor that our competition will derive financial benefits from this discriminatory legislation . . . the worst is that the public is being buffaloed. The public is being sold a patent medicine which is patently worthless. It will not—cannot by any stretch of the imagination—solve the problem of high campaign costs. The money saved in broadcasting will simply be spent elsewhere.

The public has the right to be concerned about the high cost of political campaigns. It also has a right to expect from its Congress a fair and effective solution, not a political copout, which will earn the applause of broadcasting's competition whose nests will be feathered, but which will accomplish nothing else.

Thank you for your interest.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE SIXTIES

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant axioms concerning man's effort to live on this planet is that the greatest crises offer the greatest opportunities. But this is a proposition seldom invoked, for the great opportunities are lost to all but those who possess the wisdom to see beyond the current crisis, and the courage and sheer energy required to move toward a greater scope of action.

Such men do appear from time to time, however, and I submit that our former President Lyndon Baines Johnson belongs among their ranks. Faced with intensifying and unending crises on both domestic and foreign fronts, he went ahead, with total disregard for his personal welfare, to move beyond the present and lay in treaty and in legislation and in action foundations which both help point the way to ultimate solutions to many of those crises and offer our Nation greater latitude in dealing with the problems of the future.

A recent article by Alistair Cooke in the *Guardian Weekly*, the airman version of the *Manchester Guardian*, throws interesting lights on the subject of the sixties.

Mr. Cooke says:

There has never been a time when so many Americans despaired of their own past and present and renounced their old cocky boast to roll up their sleeves and face the toughest job. The one consolation must be that in the sixties . . . Americans at least began to grapple with the real problems of their society, horrendous though they may be.

Whatever one's judgment on the sixties may be, one thing is clear: The rhetoric stopped and the action began.

I am pleased to reprint Mr. Cooke's remarks in the *RECORD* at this point:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE SIXTIES

In time the sixties, like the gay nineties and the roaring twenties, will no doubt acquire their distinguishing epithet. As a beginning, we might quite simply suggest the word *ghastly*.

This is not said lightly or cynically. In 37

years experience of the United States, from the pit of the Depression to the apotheosis of President Richard M. Nixon, I have known no stretch of American life so continuously disheartening as the six lean years that were so dreadfully announced by the shots in Dallas and were echoed in Watts and Detroit and Newark, that reechoed on the motel balcony in Memphis and the hotel pantry at Los Angeles, and rumbled obscenely on the streets of Chicago and through the stadiums of the Presidential election campaign.

That, to be fussy, leaves four preceding years of what may now be seen as the fool's paradise of the Kennedy era; which is what I truly believe it to have been.

Vietnam was practically heralded by the ringing, and ringingly hollow, boast of the Inaugural: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty." After six years of opposing their Roman might to a foe that, like Gibbon's earlier "barbarians . . . were inured to encounters in the bogs," even the most belligerent hawks in the Pentagon admit to America's capacity to fight no more than "two and a half wars," not by any remote possibility the 43 wars which the United States is by treaty bound to undertake.

In 1960 the United Nations announced the Development Decade as an urgent mission whereby the rich nations would start to close the gap with the poor. At the end of the decade U Thant had nothing better to report than that the gap had widened alarmingly, and that what lies ahead for many of the poor nations is a reign of famine and revolution.

In 1961 John Kennedy announced, to universal applause, the Alliance for Progress, the high-minded disbursement of billions of dollars to Latin America. Today, with no sign of a Latin American economic union, and with the population growth-rate as headlong as ever, the sour prediction of an eminent Colombian economist has been fulfilled: "Twenty billion dollars in ten years will help us to stand still."

In 1963, only a month or two before his assassination, John Kennedy looked back numbly on nearly a hundred Bills—for public housing, civil rights, Medicare, public health, land conservation, model cities, tax reform, etc., etc.—that were petrified in the appropriate committees of Congress. A notable political scientist and an admirer of Kennedy wrote a book called "The Democratic Deadlock." It might well be that the Congressional system is too torpid, too unresponsive to the pace of essential reform, to be able much longer to steer the country towards a governable United States. But in 1963 much of this deadlock had to be attributed to Kennedy's fatal incapacity to respect the sincerity of his Congressional opponents, to trade one conviction for another, and to retain the friendship of the vital committee chairmen who had once opposed him.

Probably the best thing that happened in the political life of the nation during the decade was Lyndon Johnson's healing gift with friend and foe and his consequent ability to put through the eighty-ninth Congress between January and October of 1964 a volume of domestic reforms which, in a period of easy affluence and Congressional complacency, far surpassed that given to Franklin Roosevelt in the depth of the Depression by a frightened and submissive Congress. And this was done on top of huge appropriations for defence, which took up about half (\$46.9 billions) of the total budget (\$119.3 billions).

It is conceivable that if there had been no Vietnam Johnson would have moved, with his rogue-elephant's strides, into the transformation of urban life, the purifying of air and water, and the lifting up of the Negroes into the equality which he came to first re-

luctantly and then with the vigour and passion of a convert. It has to be remembered that the Civil Rights Bills, from Eisenhower first to Johnson last, were his doing; and in the most wasteful episodes of rioting and violence it should not be forgotten that more was done in Johnson's five years to liberate the Negro than in the previous 350 years, exactly, of his subjection. It is, plainly and tragically, not enough. But it is, in an historical view, a great deal.

But whenever we begin to take comfort, to hope for a new era of radical reconstruction (of the cities of the state legislatures, of the protection of what we now call "the environment") we stumble into Vietnam. The continuing curse of it is that it has almost ceased to be an issue in itself, it is like some technological monster in a horror movie that terrifies and befouls all the life around. Until it is over, we shall not know whether the will, as well as the money, is available to bind up the cities' wounds, to advance the Negro with a "deliberate speed" that he will accept as the best that can be done.

It is possible that the Negro, and the radical youth, black and white, are already too cynicised—by Vietnam, by widespread corruption in state and in municipal government, by the respectable inroads of the Mafia, by the climate of violence—to accept any longer the habit of creative compromise that is essential to effective government of the people by the people and which, in truth, has been the genius of the American system since its founding. Perhaps by now there are not enough believers left to rescue and reform the system. If this is so, what seems to be the most fearful possibility is a dogged reaction by the middle-class mass, and the arrival of fascism by popular democratic vote.

Other nations have their hippies and their rock culture, their drugged youth and their "alienated" students, the Babylonian heritage of the sixties, plunging its unhandlable populations into headier and headier materialism. Only America has suffered the traumatic disillusion, in ten short years, of losing its status as the beneficent leader of the world and turning into a giant, writhing in its own coils, suspect, frightened, and leaderless.

There has never been a time when so many Americans despaired of their own past and present and renounced their old cocky boast to roll up their sleeves and face the toughest job. The one consolation must be that in the sixties, after two decades of enjoying a self-deception that is common to all the "developed" nations, the Americans at least began to grapple with the real problems of their society, horrendous though they may be.

NEW EXTREME LEFT THREATENS OUR FREEDOM

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday's Washington Post contained a UPI story out of New York City headlined "N.Y. Bank Damaged by Pipe Bomb." The article recounted another crime of violence—the bombing of a branch office of the Bank of America. Fortunately, no one was injured. According to the article:

Police said a six-inch pipe bomb was wrapped in a red, white, and blue flag with a white star. The debris was cleaned up by the time the bank opened and workmen replaced the doors.

About five minutes after the 3:45 a.m. blast, a male called the Daily News city desk:

"This is a Weatherman. Listen close. I'll only say it once. We have just bombed the Bank of America. We left a Vietcong flag. We did it in honor of the Cuban revolution and our brothers who died on the Isla Vista. Tell (Attorney General) John Mitchell that no matter what he does, we cannot be stopped."

Sunday was the 17th anniversary of the Castro revolution.

Without a doubt, the bombing of the New York bank is part of a calculated plan to destroy this society, this Nation. Yet it rated only a page 3 story.

Just who are these people who are attempting to destroy America?

The facts are clear. The culprits are "the new left"—the "neofascists" of the 1960's and the 1970's.

Let us look first at their words and then at their deeds.

Abbie Hoffman, 31, a member of the Chicago Seven, is quoted in the April 16, 1970, edition of the Saratogan of Saratoga Springs, N.Y., as saying:

Burning down a bank does more to fight pollution in this country than any goddamn teach-in next week will ever do . . . The only courts we have left in this country are in the streets . . . The hippies have to get guns and defend their communes.

Rennie Davis, 29, also a member of the Chicago Seven, said at Columbia University that—

The sixties was a time of sit-ins—the seventies will be a time to burn the banks.

At this point I request unanimous consent to insert at the end of my remarks an article from the July 22, 1970, issue of the Washington Post. It is very pertinent to my remarks because it contains the statement of a member of the Illinois Crime Commission, Charles Siragusa, that student activists have been conducting bombmaking workshops since 1968.

I take special note of Mr. Siragusa's comment that "well-calculated guerrilla warfare has become an integral part of the SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) strategy."

What are the fruits of these terrorists?

In the 15-month period between January 1969 and April 1970, this country suffered a total of 4,330 bombings, 1,475 attempted bombings, and 35,129 threatened bombings.

This cruel form of terrorism accounted directly for the deaths of 40 people and accounted for \$21.8 million in property damage. Countless others were put in imminent danger of physical injury or death.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that the more radical elements of the "New Left" are fanatically dedicated to the destruction of this Nation. Their hatred of our society extends to every segment. It includes their parents, schools, fellow men, and country.

Tom Hayden, a founder of SDS, had this way to say about the purpose of the revolution:

We haven't any. First we will make the revolution; then we will find out why.

Mr. Hayden has been quite successful. He was an active participant in the violence at Berkeley in 1964-65 and laid the groundwork for the 1968 closure of Columbia University.

I think it is fair to raise the question, Mr. Speaker, "What is the connection between student radical groups in the

United States and the Communist Party?"

It may not be direct. The student groups may not be acting on the direct orders of Peking or Moscow. But at this point they are without a doubt acting in concert since their goals are the same—the destruction of our way of life.

We know that new left activists visit Communist countries where they receive training and encouragement. We also know there are Communists in the leadership of the student radical movement.

This information was clearly documented in April hearings of the House Committee on Internal Security.

One of the most obvious links in the chain is Communist Cuba.

In his 1968 campaign President Nixon stated that Cuban Premier Castro "must be made to understand that Havana cannot remain forever a sanctuary for aggression and a base for the export of terror to other lands . . ."

The evidence indicates that Cuba is serving as the base for guerrilla operations against the United States.

An editorial in the March 18, 1970, issue of the Chicago Tribune summarizes in detail the use of Cuba as a training base for anti-American activities.

In light of the bombings of the Bank of America in New York I would draw special attention to the last four paragraphs of the editorial:

Ralph Featherstone, one of the two black terrorists who were killed by a bomb they were transporting in an automobile in Maryland last week, attended a revolutionary conference in Cuba in 1968. Mark Rudd, organizer of the riots that almost destroyed Columbia University in 1968, had made a pilgrimage to Cuba. So had Jerry Rubin and David Dellinger, two of the seven defendants in the recent riot-conspiracy trial here. They were convicted for their part in efforts to disrupt the Democratic convention in 1968.

Cathy Wilkerson and Kathy Boudin, who failed to show up in Chicago Monday for their trial on charges of attacking the police in a Grant Park riot last October, were reported to have visited Cuba. Both fled from a palatial townhouse in New York which had been converted into a bomb factory, when it was wrecked by an explosion in which three of the terrorists were killed.

The violent Weathermen faction of Students for a Democratic Society, the Revolutionary Youth Movement II, the pro-Peking Progressive Labor Party, and other "New Left" revolutionary groups are collaborating with the Black Panther party and other Negro extremists in a campaign of class warfare and guerrilla terrorism. In their so-called "free universities," they study the aims and techniques of guerrilla warfare in an urban setting.

The recent wave of bombing explosions and bomb scares is just a sample of what a few thousand trained terrorists could do. The cities are particularly vulnerable to such guerrilla tactics as terrorist bombing, destruction of key elements of the power grids, and disruption of communications and transportation. Obviously Castro is well aware of this potential if the State Department is not.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to an SDS project to send American volunteers to Cuba for the ostensible purpose of cutting sugarcane. The so-called Venceremos (we shall overcome brigade) is mentioned in the 1969 report of the House Committee on Internal Security. I ask unanimous

consent that the House Committee's report on the groups be inserted in the RECORD.

The committee report makes clear the purpose of the sugarcane cutters:

The real purpose of the sugar brigade project . . . is to propagandize the so-called blessings of the Cuban socialist (i.e., communist) revolution under Castro's forced-draft economies . . . SDS pointed this out when its article stated that "the duty of every revolutionary is to make the revolution" a slogan adopted as Cuba's new concept of "internationalism" and which had been expressed in the Second Declaration of Havana.

Mr. Speaker, 200 young Americans journeyed to Cuba with the first Venceremos brigade. An additional 500 traveled to Castro-land with the second brigade. At the moment efforts are being made to finance a trip for an additional 500 young Americans.

Needless to say, I am concerned. I am happy to see the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee shares my concern and has started an investigation of the Venceremos activities.

I also have been conducting an investigation of this group. Early this month, at my request, a member of my staff visited a fund-raising activity held to raise funds to get members of the group to Canada from where they would take a boat to Cuba.

My investigation shows that many of the persons hoping to travel to Cuba are youthful idealists who have not the slightest idea of what they are getting into. I hesitate to cast a shadow on their efforts by calling them dupes but the facts prove they are being led. There is no doubt in my mind that these people will be indoctrinated in communism and in violence while in Cuba.

The sponsors of the trip, the leaders of the trip, and the Cuban Government are clearly dedicated to one thing—the overthrow of the United States.

I am particularly concerned about the activities of the upcoming 3d Brigade. According to press accounts, the first two brigades actually cut sugarcane. There is no doubt that they received intensive political indoctrination but there is some doubt as to whether they actually received paramilitary or guerrilla training.

I insert an article by Newsweek correspondent Min Yee who journeyed to Cuba with one Venceremos contingent.

From my investigation, however, I have learned that the 3rd Brigade is not going to work in the sugarcane fields. Rather, they are going to the "Isle of Youth." Little is known about this place other than the cryptic comments of Castro:

The Isle of Youth is adding a new dimension to our revolution—a place where, unburdened by the traumas of capitalism, they can develop their potential to the fullest.

At any event, the Isle of Youth is a place where the Communist youth elites of Cuba undergo total immersion in a model Communist society.

I am horrified that American youth are apparently going to be allowed free access to partake of this experience. It bodes only evil for the United States.

In this Nation we can tolerate a great deal. Dissent provides for growth. Di-

versity is the norm. There is, however, a limit to just how far we can go. Freedom is not license.

Any government, and that includes our own, is entitled to take steps to protect itself from persons and groups that would violently destroy itself.

That is especially true for the United States for we have a free society. We have institutions that allow for peaceful change. The greatest and most important method of dissent is that which can be resorted to only in free countries: the free and secret ballot.

But the members of the new left repudiate the ballot. They desire only to destroy. But we must not let this small violent minority deny freedom to this generation of Americans and to generations still unborn. We have an obligation to protect this freedom both for ourselves and for our children.

Who can forget the lessons of 1932 in Germany where a violent majority used legal methods to destroy freedom? We must not let it happen here.

The articles follow:

SCHOOLS FOR BOMBERS REPORTED TO HILL UNIT

(By Lawrence L. Knutson)

An Illinois investigator told Senate investigators yesterday some members of Students for a Democratic Society have conducted workshops on bombmaking regularly since a 1968 meeting in Boulder, Colo.

Charles Siragusa, chairman of the Illinois Crime Investigating Commission, urged the government to classify official publications on how to make explosives to prevent them being used by subversive groups. Such pamphlets now are available through the Government Printing Office.

He recommended enactment of new federal laws to restrict sales of explosives and incendiary devices and to punish violators who "illegally cause damage to life, limb or property."

Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel, meanwhile, announced administration proposals for legislation to control sale of explosives.

The law would require federal licensing of explosives manufacturers and dealers, positive identification of buyers, and safe storage.

Illegal use of explosives and trafficking in stolen explosives would become federal offenses with maximum penalties of 10 years' imprisonment and \$10,000 fines.

Commenting on the "Days of Rage," in Chicago's streets in October 1969, Siragusa told the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations:

"Well-calculated guerrilla warfare has become an integral part of the SDS strategy."

Siragusa said the radical Weatherman faction of SDS appears to have gone underground in order to carry out a campaign of sabotage, and claimed the group had established relations with the Black Panthers, the Young Lords and other militant groups.

Other witnesses, all representing the explosives industry, recommended the federal licensing of makers and users of dynamite. They stressed their belief that manufacturers should not solely be singled out and said legitimate users of high explosives would have no objection to obtaining a license.

CUBAN SUGAR BRIGADE

Romerstein also reported that SDS had undertaken a project to organize a brigade composed of 300 Americans who, in two groups, would be sent to Cuba to harvest its 1970 sugar crop. One section would leave in late November 1969, the other in late January 1970.

An SDS resolution concerning the same

program had been proposed by three of its members according to the June 18, 1969, issue of *New Left Notes*. A cursory reading of the proposed resolution revealed that the true motive behind this aid program to Red Cuba was not simply to "morally and materially support Cuba in the critical sugar harvest of 1970."

The real purpose of the sugar brigade project, as the article explicitly reveals, is to propagandize the so-called blessings of the Cuban socialist (i.e., communist) revolution under Castro's forced-draft economics. Cuba, said by SDS to be the first so-called liberated territory in the Americas, adheres to a foreign policy based on violence directed at the "liberation" of other Latin American nations. SDS pointed this out when its article stated that "the duty of every revolutionary is to make the revolution," a slogan adopted as Cuba's new concept of "internationalism" and which had been expressed in the Second Declaration of Havana. Moreover, *New Left Notes* reiterated the strategy developed by the former high Cuban official, the deceased Che Guevara, Castro's roving ambassador of revolution, when he called for "two, three, and many Viet-nams."

Lastly, these American sugarcane cutters would be educated, the article stated, in the art of international revolution directed against imperialism (i.e., the U.S.). Their so-called education would be "accomplished through a well-developed education and propaganda program." The ostensible humanitarian motive for the Cuban trips fades perceptibly when contrasted with the other stated objective behind this fraud—that is, a scheme to expose 300 Americans, of whom some may be genuinely motivated, to the "application of communist principles on a day-to-day basis."

CUBA: THE NEW LEFT CUTS CANE

In an attempt to achieve a record sugar harvest this season, Fidel Castro has mobilized hundreds of thousands of Cubans and sent them into the cane fields. The Cuban Prime Minister has also called for volunteer workers from abroad. In response to this invitation, youthful radicals in the U.S. formed the first *Venceremos* (We Shall Overcome) Brigade last fall and headed for Cuba. Since then 1,000 American youngsters, including a second *Venceremos* Brigade, have made the trip. Among the members of one recent contingent was NEWSWEEK correspondent Min Yee, whose regular beat is San Francisco. Min Yee's report follows:

They had come, for the most part, out of the ranks of American political activism. Among them were miniskirted coeds from Berkeley, studious Trotskyites from Los Angeles, chicanos from California, Weathermen from New York and Chicago, blacks from East Oakland and Harlem. It was a kind of New Left collage of SDS, Socialist Labor, Progressive Labor, Communist Party-U.S.A., women's liberation, Revolutionary Youth Movement-2, the black Che-Lumumba wing of the C.P., yuppies, crazies—and just plain romantic revolutionaries.

Despite the differences in their backgrounds, political affiliations and age, there was among the brigade members a common denominator. For they had joined together in what they considered to be an act of political defiance—to break "the American imperialist blockade of Cuba." And they wanted to participate in the historic "10-million-ton harvest," which, if attained, would "strike another blow at American imperialism."

The trip began with a 65-hour, knee-cramping bus ride from San Francisco, and when we arrived in Mexico City we were tired and a bit depressed. But when a halting English voice announced the boarding of our Cubana Airlines flight to Havana, the group cheered, applauded, whistled and ran to the exit doors, surging onto the tarmac

and scrambling up the ramp into the Russian turboprop. "Take me to Havana," laughed one youth, brandishing his briar pipe in a mock re-enactment of a hijacking.

WELCOME

A few hours later we landed in Havana, and after an airport cocktail party of daiquiris and cake we were bused eastward from the capital to the brigade camp near the town of Aguacate. "Welcome home," said a Cuban comrade as he grabbed my arm. Bleary-eyed but exhilarated, we were then welcomed by the camp director, a square-faced young man named Javier Ardizones. "The name *venceremos* was earned by the first American group by its attitude, and it was earned by all of you by your decision to leave the United States to come and help Cuba. *Venceremos!*"

Then we were shown around the camp. Set in the middle of a spacious plain surrounded by rolling hills, it had more than 50 field tents, a mess hall, various offices, an outdoor theater and other recreational facilities. Twenty of us were assigned to each tent, in which there were ten iron-frame double bunks. It was, all in all, pretty plush by Cuban standards, and some of our people were not too happy to hear that Cubans in nearby camps had to sleep in hammocks.

CANE

The day was a full one. We were jolted out of bed at 5:30 to the bouncy martial strains of "De Pie" (On Your Feet). There was a breakfast of *café con leche* and one or two rolls, and then—dressed, for the most part in work clothes handed out by the Cubans—we marched off with our black-handled Spanish machetes to the cane fields 2 miles away. Cutting, once you got the hang of it, was routine—but hard. When we first arrived at the camp, work hours ran from 7 a.m. to 11 a.m., and from 3 to 6 p.m. Several days later, however, the Cubans who ran the camp told us that we would probably like to extend the afternoon session by starting at 2 p.m. The announcement received an ovation, but later in the day I heard such complaints from brigade members as "It should have been a collective decision."

Work procedures soon produced the first open clash between the brigade and the Cubans—actually between women's liberation members and the Cubans. Traditionally in Cuba, the men cut the cane and the women stack it. Our women's lib people were not about to have any such divisions. They wanted to cut side by side with the men, and the Cubans had to give in. It took some of these gals half a dozen whacks to cut through a stalk of cane, and from anything but a women's lib point of view that was nonproductive.

And, to the Cubans, the name of the game was production. The best way to cut more cane, they preached, was not through individual competition, as in the capitalist system, but through socialist "emulation." Theoretically, this meant that you were supposed to emulate the most productive members of the brigade. Still, it was hard for the Americans, radical as they were, to abandon the spirit of competition—especially since by nightfall the day's production statistics were always posted. My unit was the fastest of the newer ones. "But we shouldn't boast about it," said one comrade. "Yeah," replied another, "we can keep quiet about it. But we know we're better."

CAUCUSES

After work hours there was remarkably little sleeping around between the guys and the girls and, since the Cubans had made it plain that we were not there for another Woodstock, hardly any use of drugs. But there was an almost continuous round of caucuses: black caucuses, chicano caucuses, Anglo caucuses, yellow caucuses, Third World caucuses, Puerto Rican caucuses and women's lib caucuses. Some of the discussion in the

non-white caucuses involved racist acts or comments by white brothers and sisters in the brigade. The displays of "racism"—largely unconscious—ranged from things like a white not touching someone of color to not taking a bite from a dark brother's orange. Or comments about Cuban food such as "I can't eat this crap."

Another subject frequently discussed in some of these caucuses was the presence of Randall Richard, a staff reporter for The Providence (R.I.) Journal, free-lance photographer Ron Alexander and myself in the brigade. We had made no secret of our journalistic connections when we signed up for the trip, and most of the members of the brigade were not against our being along with them. But some of the radical-radicals wanted control over the stories we intended to write. They wanted them written collectively in the camp and sent from there—and this I refused to do. As a result, I got into a number of nasty confrontations. "You work for NEWSWEEK," someone would say, "and so you work for the pig media. You're a pig, man."

I had listened with detachment when I heard the word "pig" hurled at cops back home. But it was an altogether heavy scene at the camp to hear it aimed at me. "Take my picture and you're dead, pig," I was told on a number of occasions, and one day someone tried to smash my camera lens, but only managed to get the filter. "The only reason you still have your equipment is because you're in Cuba," one young woman told me. "In the States, I would have broken every piece of it." To which I responded that I would have broken every piece of her. Curiously, all the people who gave me a hard time were whites.

TENTMATES

Randall Richard, the Providence reporter, was getting much the same treatment. He told me that he slept with a machete under his mat—and I couldn't blame him. I would have done the same if it hadn't been for the fact my notes and photographs—as well as my personal address book—were confiscated. And Ron fared even worse. When the customs officials discovered that he had a Havana phone book in his bag, they put him up against a wall and searched him bodily.

The whole character of our departure could, at best, be excused as an enormous misunderstanding. At its worst, it was an indication of the fragmentation of the Movement in America—a microcosm of the tension, mistrust, paranoia, scape-goating and disorganization which is the New Left.

It was with such reflections that we boarded a Cuban ship and set sail for Canada. Almost six days later, we went through U.S. customs in Toronto. "Where have you been, fellows?" asked the American officer. "Cuba," we answered. "Bring anything back with you?" he asked. We told him we had not. But actually we had come back with conflicting emotions about Cuba and the New Left.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 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?

AUGUST AT THE SMITHSONIAN

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Calendar of Events for the month of August 1970 of the Smithsonian Institution. Once again, the Smithsonian has scheduled many excellent events, as well as a number of special summer activities.

I strongly urge my colleagues and the American people to visit the Smithsonian Institution and take advantage of the many planned activities and events:

AUGUST AT THE SMITHSONIAN

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

Saturday, 1

Exhibition: *Today and Tomorrow in Space*. Space Art by Robert McCall, Arts and Industries Building through August 15.

Sunday, 2

Demonstration of African Music and Dance. 3-5:30 p.m., National Portrait Gallery.

Tuesday, 4

Lecture: *Thomas Nast Paintings*, by Mrs. Janet Flint. 11 a.m., National Collection of Fine Arts.

Wednesday, 5

Informal Concert: A 45-minute performance of piano trios of Mozart and Brahms. 1:30 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, National Museum of History and Technology.

Films: *Out There, a Lone Island and Korea*. 7:30 p.m., Auditorium, National Museum of History and Technology.

Thursday, 6

Creative Screen: *Art of the 60's*. Continuous showings on the half-hour from 11 a.m. to 2:30 p.m., at the National Collection of Fine Arts.

Friday, 7

Mr. Zip Through Cartoonists' Eyes. Exhibition of cartoons drawn for the Post Office Department by widely syndicated artists. In the Hall of Philately, National Museum of History and Technology, through early October.

Artists Abroad. 50 paintings and sculptures by Americans who studied abroad under the Institute of International Education Sponsorship. National Collection of Fine Arts through September 7.

Saturday, 8

Creative Screen: *Art of the 60's*. Repeat. See August 6 entry for details.

Saturday, 15

Mohandas Gandhi. Memorial exhibition commemorating the birth of the great Indian leader. 3rd Floor, National Museum of History and Technology through October 12.

Wednesday, 19

Informal Concert: 45-minute performance using instruments from the Smithsonian's collection. 1:30 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, National Museum of History and Technology.

Thursday, 20

Creative Screen: The Ivory Knife. Continuous showings on the half-hour from 11 a.m. to 2:30 p.m., at the National Collection of Fine Arts.

Moon Rocks. Photographic exhibit showing Smithsonian scientists conducting research on lunar samples and results of the study. Foyer Gallery, National Museum of Natural History through Labor Day.

Saturday, 22

Creative Screen: The Ivory Knife. Repeat. See August 20 entry for details.

Vibrating World. 50 black and white photographs help to explain cymatics—the structure and dynamics of waves in fibrations. Complex and orderly patterns are formed and many peculiar undulations and surface effects are seen. Arts and Industries Building through October 12.

SUMMER HOURS

Smithsonian Museums are open to the public 7 days a week. Hours: 10 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. daily. Museum of History and Technology: 10 a.m. to 9 p.m. daily through August.

HOURS AT NATIONAL ZOO

Gates open 6 a.m.—Close 6:00 p.m.

Buildings open 9 a.m.—Close 6:00 p.m.

Dial-a-museum—737-8811 for daily announcements on new exhibits and special events.

Dial-a-Phenomenon—737-8855 for daily announcements of satellite passages and worldwide occurrences of short-lived natural phenomena.

The Smithsonian Monthly Calendar of Events is prepared by the Office of Public Affairs, 381-5911. Deadline for September Calendar: August 8.

Mailing list requests and change of address should be sent to the Smithsonian Calendar, 425 Smithsonian Institution Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20560.

FOREIGN STUDY TOURS

In 1970

The Smithsonian has organized several special tours concerned with archaeology, the arts, museums, private collections, and natural history, for members of its Associates Programs.

Northern Italy: Palladian tour of Venice, Vicenza and Verona. Leaving September 14th for two weeks, with a third week free for members arrangements at will in Europe. (Itinerary available, waiting list only.)

No-tour: BOAC Excursion—Dulles/London/Dulles. October 2-23. \$247.00. Make your own arrangements for three weeks travel in Europe.

In 1971

Sicilian Archaeological Sites and Opera in Italy: February 1-22, with visits to the opera houses of Palermo and Catania in almond-blossom time, Trieste, Venice, Naples, Rome, Milan: good seats assured and backstage visits. Under the direction of Mrs. Constance Mellen of The Washington Opera Society.

East African Safari and Cruise: March 20 to April 15; five days in game reserves; two-week cruise to visit the Seychelles Islands, Aldabra Island, and others in the Indian Ocean; sailing from and returning to Mombasa. (Itinerary available.)

Cyprus & Asiatic Turkey: May 13-June 3, for three weeks; visiting archaeological sites in central and Southern Turkey, as well as better-known excavations near the West Coast; an extended itinerary fanning out from four centers with comfortable hotels: Nicosia, Izmir, Alanya, and Ankara. Under the direction of John J. Slocum.

Palladian Architecture in Ireland: May 31 to June 15; seminar on preservation techniques and methods; visits to private properties. In co-operation with the Irish Georgian Society. Under the direction of Dr. Richard H. Howland.

France: No-tour tour; an extremely inexpensive excursion via Air France, June, for three weeks; members plan and pay for their own arrangements in Europe.

South America: August; a tour of Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Brazil, with emphasis on archaeology, old and new architecture, museum and private collections, plus a short visit to the Upper Amazon.

Russia: September 20 to October 12. An unusual tour that includes Armenia, Samar-

kand, Kiev, Vladimir, and Novgorod besides extended visits to Moscow and Leningrad. (Itinerary available.)

For itineraries and details please write to Miss Susan Kennedy, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

SMITHSONIAN RESIDENT PUPPET THEATRE

Confetti, presented by Bob Brown Marionettes. This production, which continues through September 7, is a half-hour of merriment aimed to delight children and adults alike. Summer hours: 11 a.m., 1 p.m. and 3 p.m., Wednesday through Sunday. Reservations are advised and can be obtained by telephoning 381-5241. The Puppet Theatre is located on the third floor of the National Museum of History and Technology and is produced by the Smithsonian's Division of Performing Arts.

MUSEUM TOURS

National Collection of Fine Arts: Weekday tours 11 a.m. and 1 p.m. For advance reservations and full information, call 381-4188 or 381-6100; messages 381-5180.

National Portrait Gallery: Tours of the permanent collection of the National Portrait Gallery and special tours may be arranged by calling 381-6106 or 381-6161. Tours will be given by special appointment only.

Museum of History and Technology: Highlight Tours of the Building—Meet at the Pendulum.

Weekday tours arranged through Office of Academic Programs call 381-5680, 381-5019. Early American Furnishings—Monday through Friday

First Ladies Gowns—Monday through Friday

Ceramics—mornings by request

SUMMER ADVENTURE

Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates

Mineral and gem collecting (August 27-30). Three days of collecting in quarries of northwestern Maine, under supervision of Dr. Thomas Feininger, Smithsonian mineralogist. For information call 381-5159.

Arts and Industries Building

1. *Art Proffis*—closing indefinite.
2. *Moon Rock*—closing indefinite.
3. *Polish Folk Art*—through September 21.
4. *Dorothy Liebes Retrospective*—through September 28.

Museum of History and Technology

1. *Voyage of the U.S.S. Manhattan*—through August 31.
2. *Women and Politics*—closing indefinite.
3. *Laser 10*—through Labor Day.
4. *The Demand for Water*—through September 15.

Museum of Natural History

1. *South African Costumes*—closing indefinite.
2. *Vanishing Totems of Alaska*—closing indefinite.
3. *Malay Archipelago*—through September.
4. *Coral-Eating Starfish*—indefinite.
5. *Indian Images*—through August 31.
6. *Reptile Behavior and Feeding Habits*—through September 8.

Freer Gallery of Art

1. *Whistler's Landscapes and Seascapes*—closing indefinite.

National Portrait Gallery

1. *Language of African Sculpture*—through September 7.

National Collection of Fine Arts

1. *Thomas Nast's Grand Caricaturama*—through August 31.

RADIO SMITHSONIAN

You can listen to the Smithsonian every Sunday night from 7:30 to 8:00 p.m. on radio station WGMS (570 AM & 103.5 FM). The weekly *Radio Smithsonian* program presents music and conversation growing out of the

Institution's exhibits, research, and other activities and interests. Program schedule for August, under the theme, "A Summer of Music," is:

2. *Recital of 20th Century Piano Music by Pierre Huybrechts.*

9. *The Princeton Chamber Orchestra.*

16. *Tarr and Kent Concert.*

23. *The 1970 American Folklife Festival, Part I.*

30. *The 1970 American Folklife Festival, Part II.*

Radio Smithsonian is also heard on WAMU-FM (88.5), Tuesdays at noon; WETA-FM (90.9), Mondays at 9:30 p.m.; and on WNYC-AM/FM in New York City.

BLOODBATH PREDICTED IN WAKE OF U.S. WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the warning of a young constituent who is now stationed with the Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office in Saigon. His observations are significant, I believe, when contrasted with those who continually call for our immediate and precipitous withdrawal from Vietnam:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MYERS: I don't know if you remember me or not, but a couple of years ago I was active in the Victory in Vietnam movement at I.U., and we exchanged letters at that time.

I am now working as a writer/editor in the North Vietnam Affairs Division of JUSPAO, and among my duties is the requirement to closely follow the North Vietnamese press and radio, and to read hundreds of captured documents every month.

Perhaps at no time in our history has a major problem been surrounded by so much misinformation and misunderstanding as has the Vietnam war. From my current vantage point—and because I spent 5 years at IU specializing in Vietnamese Studies—I feel I have a better understanding than most people.

I am working at present on a detailed study of the Viet Cong tactic of assassination. My study has led me to conclude that if the communists are allowed to take over Vietnam, something on the order of 3 to 5 million people over here are going to be in danger of being killed. Daily I see captured directives complaining that many of the "traitors" and "puppet administrative officials" who have been sentenced to be "punished" are "still alive."

I know of no one who enjoys what is presently taking place in this war-torn land. Certainly, I would rather be home with my new bride than over here. However, those who urge that we abandon these people in the interest of "peace" and of saving lives, just simply do not know what they are talking about. The bloodbath that will follow an American pullout before the Vietnamese are ready to assume the full burden of the war will dwarf what is presently taking place here.

As a constituent who has been more than casually interested in the Vietnam question—I returned here for my third trip in January—I want to ask you as my representative in government to please do not betray these people. Please, do not vote to pull us out of here—millions of people have accepted our word that we would protect them, and it is largely because of their confidence

in us that they now find themselves under sentence of death by the communists. To betray our promise at this time would consign many of Vietnam's finest and most courageous people to death. It would further completely destroy my faith in our system of government, and my pride in my country as the defender of the weak.

THE AMERICAN IMAGE ABROAD

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, once there was a book called "The Ugly American." It set forth many reasons why Americans were not liked in foreign lands no matter how much they did for the people in those lands.

Years ago—1948-49—I served as first counsel to the first joint congressional committee set up to watch over the Marshall plan spending in Europe. In this assignment I traveled in Europe and the Middle East to see how things were going and submitted reports to then committee chairman, the late Honorable Pat McCarran, advising that the seeds of the ugly-American-to-be were being planted by what some Americans were doing.

For example, in Greece American staff employees and economic mission representatives were riding around the streets in Paul Hoffman's new Studebakers—Hoffman was then head of the Economic Recovery Administration—blowing their horns to move the populace off the streets so they could get by, a populace that for the most part had no cars, and mightily resented the American opulence.

No matter what we do in Vietnam for the Vietnamese or otherwise, we are still foreigners—still unwanted, and in some respects even hated. One does not need to go to Vietnam to know that this is almost bound to be the case. It would be the situation with almost any foreign presence but perhaps particularly Americans because of their insistence on material comforts in contradistinction to a majority of the people of South Vietnam.

I do not know that this means that we ought to get out of Vietnam any faster for President Nixon's withdrawal is now geared to the military situation and the capability of the South Vietnamese to defend themselves from an even more hated presence—Communist infiltration from North Vietnam or possibly Red China. But it is an indication of what ought to become fairly well settled American foreign policy, which is that the American presence in terms of either too much money or too many people in other lands should be sharply curtailed in future years lest we become even more unpopular than we already are.

I commend the recent report appearing in the Sunday New York Times to the thoughtful consideration of readers in the RECORD in this connection:

AMERICANS IN VIETNAM FIND THEMSELVES HATED

SAIGON.—If there are any truly hopeful or complacent Americans still left in the

huge United States mission here, last week should have made it more difficult than ever for them to believe that they are loved, even liked, or occasionally appreciated by the South Vietnamese. For the politicians, the university students, the angry Buddhists, the adolescents who hate the war and refuse to be pulled into it, the working class man who blames inflation on the foreigners, are all trying in different ways to tell him how they feel.

Anti-Americanism in South Vietnam is most particularly seen and sensed in Saigon, but only because peasants in the countryside have fewer chances to express it. Since 1965, when the buildup of United States military forces began, few Americans here thought it would all be rosy between the two races. But fewer still thought the day would come when a warning would be issued by the United States Embassy for staff members not to travel alone in Saigon because of recent acts of violence against Americans. Last month, Vietnamese students here pulled an American M.P. from a jeep, beat him, and burned the vehicle.

After the embassy warning—in which employees were advised to travel in pairs—officials were embarrassed by the attention it drew to a problem they, naturally, would wish to conceal. An embassy spokesman said last week the warning was actually more of a precaution than the result of specific anti-American attacks (on which no figures, of course, were available) but it was too late to convince anyone.

UGLY MOOD

The warning makes sense. The mood of the Vietnamese in Saigon has been increasingly ugly since last May. There are fewer Americans in Vietnam—in Saigon, too—but those that are here are hated more. It is unsafe, even stupid, for a foreign woman to walk alone after 9 p.m. even in the heart of downtown Saigon. Boys riding in pairs on Honda motorcycles will try to snatch her handbag. The same boys will also try, and nearly always succeed, in cutting camera straps on the shoulders of Americans, and even pulling off wristwatches from the arms of men. Theft is not the only reason: What happens in Saigon is not quite the same small mean crime that happens so often in New York. Here, it is a way of getting back, of showing the Americans that the Vietnamese can threaten them, too.

The Americans are hated now because they have, for so long, told the Vietnamese how to win the war. Despite such assurance, the war is a long way from being won. It is the Americans who advise on so many things—how to be a mayor, how to run a detention center, how to burn marijuana, how to pacify a village and how to blow it to pieces if that also is called for—that the Vietnamese ache to be left alone and to divorce themselves from their well-meaning but tiresome allies.

Some Vietnamese hate because the Americans are bigger, richer, smugger, calmer, because they have ice, telephones, helicopters, medicines, cars and the conviction that they are right, even when surrounded by the wreckage of their plans and the failures of their charts promising certain victory and peace.

The Vietnamese are not always fair or honest in their grievances. They rarely blame themselves for lack of leadership, for the mess in their own country in the last 15 years. They will not admit that they, too, want money and Salem cigarettes, hot water and tape recorders and Hondas. But the grievances against the Americans are there and growing.

CAUSES OF ANGER

The B-52 bombing raids, the air strikes on villages where there might have been Vietcong but maybe not, the incidents of cruelty by United States troops, the Phoenix pro-

gram, have made many Vietnamese angry and outraged. The victims of American actions are very numerous, indeed.

But even the Vietnamese who have never been injured or deprived because of Americans have caught the fever.

Anti-Americanism is strongly espoused by the Opposition deputies in the National Assembly, as is their campaign against the

Government of President Thieu. They boast about it, as though at long last they were ready to make their own decisions, pay their own bills, accept their own risks.

There is the feeling here that President Thieu rather enjoys their attacks on American policy. His opposition says to the world what his political position prevents him from ever expressing. In fact, there are few Viet-

namese who do not feel that the Americans really have gotten them into more trouble—forgetting their Government's call for help in 1965. A typical comment comes from a newspaper publisher and prominent National Assembly deputy: "I don't know what might have happened to us if the United States had not intervened but I do know they have made the war worse."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, August 6, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might.—Ephesians 6: 10.

O God and Father of us all, we thank Thee for our homes and pray that Thou wilt bless all who live within our family circles. We are grateful for Thy mercies which daily attend our days, for food, clothing, and shelter, for the warmth of our affections and for the ties that bind us together.

Help us so to live each day and so to love one another that we may never be afraid or ashamed but always may our hearts be happy, our thoughts good, our words gentle, our deeds genuine, and our hands ready to help.

Daily renew our strength, replenish our love and restore our faith that we may face life bravely because we face it together. As we come to family reunion day this Sunday deepen our love for one another and for Thee that love may reign in every room in our hearts and rule in every room in our homes.

In Thy Holy Name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16915) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate concurred in House amendments to Senate amendments numbered 23, 32, and 35 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1076) entitled "An act to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes."

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE NATIONAL PARKS CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 91-

332, the Chair appoints as members of the National Parks Centennial Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. SKUBITZ.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 14 United States Code 194(a), the Chair appoints as a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

THE INVESTIGATION OF ASSOCIATE JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a public account of the first 60 days' activities of the House Judiciary Subcommittee chaired by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), charged with the investigation of certain allegations concerning activities of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Douglas, for some reason failed to include an outline of recommended procedures submitted by me in May specifically in response to prior request by Chairman CELLER.

Inasmuch as the Celler subcommittee has now made this report public, I am including in the RECORD today in an extension of remarks a copy of this letter of May 6 in full.

To this day it appears that this subcommittee has failed to call a single witness, or to take a single word of testimony under oath.

Conceived in deceit in that the resolution that it is operating under was offered as a palpable subterfuge, to avoid House Resolution 922 and companion resolutions containing cosponsors this so-called investigation by the Celler subcommittee makes a mockery of the responsibilities of this House to meaningfully investigate impeachments.

Yesterday the chairman announced that there were going to be three phases to the investigation, and that phase I had been concluded.

This phase staging is a palpable stall, to protract and drag out this investigation of Justice Douglas until this House is out of session and it is too late to do anything about it in this 91st Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the charges that have been made are quite serious ones. I believe testimony should be taken under

oath in a public hearing by an independently and objectively minded committee. I hope this body will act to see that this is done without further delay.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate my concern over the progress made to date with respect to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. While I certainly do not want to prejudge the progress we will make next week, our record last week and this week was not good, considering the importance of this legislation.

The subcommittee chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) and our colleague Mr. SMITH of California, have labored long and hard to bring this bill to the floor. The debate so far has been full, fair, and constructive. However, I would hope that we would not let the initiative for true reform be lost by dragging out our discussions over a prolonged period of time.

Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that we will devote the major portion next week to the passage of meaningful congressional reform bill.

THE PRINCIPAL FIGURE IN THE BOOK "THE REAL MAJORITY"

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I am intrigued by the interest generated by the new book, "The Real Majority," coauthored by Richard Scammon and Ben Wattenberg.

Several noted pundits, including Stewart Alsop, Richard Harwood, Frank Maniewicz, and Tom Braden, have referred to the principal figures in this book, a "47-year-old housewife from the outskirts of Dayton, Ohio, whose husband is a machinist."

Since this lady resides in my congressional district, I took the liberty of checking her political alliance. I am informed, Mr. Speaker, by the board of elections that she is not registered and therefore, not eligible to vote in the November 3 election.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.