

of general sessions, for the term of 15 years, as prescribed by Public Law 91-358, approved July 29, 1970, vice Milton S. Kronhelm, term expired.

Paul F. McArdle, of Maryland, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, for the term of 15 years as prescribed by Public Law 91-358, approved July 29, 1970, vice Thomas C. Scalley, term expired.

Sylvia A. Bacon, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge, District of Columbia court of general sessions, for the term of 15 years, vice a new position created by Public Law 91-358, approved July 29, 1970.

John F. Doyle, of Maryland, to be an associate judge, District of Columbia court of general sessions, for the term of 15 years vice a new position created by Public Law 91-358, approved July 29, 1970.

Eugene N. Hamilton, of Maryland, to be an associate judge, District of Columbia court of general sessions, for the term of 15 years vice a new position created by Public Law 91-358, approved July 29, 1970.

Stanley S. Harris, of Maryland, to be an associate judge, District of Columbia court of general sessions, for the term of 15 years vice a new position created by Public Law 91-358 approved July 29, 1970.

Theodore R. Newman, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge, District of Columbia court of general sessions, for the term of 15 years vice a new position created by Public Law 91-358, approved July 29, 1970.

Nicholas S. Nunzio, of Maryland, to be an associate judge, District of Columbia court of general sessions, for the term of 15 years vice a new position created by Public Law 91-358 approved July 29, 1970.

John G. Penn, of Maryland, to be an associ-

ate judge, District of Columbia court of general sessions, for the term of 15 years vice a new position created by Public Law 91-358 approved July 29, 1970.

George H. Revercomb, of Virginia, to be associate judge, District of Columbia court of general sessions for the term of 15 years vice a new position created by Public Law 91-358, approved July 29, 1970.

William E. Stewart, Jr., of Maryland, to be an associate judge, District of Columbia court of general sessions for the term of 15 years vice a new position created by Public Law 91-358, approved July 29, 1970.

James A. Washington, Jr., of Maryland, to be an associate judge, District of Columbia court of general sessions for the term of years prescribed by Public Law 91-358, approved July 29, 1970, and vice a new position created by said Public Law 91-358.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### CHIEF JUSTICE SCORES "POT" SAFETY REPORTS

#### HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, many in legislative and Government executive positions today are being pressured to legalize the use and possession of marijuana.

May I suggest that any who lean favorably toward such a proposal read the following Associated Press article carrying the views of Chief Justice Joseph Weintraub of the Supreme Court of New Jersey on the subject.

Chief Justice Weintraub counsels extreme caution and I share that viewpoint. At the very, very least all should wait until appropriate and needed studies of marijuana and its effects are made as called for in my bill H.R. 14354.

I also share the doubts of the Chief Justice that full scale and complete research will prove that marijuana is harmless. Is there any doubt that many times the use of marijuana leads to the taking of hard-core drugs and dopes for lifts, trips, and crutches? Then often minds and bodies.

It will be a sad day in this Nation if those with the allout permissive philosophy should prevail and force legalization of the use and possession of marijuana before all of the facts are before those who must make the decision.

The Associated Press article follows:

#### CHIEF JUSTICE SCORES "POT" SAFETY REPORTS

TRENTON.—Chief Justice Joseph Weintraub of the New Jersey Supreme Court said yesterday that marijuana should not be legalized "until we are darn sure it's harmless."

The chief justice also criticized medical and research reports which said that smoking marijuana has not been proven to be harmful. Weintraub said the reports, like "the piper," were enticing youngsters to try the drug.

He made the remarks during a hearing on an appeal by 21-year-old Steven Ward who was sentenced to 2-3 years in prison for possessing marijuana valued at about \$250.

Stanley C. Van Ness, head of New Jersey's

public defender office, who argued Ward's case, said the sentence was cruel and excessive for a first offender.

He urged the court to overturn the sentence and establish a policy of probation for first offenders in marijuana cases.

Ward, who was 19-years-old when he was sentenced to state prison in 1969 by Cumberland County Judge Harry Adler, is free on parole after being confined for nearly one year.

Weintraub said the prison term for Ward would appear "wildly excessive" were it not for other factors outlined in a probation report submitted to Adler before sentencing.

The chief justice said the pre-sentence report indicated that Ward had "sponsored marijuana parties" which on one occasion had led to a search of his home by police which failed to turn up any evidence.

However, Assistant Cumberland County Prosecutor Samuel J. Serata told the high court that the pre-sentence report probably played a minor role in the harsh sentence. Serata said the sentence was the product of an "almost hysterical" attitude in the county which has since changed.

Serata, who joined the prosecutor's staff this year, said that people in rural Cumberland County regarded "marijuana as a horrendous thing that comes from the cities... an epidemic that must be stamped out." He said he represented marijuana defendants before joining the prosecutor's staff.

Weintraub, who said he recognized that there has "been quite a change in public attitude" toward marijuana in the past year, said he thought it was "nonsense" to equate the laws against marijuana with prohibition on liquor during the 1920's. "One day it may be proven that it's no more harmful than Scotch," Weintraub said. "But I doubt it."

He added, "everyone agrees it's not as dangerous as heroin. But that doesn't mean it's just a drink of water."

"More harm is being done by these silly reports that it is not proven harmful and therefore it's (like) prohibition. That's nonsense. It's encouraging kids to try it."

### TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

#### HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing

renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. A Russian must work 2,950 minutes for a pair of men's shoes while an American works 275 minutes. For a business suit, a Russian must work 11,800 minutes compared to 802 minutes by an American worker.

### RESULTS OF POLL CONDUCTED BY THE AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL

#### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to introduce the findings of a poll just completed by the respected American Security Council. I would like to call special attention of my colleagues to question No. 8 which, according to this survey, it seems that a substantial number of Americans favor an objective of victory in Vietnam.

There are obviously a number of Americans who continue to reflect the wisdom set down by Mommsen:

History has a nemesis for every sin; for the will to freedom that fails in force, as well as for the pride of mind that fails in understanding.

The poll follows:

#### NATIONAL SECURITY ISSUES POLL

In a true democracy, decisions on such vital matters as military preparedness should reflect the will of the people.

Therefore, we must ask, "does the trend toward unilateral disarmament represent the will of most Americans, or the will of special interest pressure groups?"

In seeking the answer to this question, the American Security Council conducted a National Security Issues Poll with a final total of 115,559 participants.

From March 1 to August 31, 1970, the Council invited opinion leaders representing the full range of domestic political viewpoint to serve on its National Voter Advisory Board and to participate in the National Security Issues Poll. The response of the 42,946 who did both is shown under "A" below.

The response of the 45,456 who participated in the Poll, but did not become mem-

bers of the Advisory Board is listed under "B" below.

From July 1 to August 31, 1970, 203 newspapers in 44 states published the Poll. These

newspapers ranged in size from the St. Louis Globe Democrat and the San Francisco Examiner to small town newspapers. The response of the American people want the security of 27,197 readers is shown under "C" below. It is clear from the results of this Poll and the results of other polls that most of the American people want the security of military superiority and oppose isolationism.

NATIONAL SECURITY ISSUES POLL RESULTS

	Agree, percent			Disagree, percent			Undecided, percent		
	1 A	2 B	3 C	1 A	2 B	3 C	1 A	2 B	3 C
1. The Safeguard anti-ballistic missile defense system (ABM) is necessary for the defense of the United States.....	93.19	78.53	80.39	1.26	11.47	10.58	5.55	10.00	9.03
2. The United States should maintain military strength greater than that of the Soviet Union and Red China.....	93.53	82.07	84.75	2.07	10.73	9.85	4.40	7.20	5.40
3. Communists and other revolutionaries should be permitted to teach in tax-supported educational institutions.....	1.20	9.69	4.79	97.77	88.28	92.66	1.03	2.03	2.55
4. Communists and other revolutionaries should be permitted to hold sensitive positions in defense facilities.....	.58	4.78	1.32	99.00	93.05	96.04	.42	2.17	2.64
5. The United States should have a national objective of victory in the cold war.....	93.46	80.64	80.04	2.47	11.09	11.53	4.07	8.27	8.43
6. The United States needs a "Freedom Academy" to train leaders for new forms of nonmilitary conflict.....	73.09	56.91	47.25	6.61	16.46	26.40	20.30	26.63	26.35
7. The United States should help the people of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Cuba and other captive nations in their struggle for freedom.....	71.95	57.10	52.97	9.85	20.80	28.48	18.20	22.10	18.55
8. The United States should have a national objective of victory in Vietnam.....	89.85	76.77	78.16	3.18	13.70	14.09	6.97	9.53	7.75
9. The United States should give economic aid to foreign governments even if they are Communist or pro-Communist.....	2.07	8.87	5.41	93.05	85.57	89.99	4.88	5.56	4.60
10. The United States should extend diplomatic recognition to Red China.....	10.27	20.85	21.74	76.35	66.55	66.88	13.38	12.60	11.38

1 National Voter Advisory Board—42,946 members.  
2 Mail poll—45,456 participants.

3 Newspaper poll—27,197 readers.

NATIONAL VOTER ADVISORY BOARD  
(Partial listing of 42,946 members)

- Walter R. Beardsley, Chairman, Miles Laboratories, Inc.
- Dr. H. Russell Beatty, President, Wentworth Institute.
- Arch N. Booth, Executive Vice President, Chamber of Commerce of U.S.
- The Honorable Spruille Braden, Former Ambassador.
- Dr. Frank R. Brown, Dean, Hood Theological Seminary.
- The Honorable Joel Brodyhill, U.S. Congressman.
- L. B. Burger, Chairman, Westinghouse Air Brake.
- Dr. Cordas C. Burnett, President, Bethany Bible College.
- Henri G. Busignies, Senior Vice President, International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation.
- James Cagney, Actor.
- Colonel John T. Carlton, USAR, Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the U.S.
- Joseph A. Carrera, Senior Vice President, Bank of America.
- Sylvan C. Coleman, Chairman, E. F. Hutten & Company, Inc.
- Dr. David S. Collier, Director, Foundation for Foreign Affairs, Inc.
- Bing Crosby, Actor, Singer.
- The Honorable Peter Dominick, U.S. Senator.
- William L. Davis, Jr., President, Emerson Electric Company.
- The Honorable Thomas Dodd, U.S. Senator.
- Gaylord Donnelley, Chairman of the Board, R. R. Donnelley & Sons.
- Mrs. Cathryn L. K. Dorney, Executive Director, American Education Association.
- James C. Ellsworth, Senior Vice President, United California Bank.
- The Honorable Paul J. Fannin, U.S. Senator.
- Shelton Fisher, President, McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Bishop A. L. Fletcher, Little Rock Diocese.
- Mother Jane Frances, Motherhouse of the Grey Nuns of the Sacred Heart.
- Dr. Carl A. Frische, President, Sperry Gyroscope Company.
- Roland E. Fulton, President, Employers' Association of Greater Chicago.
- Dr. Vernon F. Galliano, President, Nicholls State College.
- Richard A. Goodson, President, Southwestern Bell Telephone Company.
- J. Peter Grace, President, W. R. Grace and Co.

- Elisha Gray, Chairman of the Board, Whirlpool Corporation.
- The Honorable Durwood Hall, U.S. Congressman.
- Robert P. Hanrahan, Superintendent of Schools, Cook County, Illinois.
- Z. C. R. Hansen, Chairman and President, Mack Trucks, Inc.
- Dr. Charles P. Hogarth, President, Mississippi State College for Women.
- John M. Houchin, President, Phillips Petroleum Company.
- Dr. John A. Howard, President, Rockford College.
- Claude A. Jessup, Chairman, Continental Trailways Bus System.
- Speaker Ernest N. Johnson, Speaker of North Dakota House of Representatives.
- Robert L. Jones, President, The Copley Press.
- Dr. Walter H. Judd, former member of Congress.
- Charles H. Kellstadt, Chairman, General Development Corp.
- Donald B. Lourie, Chairman of the Board, Quaker Oats Company.
- Dr. Charles W. Lowry, President, Foundation for Religious Action in the Social & Civil Order.
- Edgar F. Luckenbach, Jr., President, Luckenbach Steamship Company.
- Dr. John P. Maurer, President, Southeastern University.
- Daniel D. McCracken, Chairman, Computer Professionals Against ABM.
- H. C. McDonald, President, Eugene, Oregon City Council.
- Roger Milliken, President, Deering-Milliken Inc.
- Dr. John D. Millett, Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents.
- The Honorable John M. Murphy, U.S. Congressman.
- Reverend David Nettleton, Sr., President, First Baptist Bible College.
- Arthur C. Nielsen, Sr., Chairman, A. C. Nielsen Company.
- Sister Natalie Palagyi, Superior General, Sisters of Social Service.
- J. Milton Patrick, Immediate Past National Commander, American Legion.
- The Honorable William D. Pawley, former Ambassador.
- Admiral Arthur W. Radford, USN (Ret.), former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.
- Dr. Robert G. Rayburn, President, Covenant Theological Seminary.
- Archbishop Nikon Rklitzky, Russian Orthodox Church.
- The Hon. James Rothstein, Majority Leader

- of the South Dakota House of Representatives.
  - Frank O. Sherrill, President, S & W Cafeterias, Inc.
  - Sister Irene Socquet, S.S.A., President, Anna Maria College for Women.
  - Robert C. Sprague, Chairman, Sprague Electric Company.
  - Ezra J. Stone, Actor, Writer, Director.
  - Jerome A. Straka, Chairman, Chesebrough-Ponds, Inc.
  - Dwight H. Swanson, President, Iowa Power & Light Company.
  - The Honorable Strom Thurmond, U.S. Senator.
  - William K. Todd, President, Rockford Morning Star.
  - Dr. A. P. Torrence, President, Tennessee A & I State University.
  - George W. Waters, Executive Vice President, American Express Company.
  - John Wayne, Actor, Producer
  - Monsignor Nicholas H. Wegner, Director, Boys Town.
  - William H. Weldon, Publisher, News Tribune Corporation.
  - Colonel T. R. Wert, USMCR (Ret.), Executive Secretary, Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association.
  - George S. Wheaton, Chairman, Dillingham Corporation.
  - Dr. Ernest L. Wilkinson, President, Brigham Young University.
  - Dr. Benjamin C. Willis, Retired Superintendent of Schools, Chicago, Illinois.
  - The Reverend Victor R. Yantelli, Sn., President, Saint Peter's College.
  - The Honorable Sam Yorty, Mayor, Los Angeles.
- (Affiliations shown for purposes of identification only.)

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—  
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 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 sadisti-

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

#### QUOTAS NEEDED ON PEP PILLS

### HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled to act later this week on H.R. 18583, the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970.

Along with many of our colleagues, I feel strongly that quotas should be set on the production of amphetamines, and an amendment will be offered to accomplish this.

For the information of the House I insert at this point in the RECORD pertinent editorials from the Washington Post and the Houston Chronicle:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 18, 1970]

#### SLOWING DOWN SPEED

By now, everyone concerned about the spreading drug problem has heard the grim stories on speed and the speed-freaks. The terms refer to amphetamines and methamphetamines, the stimulant drugs which account for 8 per cent of all prescriptions written in this country. Their abuse ranges from the trivial (the athlete who takes it before the big game) to the disastrous (the person seeking a high who ends up dead, brain damaged, malnourished, violent or otherwise impaired). Few American communities are without its victims.

According to the National Institute of Mental Health over 8 billion amphetamine pills are legally produced annually by American drug firms. This is 40 doses per citizen; the legitimate medical need, reports the NIMH, is not in the billions but in the thousands. As for where the 8 billion legal pills are eventually consumed, it is estimated that over 50 per cent are diverted into illegal and unsupervised use. While the government and media have focused on other drugs, evidence exists that amphetamines—used largely by adolescents and young adults—are just as addictive and hard to overcome as heroin.

What is needed clearly is some kind of production control. It is unfair to put the entire blame on the drug firms for the oversupply; abuse is encouraged because the law is lax, many doctors prescribe the drug carelessly and because the power of the black market is increasing.

Recently, a bipartisan majority of the House select committee on crime offered an amendment to the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act now before the House. It calls for a manufacturing quota on amphetamine production. This is perhaps a strong move, but unless all the drug firms suddenly limit production and doctors suddenly prescribe with extreme care, it is a necessary move. Why should the country be flooded with 8 billion pep pills when only a few thousand are medically needed? If amphetamines are as dangerous as heroin why shouldn't they be put under the enforcement authority of the Justice Department? These are some of the questions that should be considered when the quota amendment is debated.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Sept. 15, 1970]

#### PUT A QUOTA ON PEP PILLS

One medical judgment is that amphetamines should be used only to treat narco-

lepsy, a rare sleeping sickness, and a small number of hyperactive children.

An official of the National Institute of Mental Health says this would add up to an annual need for mere thousands of doses. Yet four major U.S. companies legally synthesize some 8 billion doses of amphetamine products a year—an average of 40 doses for every man, woman and child in this country. And even more is imported, also illegally.

And what happens to this overabundance of "speed," the substances which cause euphoria and hyperactivity, generally followed by prolonged paranoid psychosis or accentuation of personality disorder? Over 50 percent of the legally manufactured pills are diverted into illegal channels. Moreover, some 80 percent of amphetamines seized in 1968 by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs originally was legally manufactured domestically.

The situation would be ludicrous if it were not so serious. It has prompted the U.S. House's Select Committee on Crime in a "Dear Colleague" letter to ask congressional support for a measure which would impose quotas on the domestic production of amphetamines. The measure would amend the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act, due to reach the House floor by the end of the week.

Most every American of junior high school age or older is familiar with one of the basic tenets of this nation's drug-taking subculture: "Speed kills." If it doesn't do that, it can make a user wish he were dead. It can contribute to hepatitis, malnutrition and the general undermining of health due to irregular eating and sleeping patterns. Permanent brain damage can result. There is some medical opinion that use by pregnant women may increase the risk of congenital abnormalities in their offspring.

It does not take a doctor of medicine or an expert on drugs to realize that the indiscriminate taking of amphetamines can injure a person's health. When a licensed physician prescribes amphetamines for a patient, they should be available. But we don't buy the drug companies' argument that we need the manufacturing of relatively unlimited numbers of doses of amphetamines.

#### MOUNT LORETTO—100 YEARS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

### HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to one of the most dynamic and compassionate personalities of his or any age, the late Father John Drumgoole and to all those dedicated men and women who worked with him and who followed him in selfless work through the last 100 years. On October 7, the start of a year-long celebration marking the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Mission of the Immaculate Virgin, Catholic child-caring institution, at Mount Loretto, Staten Island, N.Y., will commence. The Mission of the Immaculate Virgin is not just another children's institution. For Father Drumgoole, born the son of John and Bridget Drumgoole in Coolecroft, Abbeylara, County Longford, Ireland, on the Feast of the Assumption, August 15, 1816, made it a home.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend

my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to present the centennial program as a tribute to this remarkable man and all the wonderful people who have helped each child develop their capacities in a good, holy, and happy life:

#### CENTENNIAL PROGRAM

Twelve centennial events and programs are scheduled, starting with a Concelebrated Mass, Wednesday, October 7, 1970, in the Mission's Church of St. Joachim and St. Anne, and ending with an Alumni Association Reunion, Sunday, September 19, 1971, at Mount Loretto.

His Eminence, Terence Cardinal Cooke, Archbishop of New York and President of the Mission's Board of Trustees, will preside at the Centennial Concelebrated Mass, said Monsignor Edmund F. Fogarty, the Mission's executive director.

Other major events planned are St. Joseph's Union Day, November 8, 1970; Cardinal Cooke's Day, December 1, 1970; Symposium on Child Care, January 20, 1971; Symposium on the Education of the Exceptional Child, February 11-14, 1971; Reverend John Christopher Drumgoole Day, March 28, 1971; Staff Appreciation Day, April 16, 1971; Sports Night, May 19, 1971; Open House, June 13, 1971; and Fun Day for the Children, August 18, 1971.

Tracing its origin to the year 1871 when Father Drumgoole was appointed director and resident chaplain of the St. Vincent's Newboys' Lodging House, then located at 53 Warren Street, New York City, N.Y., the home was formally incorporated in May, 1877, under the laws of the State of New York as the "Mission of the Immaculate Virgin for the Protection of Homeless and Destitute Children."

Today, the facilities and services of the Mission, providing care for approximately 700 resident boys and girls between the ages of 6 and 18 years, are centered in the Pleasant Plains area of Staten Island, bordering Raritan Bay.

The initial purchase of this property was made in June 1882, and the name Mount Loretto was given to the site by Father Drumgoole.

A pioneer of organized child care and social service, Father Drumgoole came to New York City in 1824, and was ordained a priest in 1869 at the advanced age of 53. As the result of exposure in the blizzard of 1888, he developed pneumonia and died March 28 that year.

An affiliate of Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York, the Mission has accommodations for 200 in its girls' division, called St. Elizabeth's; 288 in its junior boys' division, ages 6 through 13; and 184 in its senior boys' division ages 14 through 18.

Three schools, owned by the Mission and located on the grounds, provide four educational programs for the children. St. Aloysius, staffed by the Sisters of St. Francis, is a regular parochial elementary school with grades one through eight for boys and girls and includes a reading school for levels one through five.

The New York City Board of Education operates the two other schools—St. Joseph's School for boys, grades six through 12, as Public School 25, and St. Elizabeth's School for girls, grades six through 12, as Public School 10.

The Sisters of St. Francis have been identified with the Mission and its work since July 2, 1882, when six Sisters from the Buffalo, N.Y., foundation arrived in New York City to assist Father Drumgoole.

In July 1893, the Sisters formed a separate community and adopted the title "Sisters of St. Francis of the Mission of the Immaculate Virgin, Conventual of the Third Order." They elected Mother Mary Catherine, O.S.F., their first Mother General.

Today, 44 Sisters—17 in the girls' division and 27 in the boys' division—are assigned to the Mission from their Motherhouse in Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y. Reverend Mother Anne Morgan, O.S.F., present Mother General, is a member of the Mission's Board of Trustees.

Recreational facilities for the children at Mount Loretto include three gymnasiums, an athletic field, and an outdoor swimming pool. The pool is named after Angel Mendez, Mission alumnus and U.S. Marine, killed in Vietnam, March 16, 1967, and buried in the Mission's cemetery.

Facing the Mission's Church of St. Joachim and St. Anne with its steeple rising 255 feet from ground level is the heroic bronze statue of Father Drumgoole, ten feet in height and weighing seven and one-half tons.

Since its founding, the Mission has cared for more than 50,000 children. Today, there is an active Father Drumgoole Alumni Association that meets regularly and maintains contact with Mount Loretto graduates.

Appointed August 2, 1969, Monsignor Fogarty is the eighth executive director of the Mission. His Eminence, Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington, served as Mission director from 1936 to 1943.

Mission chaplains are Reverend Eugene V. Mangan and Reverend Robert P. Hickey.

### WALL STREETERS DO NOT LIKE PRESENT SITUATION

#### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Philip Greer, has an interesting comment on our current economic problems:

#### WALL STREETERS DO NOT LIKE PRESENT SITUATION

(By Philip Greer)

NEW YORK.—Notes on a random walk through Wall Street:

Spiro Agnew came to the Street last week to explain to the financial nabobs why it is important to them that the Republicans take control of Congress this year. A GOP-controlled Congress would help President Nixon finish his programs, Agnew said.

So far, in the 21-months the Republicans have been in the White House, the Dow Jones industrial average is down about 200 points, more than 120 brokerage firms have disappeared through merger, takeover or just plain failure, incomes in the street are maybe a third to a half of what they were in pre-Republican 1968 and the entire structure of the markets is threatened by do-nothingism at the Securities & Exchange Commission.

Agnew is right. The Wall Streeters must help Nixon finish his programs. They certainly don't want things to stay as they are.

It's a rare time when the National Press Club invites a brokerage firm president to be a guest speaker. The fourth estate got its money's worth from Don Regan, who heads Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc., but, being 200 miles from the Street, its doubtful that the reporters digested all the morsels Regan fed them.

Possibly the most revealing line was his statement that Merrill Lynch "is on Wall Street but not of Wall Street." Despite its over-shadowing presence, "the thundering herd" has never been a part of the Street establishment. In fact, it has a history of fighting the roll-top desk mentality that controlled the financial community for generations. Merrill, for instance, has fought all increases in commission rates—it does well

enough without them—it was one of the first to stump for allowing brokers to incorporate and it has been a strong advocate of public ownership of brokerage firms.

Regan can afford to speak out because, with the Street still in a financial vise, the profitable and still-expanding Merrill Lynch stands head and shoulders over much of the competition. The chances are that Regan and other non-establishment types will be talking even louder in the days ahead. The Street's stumbling, bumbling approach to its problems is making minimal progress and the people who still have something to lose are getting restless.

Operation rescue at the New York Stock Exchange has taken a new turn, bringing up the question of whether the lifeguard needs a lifeguard.

The parceling of Hayden, Stone into Cogan, Berlind, Weill & Levitt and Walston & Co. and the shareholders' management takeover of Goodbody & Co., both within the last two weeks, are a distinct departure from the former approach, when failing brokers were picked apart and the diseased torso was cremated, with the Exchange watching over it all like a public ombudsman. Likewise, the suspensions of Charles Plohn & Co. and First Devonshire, chasing both of them—and their customers—from the promised land without so much as a final blessing from the Exchange.

What seems clear is that the NYSE can no longer be the guardian of the public interest. The \$55 million slush fund is used up and the Big Board apparently doesn't want to hit its members again—possibly as a lever to prod Congress into passing the investor insurance bill.

On Capitol Hill, where understanding of the securities industry is about as rare as votes against highway construction, that will probably be enough to make the legislators pass the bill, thus putting the government on the hook right alongside the Exchange.

In the meanwhile, the Street's financial fever has reached the crisis stage. The question now is where does that leave the securities industry and its more than 30 million customers?

The only thing that seems brighter is the outlook for the market itself. Analysts generally feel the list has turned into a kind of baby bull stage. Nobody is ready to pour money in just yet—the negative contingent is still sizable—but there is a growing feeling that the traders have absorbed the worst that Washington has to give. The fall could turn out to be a fairly pleasant time in Wall Street—except, maybe, for the people who live there.

### PRISONERS OF WAR

#### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the house of delegates, the governing body of the American Medical Association, met in Chicago this summer and adopted a resolution urging the World Medical Association and other appropriate international organizations to use their influence to improve the lot of the American prisoners of war in Vietnam. The American Medical Association is to be commended for its firm stand. If more responsible citizens banded together to voice their indignation at the terrible treatment our servicemen receive at the hands of our enemies, Hanoi, might be induced to yield to the pressure of world

opinion and begin to act more humanely. Following is the statement issued by the American Medical Association House of Delegates which could serve as a model for other concerned Americans:

#### PRISONERS OF WAR

In view of North Viet Nam's failure to live up to the terms of the Geneva Convention, the House resolved, "As a professional medical organization, recommend that, in the best medical interests of both servicemen and their families, the World Medical Association and/or other appropriate international organizations be requested to use their influence with those countries which do not subscribe to the Geneva Convention to the effect that (a) a list of prisoners names be furnished, (b) inspection of prisoner compounds by neutrals be carried out, and (c) medical supplies and food parcels, as well as mail, be distributed to prisoners."

### PHONE RATE PLEA

#### HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to a very pertinent editorial from the September 16, 1970, edition of the Evening News of Newark, N.J.

The editorial cites another example of the ravages of the wild inflation we have under the present national administration. While the President twiddles his thumbs and assures one and all that the Nation's economy is straightening itself out, the wage earners and housewives get hit again and again with increased prices of goods and services.

The policies of the present administration forces businesses of all kinds against the wall, and they turn for relief to their only source—the consumer.

It is about time President Nixon took another look at the legislation passed by the Congress this year giving him the authority to place controls on the factors that are continuing and expanding inflation. His failure to take affirmative action can well drive this Nation into the bankruptcy that struck the Roman Empire and brought about its fall.

The editorial follows:

#### PHONE RATE PLEA

For consumers struggling to stretch inelastic dollars, there's more bad news. New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. has filed an application for higher rates at a time when state regulatory authorities already have under study pleas for higher tariffs on gas and electricity and for increased fares on buses and railroads.

Any assessment of whether New Jersey Bell's rate request is justified must await examination by the Public Utilities Commission of the company's data, particularly figures on total plant investment and projected rate of return. In 1951 the company asked for a \$10-million rise and got nothing. In 1954, it was given about \$2 million of the additional \$19 million sought. In 1958, it was awarded \$11 million of the \$14 million requested. In all the cases, the Supreme Court had to decide some of the issues.

In addition to deciding on a rate base and a fair rate of return, both questions on which it has differed widely with the company before, the PUC must consider whether the

specific and complex rate revisions proposed are equitable, whether New Jersey Bell's profits (\$91 million last year) are sufficient to cover the costs of providing expanded and more efficient service, and whether the burden is fairly distributed between interstate and intrastate service charges.

Beyond question, New Jersey Bell's operating costs have jumped. From 1958, when it won its last general rate boost, to last year, construction expenditures climbed 132 per cent, operating taxes rose 125 per cent, the original value of its total plant in service went up 141 per cent, and operating expenses 103 per cent. At the same time, its operating revenues rose 112 per cent and its net income 116 per cent.

Money to expand further must be raised. The company estimates it will spend \$285 million next year on new plant and equipment and more than \$1 billion by 1975 to keep pace with demand. Borrowing capital to finance that construction cost the company 9.35 per cent last June, compared with 4.6 per cent only five years ago.

Still, New Jersey Bell's request for higher rates can be greeted by consumers only as dismaying news. The company has been in the vanguard of those providing better and more efficient service through automation and new technology, a factor which permitted at least half a dozen selective reductions in rate schedules during the last decade.

What the company implies by yesterday's rate application is that even its technological and operating improvements can't provide enough savings to keep pace with the skyrocketing rise in business costs caused by the ravages of inflation. If the telephone company can't keep up, how can the housewife?

#### DECLINE IN CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the announcement today of the dramatic decline in the Consumer Price Index is one of the best pieces of economic news we have had in months. Combined with the spreading trend in banks to lower the prime interest rate to 7½ percent, there can no longer be any doubt that the Nixon administration has succeeded in halting inflation.

The administration has come in for much criticism in recent months for its economic policies, but I hope its critics have now seen the light. The President's policies evidently are working and have slowed inflation without plunging the country into another recession.

Noted economists, such as John Kenneth Galbraith, who saw the worst possible outlook for the economy and implied that inflation could not be cured without resorting to wage and price controls have now once again, been proved dead wrong.

Once again, the Nixon administration has achieved its goal by hewing carefully to a predetermined course and rejecting the extremist options offered by discredited economic soothsayers. It is the type of performance we expect from this administration.

#### CONSUMER INTEREST IN LOW-COST AIR TRAVEL

### HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time, with hundreds of thousands of Americans trying to enjoy a well-earned vacation, we ought to examine very carefully the manner in which our Government is protecting its vacationing citizens, particularly in the field of air travel. It appears to me that the Federal Government cannot make up its mind on this important matter, a situation I would bring to the attention of my colleagues.

Many will recall that on May 8 of this year, the Civil Aeronautics Board published proposed revised regulations governing air travel. As a person deeply concerned about the consumer and his ability to gain equity in the marketplace, I was genuinely surprised to see that agency propose a series of regulations that would regulate not the air transportation industry but the traveling public. The CAB had a lot to say about the limitations of the number of American citizens that could belong to a traveling group, about how that group elects its officers and keeps membership records, and about the way it affiliates with other groups. The CAB attacked the travel agents and the operators of vacation, study, and travel tours, as if the consumer's right to travel and the right of others to aid him were inherently some kind of suspicious if not outright illegal activity.

Following the publication of those proposals, the CAB received harsh but just criticism from many distinguished Members of this Congress, as well as from organizations that would no longer be able to charter a plane as a group and fly to a convention or for study or simply for relief.

Messages condemning the proposals have been sent to the CAB by the United Steelworkers of America—AFL-CIO—the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., the National Grange, and the Group Health Association of America, to name just a few. Mr. President, groups with such very different interests rarely get together on an issue unless the offending agency is grossly unjust or very stupid. It is just possible that both reasons prevail in this instance. However, I would point out that just last month, on June 22, the President issued the Government's revised Statement of International Air Transportation Policy. That statement is not only a document representing many forward-looking approaches to the improvement of America's position in the air, it is also a sharp rebuke to the CAB.

The statement reads:

The economic and technological benefits we seek can best be achieved by encouraging competition and by a relative freedom from government restriction." It goes on to specifically note that the "U.S. should work for the broadest range of profitable services, designed to appeal to the broadest consumer

market and based on the lowest cost of operating an efficient air transportation system . . . We expect both scheduled services and charter services to have important roles throughout the coming decade.

It is apparent to me that the administration has a slight case of schizophrenia which can be cleared up with effective, low-cost therapy. I would strongly prescribe the pursuit of the ideas in the statement of policy and I would just as strongly urge that the Civil Aeronautics Board once again rejoin the Government, adjust its policies to the needs of the traveling public, and withdraw the proposed arbitrary, restrictive, punitive, and demeaning regulations. It is exactly this kind of fuzzy, contradictory thinking that has produced chaos in rail transportation and has worked against the welfare of passengers and shippers. Surely we can and we must avoid the same chaos from occurring in air transportation.

I am pleased to see that the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Interstate Foreign Commerce Committee has held hearings on this matter and I am positive that that committee will issue a very strong report setting guidelines for the Civil Aeronautics Board to follow if not regarding specific legislation to correct this situation. Mr. FRIEDEL and the members of his committee ought to be congratulated for stepping into the breach to contain such gross abuse of administration discretion as has been evidenced by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

#### LAW AND ORDER

### HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Hamilton County Police Association College Scholarship Fund, Lincoln J. Stokes, recently announced the first awards made by the association. These cash award scholarships were based upon academic achievement, financial assistance, and essays. Each applicant was requested to submit a short essay concerning his personal understanding of the term "law and order."

Awards were made to Geoffrey A. Paul, 797 East Columbia Avenue, Reading, Ohio, son of Col. and Mrs. Artice Paul, chief of police at Reading, Ohio; Barbara Ann Belbot, 5338 Rawhide Court, Cincinnati, daughter of Detective and Mrs. William A. Belbot, Hamilton County sheriff's office.

Geoffrey A. Paul graduated from Reading High School in June 1970, and is entering David Lipscomb College in Nashville, Tenn.

He plans to study speech and drama in preparing for a career in the entertainment and theatrical field. During his senior year at Reading High School, he was president of the Thespian group and participated in all productions and plays at the school.

Barbara Ann Belbot graduated in the upper 1 percent of her class from Seton

High School in June 1970. She is entering Xavier University for extended studies in the political science field and hopes to become a lawyer in the field of governmental law.

I am very pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues these excellent essays on this important issue facing our Nation today—"Law and Order." It is most gratifying to read that these fine young citizens and more like them are aware of the meaning of law and order, and its effect upon society.

Miss Belbot's essay reads as follows:

"Law and Order" is a product of our times that the meanings of formerly familiar words and expressions have been distorted and new meanings added—sometimes radically altering the original definitions. "Law and Order" is such an expression. Law is not a confinement of man's natural freedoms, but rather an opportunity for man to express himself freely and maturely without infringing on other's rights or vice versa. But laws must be just or they no longer are able to command respect. Order is not the enforcement of a police state, but rather the enforcement of each individual's right to live peacefully and securely. But order must never become the tool of fear. "Law and Order" reflects man as the social animal that he is.

There is nothing evil about "Law and Order". At the same time the expression should not be used as a reactionary response to our troubled times. Both uses are irresponsible. Perhaps the best solution is to abstain from using the expression at all until we are ready to use it in its proper light. Any false use of its meaning can only serve to undermine its true concept.

Geoffrey Paul felt that—

Without the law, the weak would have no security, they would slowly become engulfed by the strong. To have a Utopian society where it would be true that all men are created equal is the ultimate goal of our hopes and dreams. However, we must be realists, we still have the rich and the poor and the strong and the weak.

We must be careful not to confuse freedom with permissiveness. This freedom can be abused in many ways, not the least being apathy and indifference toward their elected officials, which tends to breed corruption and the general breaking down of moral values. When this happens, we are all losers and erode our gift of freedom.

The law is what we make of it, if it is strong our nation will grow, if it is weak we will regress. Of this we must always be mindful, for what is law? "Law Is Order."

#### STABILIZATION OF THE ECONOMY UNDER THIS ADMINISTRATION

### HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, today's announcement that the rise in the Consumer Price Index was a 20-month low of 0.2 percent for the month of August is the strongest indication we have had to date of the stabilization of the economy under the Nixon administration.

This new low actually signals the end of the fantastic acceleration in the rate of increase for the Consumer Price Index which started in late 1965. Unfortunately, the American consumer was taken along on this joyride and each new monthly increase in the Consumer Price

Index meant higher prices across the board for the wage earner.

The double tragedy of this inflation was that it was caused by escalation of the war in Vietnam. There are still those of us in this chamber who remember former President Johnson's promise that this country could have both "guns and butter."

There are also those who will recall how the "guns and butter" account went bankrupt in 1968 when this country ran \$25 billion deficit which touched off an even wilder round of inflation.

President Nixon has completely changed this situation. He has reversed our budget priorities so that for the first time in 20 years this country will spend more on domestic needs than on defense; and he has brought the runaway inflation to a halt.

#### SOUTHEAST ASIA POLICY

### HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, if we have been mistaken in our policies in Southeast Asia since adoption of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution on August 7, 1964, it has not been the fault of the armed services of the United States. The armed services are an instrument of national policy; they do not make it. The services have unhesitatingly and uncompromisingly carried out their obligations to the Commander in Chief and to the Nation, and it is we in the Congress who have both authorized and funded the vast expenditure of lives and money which an increasing number of our people now feel to have been a mistake.

For our bitter experiences of the past 6 years, however, many examples of humanity, kindness, and courage have served to retain the faith of Americans that our national instincts are those of peace rather than destruction. A number of such examples are set forth in Gen. Lewis Walt's recently published book, "Strange War, Strange Strategy." A single such example was recently described by Marine Corps Lt. Gen. Keith B. McCutcheon, commanding the Third Marine Amphibious Forces in Danang, and appearing in the Marine Corps "Sea Tiger," dated August 14, 1970. That article is set forth as follows:

CG's OP

We hear a lot of talk these days about "gaps" or areas of misunderstanding between people. There is the "generation gap" between young people and parents, the "credibility gap" between government and citizens. Back in 1889 Rudyard Kipling spoke of a similar gap. He wrote, "Oh, East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet." This is sometimes called the "cultural gap."

Serving here in Vietnam we are very much aware of the differences between the cultures of East and West. A huge jet airliner can bridge the "geographic gap" between the shores of California and the coast of Vietnam in a matter of hours. But only the actions and efforts of each individual Marine can bridge the "cultural gap."

I think this can best be illustrated by a dramatic incident that took place in a battalion TAOR. A little Vietnamese girl had

been bitten by a dog and was seriously ill with rabies. The doctor knew that she would need medicine that night or she would die. A request was made for vaccine. Soon the sound of a MAG-16 helicopter was heard overhead. VC tracer rounds streaked toward the chopper as it neared the LZ. In spite of hostile fire, the pilot completed his mission of mercy. The crew chief handed the vaccine to the doctor and the chopper lifted into the darkness, drawing more tracers as it disappeared. The little girl lived.

An entire village watched what took place. All at once the American Fighting Man ceased to be a stranger from a distant land. East and West became partners in a mutual struggle for survival and freedom. Differences of language and customs no longer formed a gap. These are the deeds that communicate to the people of Vietnam our nation's concern for the freedom, well being and dignity of all men. I know of no more effective means to destroy the "cultural gap."

I suspect that none of us can understand all the strange sights, customs and behavior patterns of the Orient. At times we even have trouble understanding our fellow Marines. But when two people stand face to face, and by their actions communicate their understanding and respect for each others dignity and worth, the differences cease to create a barrier of separation.

We can never learn all there is to know about anyone. Studying customs and culture can help, and I recommend it, but the real clue to bridging the "cultural gap" is simply the magic of one man treating the other as a human being.

I think it is interesting that Kipling recognized this. Remember how he concluded his well-known ballad by declaring:

"But there is neither East nor West  
Border, nor Breed nor Birth  
When two strong men stand face to face  
Tho' they come from the ends of the Earth."

#### NATIONAL EMPLOY THE HANDICAPPED WEEK—1970

### HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the President has proclaimed the week beginning October 4, 1970 as "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week." This is a very meritorious and good proposal, and I join with the President in promoting and encouraging this week set aside for those millions of Americans who are handicapped.

The President said in his proclamation of September 8, 1970:

Isolated from regular contact with society, many of our handicapped citizens lead lives of lonely frustration. Working together, on both public and private levels, we can—and must—insure full lives for them.

It is my feeling that this resolution, declaring the first week of October of each year as "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week," should be broadened, making the resolution applicable to all handicapped workers.

My bill, House Joint Resolution 1379, would accomplish this, providing for a "National Employ the Handicapped Week."

We want to bring all of our handicapped persons into the mainstream of American life, to utilize their vast talents and energies.

The 42 million handicapped persons

and their families in America today face not only the burdens that their handicaps present, but also a worse fate—little knowledge of how they can help themselves.

As a handicapped person myself, I know of the problems faced by people who become disabled. The lack of readily available information on how they can develop and live normal lives is a detriment to them as they go about their daily tasks.

While we have many public and non-public organizations and agencies involved in helping the handicapped, there is no real centralized and consolidated center to help the handicapped in their problems of employment, education, transportation, recreation, and other activities.

I have introduced another bill to provide for a National Information and Resource Center for the Handicapped in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I joined Senator ROBERT DOLE, of Kansas, in the introduction of this legislation, which I believe will go a long way in helping the handicapped to help themselves.

This bill has been added as an amendment in the Senate to S. 3418 as title III, the family practice medicine legislation, and I am hopeful it will be approved by the House, and I am working toward that end.

Over the last two decades I have sponsored and supported bills to assist the handicapped of America. In the last Congress, a bill sponsored by myself and the late Senator from Alaska, E. L. Bartlett, was enacted into law, and it provides that public buildings shall be constructed to be accessible to handicapped persons. In this Congress, I have sponsored bills enacted into law which provide for a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped and to insure that the proposed Washington metro system is designed and constructed to be accessible to the physically handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will help the 42 million handicapped persons and their families to achieve useful and productive lives. The Congress should and must do all possible for this large segment of our population.

#### IMPENDING DISASTER IN CHILE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the mailed fist is already beginning to show through the velvet glove of the Communist coalition which recently won a plurality in the Chilean elections. According to a statement recently issued by the Inter-American Press Association "Freedom of the press in Chile is being strangled by Communist and Marxist forces and their allies." This is in all probability simply a preview of what is to come when and if Mr. Allende takes the reigns of power in his hands.

The logic of the Communist system de-  
CXVI—2111—Part 25

mands absolute concentration of power in the hands of the party. To allow any meaningful opposition to remain is absolutely against the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism. To think that a Communist government might do so is to fly in the face of the entire history of the Communist movement. It has been suggested that if Allende signs some type of agreement promising not to do certain things then all will be well and 6 years hence there will be another fair and free election. This would seem to me to be the most wishful thinking imaginable.

At this point, I would like to insert the statement made by the Inter-American Press Association and an article by William F. Buckley which makes the point that a leftist government is not so much the answer of communism as the answer to the Communists' dreams. Some of Mr. Buckley's readers of years ago will be happy to see him returning, in this article, to the hard-hitting anti-Communist journalism which originally made his reputation.

The material follows:

#### STATEMENT BY THE INTER-AMERICAN PRESS ASSOCIATION

Freedom of the press in Chile is being strangled by Communist and Marxist forces and their allies.

The Inter-American Press Association has received information from Chile that threats of violence and intimidation are causing the resignation of news officials, the sale of newspapers and radio stations, the dismissal of anti-Marxist editors and reporters from newspapers, radio and television stations and upheaval within press-related trades unions.

Those practicing intimidation have already gained control over all of Chile's non-government television channels.

IAPA has learned that emissaries from one political faction offered a "deal" to representatives of Augustin Edwards, publisher of *El Mercurio*, one of Chile's and the hemisphere's most distinguished newspapers—the oldest Spanish language newspaper in continuous publication. It was founded Sept. 12, 1827.

If *El Mercurio* would drop its opposition to the seating of Salvador Allende as president of Chile, the emissaries said, the new government would nationalize the newspaper properties of Edwards, but would permit him to retain some other business holdings in Chile.

Mr. Edwards and his representatives flatly rejected the offer.

It is evident in reports from Chile that certain political forces are attempting to smother free speech in that country and to thwart free political dialogue.

The Inter-American Press Association must protest these activities in the strongest possible terms. IAPA does not presume to interfere in Chilean partisan politics. The choice of leaders is a responsibility only of the Chilean people and the Chilean Congress.

But the IAPA must raise its voice against this attempt to intimidate, coerce and muzzle a large section of the established press in an American nation.

Signed by:

James S. Copley, Copley Newspapers, President of IAPA.

Manoel F. do Nascimento Brito, Jornal do Brasil, 1st Vice President.

John C. A. Watkins, Providence, R.I., Journal-Bulletin, 2nd Vice President.

George H. Beebe, Knight Newspapers, Chairman of the IAPA executive committee.

Andrew Heiskell, New York Times, Past President.

Alberto Gainza Paz (La Prensa of Buenos Aires, Past President.

Lee Hills, Detroit Free-Press, Past President.

#### THE IMPENDING DISASTER IN CHILE

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Concerning the situation in Chile, a few observations:

It is not true in the formal sense that for the first time in history a nation has voted itself into communism. In order to do that, it requires that a majority of the people vote for the Communist candidate.

Far from getting a majority, Dr. Salvador Allende received this time around an even smaller percentage of the votes than he received in 1964, and less than Barry Goldwater in 1964. To conclude that because the Chilean Congress is likely to respect precedent by voting in as president the man who won the plurality of the votes, therefore it follows that a free nation will have voted itself into communism, is disjointed. The proper way to put it is that democratic mechanisms abound which make it possible for someone who has won even a small minority of the vote to take power.

Although it is certainly true that the strength of Allende is a tribute in part to Communist propaganda, in part to the shortness of the historical memory, in part to the collapsing strength of the Catholic Church, it is also testimony to the substantial superstition that the Social Democrats (in Chile they call them Christian Democrats) are the worst enemies of the Communists.

On that myth we have been brought up, and over and over and over again, our post-war thought-leaders have urged us to deal with the "progressive" governments of Latin America, Italy and Germany.

In Italy, a few years ago, the progressive government made a deal with the hard Socialists who in turn made a deal with the Communists. In Germany, the fighting Socialist anti-Communist mayor of Berlin became the head of the Social Democratic party, and then the prime minister, whereupon he made a treaty with the Soviet Union, the consequences of which may make Munich look like Custer's Last Stand.

The critical date is Oct. 23. We should bear in mind that Chile's Congress is under no constitutional compulsion to name Allende. He needs about 20 votes, and they would only come from the Social Democrats. Unfortunately, the vote is by secret ballot, and the party will not therefore accept official responsibility for the impending act of treachery. But the world will know that it was Social Democrats who made possible the Communists taking power, and the world will be sorely vexed.

In Chile there are three television networks. One is controlled by the Communists, one by an unholy combination of left-Marxists and Catholics, and one by the state. So that when Allende takes power, he would automatically take control of the only important broadcasting facility not already dedicated to revolutionary communism.

It is amusing to hear a few liberals vesting their hopes in the army. Surely—they are saying, having for generations scorned the uses of an army in Latin America—surely the army will stage a coup, and prevent the Castroization of Chile?

It is not certain by any means that the army will come to the aid of the country. To do so now would alienate a great number of people who harbor illusions about what communism will bring.

Under Chilean law, the president has almost total powers to advance whomsoever he wants to head the various branches of the military. Now hear this. Under Chilean practice, every officer who is senior to the man who is advanced, is compulsorily retired. That means that by elevating the right captain, say, Allende could retire the whole senior military, and thus diminish the threat to his regime.

Do the Chileans (just over one-third of them) have the right to impose a Castro-style dictatorship on the rest of the country? Such an absolutization of democracy is for children. It recalls the wry comment on African democracy, "One Man, One Vote, Once," because the prospects are, under Allende, for dictatorship, and for the end of the rights of the dissenter.

The humane, liberal, obligation of the Chilean Congress is to spare the Chilean people rule by Allende: That is the true democratic imperative.

#### CONGRESS SHARES STRIKE BLAME

### HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the current situation with respect to the threatened railroad strike once again underscores the need for a permanent legislative solution dealing with national emergency strikes in the transportation industry.

Four railroad unions are under a temporary restraining order barring them from striking until September 23. Meanwhile, talks with the three railroads involved are continuing. This is the third time in a year that the Nation has been faced with the prospect of a crippling railroad strike.

The House Republican Task Force on Labor Law Reform, which I have the privilege of chairing, has distributed a factual analysis of legislative proposals introduced during this Congress to deal with national emergency strikes in the transportation industry.

Last February the administration proposed the Emergency Public Interest Protection Act of 1970 to update and improve the Government's weapons for dealing with transportation strikes affecting the national health and safety. However, Congress has failed to act on the legislation, and as we draw near the closing hour of the 91st Congress, the country is again threatened with a strike while reasonable and effective proposals for permanent solution to these problems remain on the shelf.

Mr. Speaker, the Salt Lake Tribune in an editorial September 13, 1970, made some particularly pertinent comments on this situation, and I include the editorial at this point in the Record.

#### CONGRESS SHARES STRIKE BLAME

For the third time in a year the nation faces the prospect of a crippling railroad strike. And for the third time in a year the nation has nothing but outmoded procedures and laws to deal with the threat.

Most of the blame must be placed squarely on Congress which has steadfastly refused to enact, indeed to even seriously consider, remedial legislation.

It is true that no law can prevent a strike if enough workers are willing to defy the law and leave their jobs. But it is also true that if reasonable laws designed to fit modern problems were now on the books the possibility of strikes in critical industries would be greatly reduced.

Reasonable new labor laws were proposed by President Nixon last February. He asked that the Railway Labor Act of 1926 be par-

tially dismantled and that the President be given new weapons for settling major strikes by amending the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947. Both laws operate on the principle that if a strike by labor or a lockout by management can be delayed for a specific period of time (cooling-off period) then there is a good chance of working out a solution. But when the time expires and no agreement has been reached, the strike or lockout is legal. A number of such work stoppages have occurred.

President Nixon asked Congress to approve a plan which contains an optional provision for a 30-day extension in the "cooling-off" period in those instances when real progress toward settlement is being made. The plan also provides for partial operation of an essential industry during a strike and presidential authority to invoke a "final offer selection procedure" under which a neutral third party would select one of the "final" offers made by either side in a labor dispute as the binding settlement.

Mr. Nixon's plan has now gathered dust for six months and another railroad strike threat is upon the nation. This third strike threat didn't just happen, everyone knew it was coming. But Congress, perhaps because this is an election year, has refused to act to prevent it. As a result every citizen faces the possibility of personal inconvenience, perhaps financial loss, that a railroad strike poses.

Mr. Nixon's plan may not be the best one imaginable. But it was a starting point in solving a problem that returns year after year to haunt us all. Congress had an obligation to seriously consider the Nixon plan or present one of its own. It did neither. We think it has defaulted on a basic obligation to the people it is supposed to represent.

#### OPERATION EXODUS

### HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, September 13, was the final day of the 20th Pugwash Conference which took place at the Abbey Hotel in Fontana, Wis., a conference devoted to discussion of scientific and world affairs. Among the delegates to the conference were representatives from the Soviet Union and it was to these that a hopeful, peaceful assembly was addressed outside the doors of the conference. The assembly, which was known as Operation Exodus, was convened by the Community Council of Jewish Organizations of Chicago and the Milwaukee Conference on Soviet Jewry. Approximately 1,200 people were gathered in an open field for an hour and a half participating in a program of prayer, music, speeches, and the reading of Jewish freedom letters smuggled out of Russia.

The purpose of the assembly was to let the delegates from the Soviet Union know the concern of Americans of Jewish faith to the discriminatory treatment being accorded to Soviet citizens of Jewish faith and to express the hope that Soviet Jews would be permitted to leave Russia if they so desired for other lands.

The written appeal of participants in the assembly was delivered to members of the Pugwash Conference and that appeal, which I hope will be conveyed

through the Soviet delegates to appropriate authorities in the Soviet Union.

#### WELCOME TO ALL PARTICIPANTS IN THE 20TH PUGWASH CONFERENCE—AND ESPECIALLY TO THE SOVIET PARTICIPANTS

We welcome all participants in the 20th Pugwash Conference on Science and International Affairs to our country. We wish you well in your deliberations on your theme of "Peace and International Co-operation: A Program for the Seventies."

This appeal is directly pertinent to your theme. Your work towards the establishment of a just and secure peace is of great importance, and we shall pray for your success. If the goal of universal peace is not in sight, perhaps you can assist the world community in realizing more attainable objectives, such as assuring that governments honor commitments made to secure peace, that criminal attacks on civilian aircraft be ended, and that basic human rights be respected throughout the world.

We extend a special welcome to the distinguished participants from the Soviet Union. We bear no rancor toward them. We urge them to see not only the beautiful Wisconsin countryside but also to visit with the American people and observe the many facets of our society. We invite the Soviet delegates to visit our homes, to share with us our bread and our thoughts, and especially to visit our houses of worship and religious schools.

We assemble this afternoon not to interfere with the Pugwash conference but solely because our consciences forbid us to remain silent in the face of continuing oppression of three million Jews in the USSR. We hope that in the spirit of the Pugwash conference you will attempt to understand our concern just as we are sympathetic towards your work. It has been suggested by well meaning persons that Pugwash is an inappropriate place for us to express our concern. But you would be receiving a very false impression of our country and of the force of our concern if we did remain silent.

We assemble to remind you and the world of the plight of the Jewish minority in the USSR. Our program includes prayer, music from many nations, including Russia, informative reports about the plight of the Soviet Jews, a speech by the Lieutenant Governor of Illinois, and the reading of Jewish freedom letters smuggled out of the USSR.

We appreciate that the Soviet participants may not be accustomed to seeing public prayer and the assembling of private citizens to express their grievances. But prayer and peaceful assembly are among the most cherished rights of a free people. We will not suspend our exercise of these rights just because public prayer and protest are illegal in the USSR. We will even pray that outside a future Pugwash conference in the USSR the Soviet people may be allowed to pray and to express peacefully what is in their hearts. Even in the USSR, there are courageous Jews who at fearful risk to themselves are speaking out. As the group of 28 Jewish intellectuals and professionals of Riga stated in their petition delivered to the Seventh International Symposium on the Chemistry of Natural Combinations in June of this year:

"We beg for your help. We beg you to raise your voice in the defence of our rights. We beg you to render us assistance in our age-long dream to unite with our relations in Israel, to unite with our Jewish people in the land of our ancestors . . ."

"We also beg you to acquaint to other scientists and representatives of scientific organizations with this problem of ours, so that in accordance with the spirit of the General Declaration of the Rights of Man they should be able to speak in the defense of our inherent inalienable human right to unite with our people on our ancient land and to live a worthy national life."



The appeal we place before you is thus the same as that addressed to your scientific colleagues at Riga on behalf of millions of Soviet Jews. No reasonable person can expect us to hide our concern when the Jews of Riga risked their lives to express theirs.

The specific aspects of Soviet oppression of Jews which deeply concern us include the following:

1. Refusal to allow Jews who desire to emigrate to do so. This is in violation of Article 13 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Premier Kosygin's promise in Paris on December 3, 1966. Can a government which denies this basic right be considered civilized?

2. Imprisonment of Jews whose only "offense" is that they want to emigrate. A large number of Soviet Jews have been imprisoned in Leningrad since June 15 without formal charges being placed against them, and there is reason to fear they will be executed after secret trials and without trials. We hope you will agree that the saving of human lives under these circumstances is of transcendent importance.

3. Prohibition of the operation of Jewish religious schools and the teaching of Hebrew and Yiddish, as well as the unavailability of Jewish books and cultural and religious articles. Most of the synagogues in the USSR have been closed. The Jews are singled out among the many Soviet minority groups for such deprivation.

4. An anti-Jewish propaganda campaign in the Soviet press and in books published by the government, reminiscent of the libels disseminated by the Czars and the Nazis.

The facts documenting the anti-Jewish policies of the Soviet government are readily available and undisputed. If any of you care to examine further into the pertinent documents, we shall be pleased to supply you with copies. We call upon the participants in the Pugwash conference to familiarize yourselves with these facts and to ask the Soviet participants about their knowledge of these inhumane practices. We particularly suggest that you ask them why in the year 1970 a person who desires only to leave a country in peace should be forcibly prevented from doing so. The prohibition of emigration resembles the very serfdom supposedly abolished in 1861. We submit that you will not be doing justice to yourselves or to your theme of "Peace and International Cooperation" if you fail to consider these facts.

Some Soviet Jews, such as those whom the Soviet government presents in press conferences, have adjusted themselves to these inhumane practices, and they too have our good wishes. But millions of others feel the yoke of oppression, including those who ask for press conferences but are not allowed to hold them. It is for their sake that we cry out.

We ask the Soviet participants to examine the causes of our concern to your government, your academic colleagues and your fellow citizens, Jewish and Non-Jewish. For the time has come when no Soviet representative can show his face in the free world without being reminded of our indignation over oppression of Soviet Jews.

Once before in our time the world remained silent in the face of evil, and millions of our brothers perished. We respect and appreciate the heroic sacrifices of the Soviet people in the Second World War, after Hitler shattered the Nazi-Soviet alliance, but the mutual suffering of our peoples in the war provides all the more reason for granting freedom to the survivors of the Holocaust.

President Nixon said last week in his New Year Message to American Jews:

"Jewish tradition teaches that the power to do good or evil is in our own hands."

We appeal to you to take into your own hands and hearts the oppression of the Soviet Jews and to hear their groaning. The

demand to "Let My People Go" has been heard by God. It must now be heard by governments and men.

COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS OF CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY.

### NEW MEXICO'S EXPERIENCE WITH SPORTS SERVICE

#### HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the following description of the activities of Emprise, a Buffalo, N.Y., firm that does business with organized crime, should be of special interest to all the Members of Congress.

Note that the attempt by Emprise to conceal its real position of interest in an applicant for a racing permit led to the New Mexico Racing Commission requiring that Emprise could have no more than a 5-percent interest in any racing permit in the State. This pattern of Emprise concealing its true interest in various enterprises is not new. On September 2 of this year the Security and Exchange Commission forced a suspension of trading in the stock of Tucson Turf Club because the SEC, as a finding of fact, determined that Emprise had lied about its true ownership of Tucson Turf Club.

The New Mexico Racing Commission is to be commended for a courageous stand taken in the face of tremendous pressure from Emprise whose finances and expertise in legislative and administrative seduction has been so overwhelmingly successful in my own State of Arizona.

An article from the August 1970 edition of the New Mexican Horse Bulletin follows:

THE N.M. RACING COMMISSION—WHAT IT TRIED TO DO FOR THE NEW MEXICO HORSEMAN AT RUIDOSO DOWNS

The members of the New Mexico Racing Commission do not get paid. During the past months these members have put in hundreds of hours of their own time, taking it away from their businesses, their personal interests, and their home life. Time on a problem caused by a company of Raton, New Mexico, which bought Ruidoso Downs in the summer of 1969.

The Commission started an investigation in August, 1969, and ended it in April, 1970, after six hearings which averaged some ten hours apiece. These were the longest hearings on any one subject in the history of the Commission. The Commission ended by refusing racing dates in 1970 to Ruidoso Downs Racing Association, knowing full well that this decision would have a most unfortunate economic impact on the Ruidoso Community should the end result be no racing in Ruidoso in 1970.

That this result would occur was never seriously believed, but we have never known a decision of this kind to be made without deep feeling and profound investigation of the ascertainable facts. So, there must have been some good reason why four unpaid, unbiased New Mexican horsemen and ranch owners entrusted with the protection of the horse racing interests of New Mexico took the time and trouble and made this decision in what they thought was in the best interests of the New Mexico Horse Racing Industry.

We thought it would be interesting to the

horsemen of New Mexico and perhaps helpful if we asked the New Mexico Racing Commission itself to tell the story as it appeared to them. We, therefore, went to the head of the Commission and asked Mr. Robert Lee of Belen if we could publish his answers to a few questions we had heard posed. He was very cooperative.

This—in his words—is what took place. "The first question I would like to ask is what got the commission going on this matter—what happened?"

"The first thing we knew about this matter was that an outfit called Newco had taken over Ruidoso and that the track had been sold. There was a rumor that went around fast.

"Before we knew it, there was a race program from Ruidoso Downs in our hands with a new Board of Directors and a new president of the Ruidoso Racing Association.

"Well, that was almost the first we knew.

"The thing that got me looking at this matter personally was that we were issued some statements, a little later to be found completely false or at least misleading."

"What were these statements?"

"These statements involved—first—that Sports Service, a catering company, was in no way connected with the new ownership of the track.

"Then later that Sports Service was connected only as concessionaires. And then later came the word that they were concessionaires and also had a loan out, but that there was no connection between Newco and Sports Service.

"This was stated to the Commission under oath in a hearing that there was no connection between Sports Service, their loan, and their concession contract.

"As things turned out later, the concession contract and all of the financing agreements and everything else were completely tied together. The only way you could divorce one from the other was to take Sports Service completely out of the financing; and as it turned out, the concession contract was for twenty years which would probably make it difficult to do. So, I don't know what decided the other members of the commission later on to go the way they did, but this is one of the things that started me looking at the whole operation."

"Isn't it the law of New Mexico that when a major track is sold, a full disclosure of the ownership as to who is buying it and how it is going to be run has to be made to the racing commission before the deal can be consummated?"

"That's right. The Commission has the right, and I think the obligation, that all of the financing and the complete planned operation must be disclosed any time one of these tracks is taken over.

"And, in this case of course, the whole deal was completed before the Commission knew anything about it. The contracts were all signed with no provision in them based upon the Racing Commission approval.

"The next thing we knew they just brought this thing in and dropped it on the table and here it is.

"And, at the time, they didn't bring us any of their contracts and getting the total number of their contracts was kind of like pulling teeth. We didn't wind up with something like this management agreement between Newco and Ruidoso Racing until this last hearing we had in Albuquerque."

"What was the management contract?"

"The management contract was set up to be a percentage of the handle or \$800,000 a year, whichever was greater. This would be paid from Ruidoso Racing Association to Newco. In 1969 at the rate of last year's handle it would have amounted to \$960,000. We couldn't see from any reported income the Ruidoso track had ever had, how it could meet these obligations to Newco year by year; and if it didn't, everything ended up in the hands of Sports Service or the owners of

Sports Service. There just didn't appear any way that they could do it and save Ruidoso racing.

"So, we got to studying this and in a full hearing of the Commission which is on record, a member of the Board of Ruidoso Racing Association stated that they couldn't meet their obligations. They were going to have to have outside help. With the contracts set up the way they were, it looked like a take over of Ruidoso Downs.

"We had only received a part of the contracts by then. Ten out of the seventy or eighty or whatever it turned out to be after it was all over. And so, we became even more concerned for it looked like it, as I said, has just been set up for Sports Service to take over Ruidoso Downs.

"And so we called another hearing on the findings. We had this hearing back in Albuquerque. They brought in additional information and everything. It didn't look right to us and didn't look too good.

"In the meantime, of course, you hear a lot of these things as rumors and everything, but we got to hearing about other provisions in some contracts that we didn't know any thing about even then. So, we made demands for these.

"I can't remember just the sequence of all the events and we got some more contracts in but still didn't have them all.

"Along about this time, it got to looking serious enough so that we requested a special investigation from the Attorney General's Office and that's where Mr. Balamonte and Jack Love came in. He took over handling the investigation from this point on.

"We found then there were some 50 more documents we hadn't received. We demanded these. We finally got most of them, including a letter that covered some of the financing contracts to Sports Service. The letter was the same date and the same time and in addition to all the really obnoxious provisions that had been counted out in the contracts themselves.

"The provisions in this letter would have allowed Sports Service to take over and all their options were in this letter that was written on the side and was just as binding a contract as one of the contracts themselves.

"But it was there, and all this time we were having the hearings and hadn't come to a decision. Eventually when we had gotten all of this and had come to look at what Balamonte had turned up in his investigation, what Congressman Steiger had testified, and a few Arizona commissioners had come over and testified on how Sports Service had operated in in Arizona, we turned down the application. It looked like a take over, and we didn't like the operation in other states and didn't think it would be good for New Mexico."

"What about this Arizona operation?"

"We had some people from Arizona testifying—the little dog breeders groups—they had personal problems with Sports Services. Their testimony may not have had too much value in court; but what it did to me—it proved, first, we didn't want any dog racing in the State of New Mexico. Second, we don't want these people taking over because they have a set-up over there in Arizona so that their dog track management absolutely controls who can race a dog on that track, who can get on there and there is not much recourse from it. An old boy can't set over there in Arizona and raise a couple or three dogs himself and take them to the track and try them out. He's got to go under one of these full stable deals of 25 dogs and be approved by the management and everything before he can even get on the track. Sports Service had a tendency under the testimony of these people to keep the Arizona Breds out, because they have to pay 10% breeders' award to go along with it and costs them some more money. We got several of these

people testifying to this over there and, like I say, there are arguments that while Sports Service is not the management over there, they own 50% of the track but they still are not the management. Well, whatever it is, the main thing this proves to me is that we certainly don't want the dog racing and we don't want any set up like this in New Mexico where a concessionaire would control who runs and who doesn't. In stables protected by state controlled pari-mutuel law, any citizen in that state who is qualified would be able to raise his livestock and get it tried out on the State's tracks. Boy, they can't get them in over in Arizona. They have to get them into one of these contract stables or kennels, I believe they are called. So many dogs, 25 or so many approved dogs, I mean, ran with records and then they can have two or three maidens, and you've got to get them in that. And most of these guys travel from one track to another, which means that a guy sitting there in Arizona can't run his dogs and take them to a track and run them unless he can make a connection with these people. It's a bad set up. It would be bad to have it here for the horses."

"Have you had any trouble in getting witnesses to help you in this situation from the horsemen?"

"We have had a lot of trouble. All the time throughout this investigation we have had so many complaints from horsemen.

"But when it came time for people to get up and testify in an open hearing, our attorneys called numerous New Mexico horsemen and we couldn't get one to get up and testify just as to their honest opinion. The horsemen of the state are going to have to help if they want help and protection. They are going to have to come forward and do something to help us out."

"What was the final agreement?"

"The final agreement was that the concession contract be dropped from 20 years to 5 years. That Sports Service can own no more than 5% in any New Mexico race track. That they will loan no further money to race track operators in New Mexico. This is not only for Sports Service—this goes for any concessionaires too. We are writing a rule to this effect. The quality of Sports Service concession is based not on their services in New Mexico, Texas, and Colorado but it was based on a comparison of concessions other than Sports Service operation in New Mexico, and the terms of this agreement would start at the time Sports Service gets paid the \$600,000 that they put into the financing of Ruidoso Racing Association."

"What is the connection between Emprise and the Trustees and why did you grant them dates?"

"There is no connection between Emprise and the Trustees. I don't know about their personal friendship and things like that. But as far as their operation of that race track, the three trustees are true receivers by order of the Court. They operate this race track under the direction of Judge Waldo Speiss and the New Mexico State Racing Commission, and this is all.

"They have no obligation to any one else as far as the operation of that race track goes. They report to the judge, and they report to the Racing Commission. They are obligated to sell the race track. They are obligated to get Sports Service out of the financing as soon as possible. They are obligated to run this track as well as they can run it during the time they are in there, but under the court's order, they've got to get a sale on this thing if there is any sale to be made.

"Another reason we went ahead and made our decision on this concession deal at the time we did was that anybody coming up interested in buying this race track knows exactly what they have got to do. He's got a five year concession contract with Sports Service, but this concession contract is up before the Commission for annual review.

This is the point I want to emphasize—these concession contracts are reviewed annually by the State Racing Commission.

"It would have been extremely hard for the trustees to get a sale on the race track with things still up in the air, and an old boy not knowing which he was buying, Sports Service for twenty years or just what he was doing. At the hearing Judge Speiss widened the power of these trustees by his written order so that we and everybody else understands that these are true receivers in every sense of the word.

"And again they are obligated to take care of all financing, obligated to get a sale as soon as possible and to act as true receivers in every way. This was one thing we were vitally concerned with and one of the reasons we turned them down.

"The first time these trustees asked for dates they were not true receivers and did not have the authority. Judge Speiss changed all that and made them true receivers, gave them by court order full authority to run the track, so the next time they asked we gave them dates.

#### CREATION OF WORLD ENVIRONMENTAL INSTITUTE

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House resolution calling for the creation of a world environmental institute and the support of this concept by the U.S. delegation to the U.S. Conference on the Human Environment in 1972.

The phrase "one world" has taken on a new meaning as our perception of ecology increases. We are still struggling for peace and political agreement but the one world which every citizen shares is that of the environment and natural resources. Barbara Ward, who appeared before our Science and Astronautics Committee in 1968 coined the term "space ship earth." And we are no less dependent than the astronauts on the wise usage of the finite supplies we carry on our journey around the sun.

The management of this common environment cannot be successful without international agreement because increasing evidence shows the consequences of actions taken in one area on the landscape in another. We have already learned this lesson in America. Connecticut counties are a part of an air shed shared with New York and New Jersey jurisdictions. And Connecticut's shores are linked by the Long Island Sound and the ocean to pollution out-falls far away.

I was particularly impressed by the results this summer of a study organized by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Incidentally, it was the very first project sponsored by the National Science Foundation—along with other funding sources—under the Interdisciplinary Research Related to the Problems of Society—IRRPOS—program which the Congress stimulated by the 1968 amendments to the NSF Act.

The study focused on environmental problems whose cumulative effects on ecological systems are so large and prevalent that they have worldwide signifi-

cance. Here are the specific topics considered:

Climatic effects of increasing carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere.

Climatic effects of the particle load of the atmosphere.

Climatic effects of contamination of the troposphere and stratosphere by subsonic and supersonic transport aircraft.

Ecological effects of DDT and other toxic persistent pesticides.

Ecological effects of petroleum oil in the oceans.

Ecological effects of nutrients in estuaries, lakes, and rivers.

This study and others have established the need for world accord on actions affecting the shared environment. For example, even if the United States bans DDT, fish caught off our shores may contain this persistent chemical washed in from continuing foreign applications. Radionuclides from atomic powerplants can circle the globe and enter food chains far from the point of origin. The carbon dioxide from fossil fuel combustion in the highly industrialized countries may eventually alter the worldwide climate and weather patterns. Oil in the oceans originates from defective offshore rigs and from the tankers of various nations to pollute the shorelines of the world.

Thus the requirement for international control of critical environmental problems is established. Rational decisions can be reached only with a strong information base, as we have learned so well in the United States. World environmental management will also rest on accurate and timely scientific data, analyzed and validated for use in appraising the consequences of ongoing actions and options for change.

The time for attention to an adequate information source is now. The experience of my Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development suggests that many valuable laboratories and research centers for environmental science already exist and are located in various nations. But no central function is available to gather, analyze, evaluate, and interpret the myriad facts and figures. Measurements must be systematically filled; and unnecessary replication of expensive experimentation and monitoring must be avoided.

Science has shown itself to be an international discipline which, in its practice, transcends ideologies and geographical boundaries. The careful study of cause-and-effect relationships in environmental matters should be susceptible to worldwide participation with great benefits to the political decisionmaking process.

I do not propose further to define my concept of a world environmental institute. It would be inappropriate for me to do so. Several capable efforts are now underway and the intent of my resolution is to put the House on record as urging that the creation of such an entity be pursued vigorously.

I am aware of the plans for the extension of the international biological program, an ongoing activity relevant to the information needs I have described.

The International Congress of Scien-

tific Unions has formed a Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment—SCOPE—which is developing an International Center for the Environment. This organization may be very much what is needed by international management.

The National Academy of Sciences has formed a Committee for International Environmental Problems with Dr. Thomas Malone of the University of Connecticut as chairman. I will look forward to their development of a pattern for a world environmental institution.

Senator MAGNUSON has introduced a similar resolution (S. Res. 399) in the other body and has called attention to the varying proposals made by George Kennan, Secretary General U Thant and others.

The need is recognized, the capabilities are at hand. My resolution can add the push of congressional concern to the developmental efforts now going forward so that environmental science can be focused on those critical problems which will demand international political agreement in the next few years. I ask early consideration of the resolution in order that the organizational work which it will stimulate can move ahead rapidly.

#### COST OF LIVING SLOWED

### HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, there is good news today for the workers and housewives of America.

The news is that the increase in the cost of living has slowed to the lowest pace in nearly 2 years.

This is conclusive evidence that the Nixon administration policies of fiscal and monetary restraint are working in the fight against inflation. This is solid evidence that all of the scare talk about the need for wage and price controls was exactly that—wild talk which flowed from a desire to reap political advantage.

We have now not just turned the corner on inflation. We are on the road to relative price stability.

I have predicted that the administration's policies will slow inflation down to a 3-percent rate. I renew that prediction today. As I see it, the annual rate of consumer price advance will fall from the recent level of 6 percent to about 3½ percent by the end of this year and to 3 percent by the summer or fall of 1971.

I firmly believe that the administration's policies of fiscal and monetary restraint are producing a victory over inflation. This has been the administration's game all along. It is a game which is going to push the ball over the goal line.

And now that we have started down the road to relative price stability, it is all the more important that Congress refrain from mandatory overspending—refrain from jeopardizing the economic gains we have made in our transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

#### CANNOT AFFORD TO ABANDON SST

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in the past few months the supersonic transport has become so clouded in dissension and controversy that we have lost our sense of perspective on this issue. The following editorial from the San Diego Union analyzes the pro and con issues, emphasizing the uncertainties still involved as well as the economic consequences if we fail to proceed now with the funding on the SST. I know my House colleagues will find this editorial both interesting and informative.

[From the San Diego Union, Aug. 24, 1970]

TECHNOLOGICAL FUTURE AT STAKE: UNITED STATES CANNOT AFFORD TO DROP SST

The American supersonic transport is approaching another hurdle in its difficult journey from the drawing board to the flight line. The Senate must decide soon whether an additional \$290 million in federal funds shall be invested in development of an aircraft designed to carry passengers between continents faster than the speed of sound.

Only by a narrow margin did this item in the budget clear the House of Representatives last May. The SST has become a cause for environmentalists, a bone of contention among economists, a subject of gee-whiz statistics about future world travel.

The welter of conflicting views about the SST make one thing clear. If the program is to proceed at all, it must do so in the face of many unknowns—ranging from a controversial theory about the effect of high-altitude jet exhaust on the world's climate, to whether airlines will buy as many of our SSTs as the proponents foresee.

It would take rose-colored glasses to obscure these uncertainties and to deny that the American taxpayer is taking an economic risk in underwriting the SST program. No one can assure us that supersonic travel will be commonplace in the future. It is equally true that no one can assure us that it will not be.

The problems and uncertainties of this great undertaking have not deterred Britain, France and the Soviet Union from pressing ahead with development of their own supersonic transports. They are creating the technology and production capacity for an era of supersonic travel, bidding for an historic breakthrough in the world aviation industry.

In our own country we see scientific and technical teams breaking up in our aerospace industry with the lull in our space program and as a consequence of drastic cutbacks in the defense budget. Federal funds for basic research are being curtailed.

An industry that now stands as the foremost supplier of multi-engine jet transports to the airlines of the world, and which only recently was celebrating the triumph of providing the hardware to send the first men to the moon, is facing a clouded future.

Members of Congress are asking whether we can afford the SST program. A better question is whether we can afford to continue dismantling a part of the network of creative technology which has contributed so much to raising the United States of America to a pinnacle of economic and industrial success in the 20th Century.

The misnamed "military-industrial complex" is in reality a wedding of technology and industry which gives us much more than the weapons on which our security rests. It is the means of translating the inventive genius

of our scientists and engineers into the material goods that fulfill dreams of progress and become the basis for our prosperity in the future.

It is a national resource in the fullest sense of the word, and it would be even more gravely damaged if we allow the SST program to die.

#### MOORHEAD CHEERS COLLEGIATE FUNDRAISING EFFORT

### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce into the RECORD an editorial from the September 14 Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

It details the efforts of a group of Duquesne University students who have responded to the financial plight of their school by organizing a fundraising program of their own.

I think it is often forgotten in this day, when few people use anything but expletives to describe our young people, that today's group of students is truly an outstanding aggregation. Events like those at Duquesne reinforce this positive image.

I hope their effort to save their school is successful. Duquesne University has contributed much to Pittsburgh and the Nation, and its students and academic family deserve a much better fate. And with the kind of spirit "The Third Alternative" has manifested, the long path the school has to travel toward financial solvency seems a bit shorter.

The editorial follows:

#### A "THIRD ALTERNATIVE" AT DUQUESNE

In view of the adverse publicity which a radical minority has inflicted upon the nation's campuses, it is most reassuring to watch developments at Duquesne University, where student volunteers are coming to the institution's financial rescue. Hundreds of students are demonstrating the loyalty, the appreciation and the sense of responsibility traditionally associated with an American campus.

Like most of the nation's 1,500 private colleges, Duquesne has serious financial troubles. These institutions are caught between steadily rising costs, tight credit and diminishing resources. Campus disorders have tended to slow down once generous giving. Tuitions are rising and some of the country's seven million college students have found it difficult to return to school this fall.

Due to such obstacles, Duquesne faces tough alternatives. It can curtail program or even close its doors, it can subject students to yet another tuition increase (it went up \$200 this year) or it can raise some \$5 million needed to keep the institution's head above water.

University officials will undertake to raise \$4 million through loans and gifts. Student volunteers, calling themselves The Third Alternative, started last April to raise \$1 million. During a spring telephone solicitation they raised \$61,000. Starting next week they will make a house-to-house canvass seeking contributions.

We hope these student visitors will be received generously. Their cause is good and their motivation is commendable. They restore faith in the constructive majority

who have been sadly eclipsed by the destructive posturing of an exhibitionist minority. With students like The Third Alternative, Duquesne promises to make in the future the same valuable contributions it has made to this area for more than 90 years.

#### THE BATTLE FOR THE AIR FARE DOLLAR

### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Bill Eaton, a staff writer for the Oakland Tribune that is now published by former Senator William F. Knowland, has written a very interesting article entitled "The Battle for the Air Fare Dollar."

In this he outlines some of the problems that are materially affecting the supplemental or nonscheduled airlines.

Mr. Eaton points up the problem that confronts Trans International Airlines, one of the supplementals that is based at the Oakland airport in California.

The article is based on an interview with Mr. Glenn A. Cramer, chairman of TIA and one of the imaginative operators in the air business. I commend the article of Mr. Eaton for your consideration:

[From the Oakland-Tribune, Sun., Aug. 30, 1970]

#### THE BATTLE FOR THE AIR FARE DOLLAR

(By Bill Eaton)

"The airlines are beginning to cut down on the frills.

"Last week I was flying on one of the scheduled carriers, in first class, and they sold me a drink."

Glenn A. Cramer wasn't laughing when he said it. There is little to laugh at in a year of recession in the airlines industry.

He smiled when it was suggested the scheduled carrier might have handed him a free highball had it known who he was.

They know who he is.

Cramer is chairman and chief executive officer of Trans International Airlines, a supplemental air carrier. There are 13 of these in the United States. They have existed as such since 1963, survivors of more than 100 small "non-skeds" that sprang into the air after World War II with ex-GI pilots and equipment. They became "supplementals" by federal edict seven years ago and have prospered in military contract airlift and commercial charter flying until lately.

Now the Vietnam War and the nation's economic boom, if these can be thought of separately, are winding down in a severe recession.

The supplemental airlines and the scheduled airlines alike are seeing their military contracts halved.

In the troubled civil market passenger loads consistently average below 50 per cent.

The scheduled carriers, trying to fulfill the somewhat unwanted promise of new trans-pacific routes and the outsized Boeing 747 jetliner in the same bad year, have reduced service on intercontinental routes and will cut back flight frequencies on transcontinental runs this year.

It is the kind of a year when the scheduled carriers can't help but notice Glenn A. Cramer. He is no direct threat to them when it comes to their mainstay, the single-ticket passenger. And while he and other supple-

mentals take half the military contracts, this is a market the scheduled carriers entered only recently and it isn't easily manipulated in favor of one class of carrier or the other.

Commercial air charters are, in the modern idiom, where it's at for the supplemental air carriers. And in this recession year the charter passenger business is where the fight is, between scheduled carriers demanding more restriction of the supplementals, and the supplementals fighting the U.S. Civil Aeronautics Board's attempts to regulate them more or at all.

The dispute is not new. Hard times have made it more serious, so serious that the fight is moving into the Congress in the full belief that if something isn't resolved some airline presidents will be reading the bankruptcy statutes.

It is not merely a matter of which class of carriers gets the charter business, because the supplementals are saying quite plainly that if they are given the unlimited charter authority they feel they deserve, then some truly low-cost air travel will result. They can do it for half, they say, for that little guy who will never see a far-away place unless he goes as a member of a group to spread the cost.

Glenn Cramer is saying that little guy has a right to that trip, but he's saying something else about what could happen if the government regulates the supplementals out of the charter business.

"The consumer loses. If we're knocked out, you'll see all the prices go up" in the airline industry.

Cramer is saying this in a year when the supplemental airline industry's total first quarter loss is \$8 million, after 1969 when the total loss was \$7.7 million, and in comparison with 1968 when the supplementals ran in the black to the extent of \$17.7 million in profits.

"The answer is more income, not restricting people from doing more charter flying," he said. "Take off the restrictions and we'll fill the airplanes."

The CAB has always authorized "single entity charters" to a person for his own use, and this included both passengers and cargo. The people hauled, or the people interested in cargo hauled, make no contribution toward payment of the charter price and most freight forwarders work under this category. There are few regulatory problems.

Another charter classification called "pro rata" is used almost exclusively for passenger carrying and it has long stirred conflict in the determination of what constitutes a qualified pro rata charter. At first the CAB prohibited any solicitation of the general public for such charters, and that was the main rule.

In the last decade, when powerful jetliners made it possible to whisk charter loads all over the world, the supplemental airline prospered in the pro rata charter business, and regulation grew apace.

A restriction evolved as the "affinity group" charter, a classification conceived by the International Air Transport Association of scheduled air carriers—which is called "their international price-fixing cartel" by the National Air Carrier Association of supplemental air carriers (NACA).

The affinity group concept grew into a bewildering series of CAB regulations intended to set the contributory-type charter apart from the general public, an affinity group being essentially one which has aims and objectives other than travel, and its members having their required affinity as a group before any application is made for a charter flight. Fraternal, social, religious or educational groups, and employee associations, fit this category.

A third classification of charter regulation grew up as the "inclusive tour" charter which allows a full or splitload charter to a

tour operator or travel agent who organizes and promotes it, and arranges the flight.

Clients pay the tour operator who hires the airplane, and the CAB approves the tour, which must have three stopping points and at least seven days. The cost includes hotel, and surface transport, and the cost must be at least 110 per cent of the lowest available single-ticket scheduled airline fare over the route.

Amid this welter of rules and rule-making, travel agents and supplemental airlines increasingly ran afoul of restrictions at some point or another in the process of making arrangements and scrambling for business.

A scheduled airline couldn't scramble for so much as a supplemental carrier, being bound by law not to make up more than two per cent of its business in the form of "off-route charters" not flown along their regularly scheduled routes. But groups of people don't ordinarily fly to jungles and deserts, and as the scheduled carriers expanded their routes to all the best-known civilized places on earth they cut deeper into the formerly off-route markets which the supplementals pioneered and claimed as their own.

The NACA now is asking the government to switch that two-per-cent-of-business restriction from the off-route to the on-route charters flown by the scheduled carriers. The supplementals ought then to be given a right-of-first-refusal on all off-route charters, NACA says. (Some foreign nations now impose such a right-of-first-refusal on the U.S. supplementals which can't, for example, fly a charter tour to Australia until Australia's own Qantas airline has been solicited for the job and rejected it.)

The CAB, in this year of airline difficulty, proposes more stringent regulations of the supplementals. One proposal would limit charter a group with membership of more than 20,000 to 2,000 airplane seats in a calendar year—eight trips on a TIA Stretched Eight.

The CAB says it will allow the seeking of waivers of any rules, but this will mean a waiver for virtually every charter, NACA says, and the CAB has no regulatory standards now for guidance of its own officials in deciding for or against a waiver request. The criteria would have to develop in the way legal precedent does, through time and trial, in a field where everyone wants a piece of the action now.

The scheduled air carriers say they need more business or higher fares or both; the supplementals insist they can't exit with less business and more restriction, and the general public must be assumed to want more low-cost travel.

Congress is in the game, in hearings before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's subcommittee on transportation and aeronautics. The supplementals hope the hearings will produce recommendations for a simplified set of rules that will assist them in making low-cost charter air travel available to more people.

CAB Chairman Secor D. Browne a week ago told the subcommittee the key question is, "How can the delicate balance between the scheduled services and the charter services be maintained to the benefit of both?"

Browne deplored the battle between the two in which "... the ability and the desire to supplement and develop new markets has been subordinated."

Glenn Cramer says, "We found a new market in low-cost charters. We just need simplification of the regulations to develop it."

"We developed the military contract market, too, and the scheduled carriers got in. We agree with Mr. Browne, but after we've developed new markets we should have a chance to reap the harvest."

"We want total competition. If we develop business we should have the right to that business."

Chairman Browne feels new laws are un-

necessary. "In my judgment we need to take the five or six regulations now in existence and clarify them."

Cramer: "We don't think the affinity group is necessary. It will always be a big source of passengers but why should a man have to join a group just to make a trip at low cost?" A man ought to be able to form his own group for the purpose of a charter trip.

TIA can take a group at 50 per cent of the cost the members would pay for single-ticket airline service. This is because the scheduled carrier must maintain the service on its routes even when its airplanes go at less than 50 per cent load factor as they have most of this year. TIA, however, has what amounts to a guaranteed load factor of 95 per cent, in characters booked before an airplane is scheduled to fly.

Cramer: "To Paris our passengers pay under \$300, but it's \$700 (single-ticket) on a scheduled carrier. If he belongs to a group that can qualify under the regulations then he goes, and if he doesn't qualify then he doesn't go, and he doesn't pay the \$700."

In 1969, 57 per cent of TIA's revenues came from commercial flying—charter passengers and some cargo. That figure will pass 60 per cent this year, Cramer said.

TIA had \$15.7 million worth of so-called "fixed buy" military contracts in the final three quarters of fiscal year 1970, but has only \$9.3 million in the same period of fiscal 1971 (and the supplementals together watched the figures drop from \$63.1 to \$38.9 million), while among their scheduled air carriers competition American Airlines is looking at \$21.3 million that sank to \$11.4 million, and Trans World Airlines as \$13.6 million that went to \$9 million across those same fiscal periods.

Cramer: "In the last three years the scheduled carriers have gotten into the MAC (Military Airlift Command) work and caused dilution of that market. We pioneered it, and now everybody's got a piece, but we were there when the need first developed."

"We've worked the last six years to develop and explore our commercial markets to where, when we have a choice between a military and a commercial job, we'll take the commercial one."

For a long while in Vietnam War related flying, the military operated its own aircraft at 4.5 hours a day, leaving the balance of the work to commercial airlines. But then MAC began working its airplanes eight hours a day, and still works them 6.5 hours a day this year, and that reduces the need for civil aircraft, Cramer said.

But in competing for whatever military business is available the supplemental carriers are clearly in a better position insofar as equipment is concerned. They don't have the 747.

The military has shown a continuing clear preference for the convertible jetliners operated by the supplementals, rather than for the big new 747's with which the scheduled carriers made a bid for a greater piece of MAC pie.

MAC rated the 747 solely as a passenger aircraft, with a belly cargo hold. MAC prefers the McDonnell-Douglas DC-8-61 and DC-8-63 "Stretched Eight", because, Cramer says, "we can convert the airplane on the other end of a trip to meet the need—18 pallets and 90,000 pounds of cargo or 221 military passengers—and we don't need the special ground-handling equipment the 747 does."

Cramer has ten Stretched Eights and a pair of medium-range Boeing 727 jet-liners, and all of them are convertible.

This past Friday, Cramer's principal competitor among the supplementals, World Airways, based just down the street from TIA at Oakland International Airport, opted out of the jumbo jet field for the time being. World withdrew its orders for what would have been its first three 747s, on the basis

of the troubled charter situation and the proposed restrictions.

TIA plans to take a 330-passenger McDonnell-Douglas DC-10 in 1973 but Cramer says, "We presently don't want to face the big ones. We look at the 747 and it's too big. It doesn't fit the transportation market at all."

The scheduled carriers are carrying average loads of 250 to 300 in their 400-passenger 747s, but in these hard times they're doing it by literally robbing their older jetliners of passengers. The scheduled airlines, in a year of 40 per cent load factors, "have got to reduce their promotional fares," Cramer said.

"There's no point in advertising that 'My 747 is better than your 747' when it's just a big bus."

No frills are advertised for TIA charter flights.

There are no movies. Dinner is a one-course meal which Cramer says is "good, wholesome, hot."

He believes the business traveler cares little for lobster-in-the-sky, and the tourist would as soon wait to eat his exotic meals in that exotic place he's bound for.

"Our liquor service isn't as extensive as the scheduled carrier's," Cramer added.

He was a business traveler last week when that scheduled airliner sold him a drink in a first class seat, and he was delighted.

## VA DOES GOOD JOB IN VIETNAM

### Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, last week each one of us received a letter from Mr. Donald E. Johnson, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, in which he outlined the steps that have been taken by the Veterans' Administration to acquaint Vietnam-duty servicemen with the VA benefits available to them as veterans. I think the VA has done a very commendable job in apprising these men and women of the programs we have voted for their benefit.

When the House Select Committee on U.S. Involvement in Southeast Asia went to Vietnam, we looked into the work being done by the Veterans' Administration. Our investigation substantiates the facts related in Mr. Johnson's letter. Our committee found that 80 percent of the servicemen and servicewomen had been contacted by a representative of the VA through either personal interviews or group meetings before leaving the combat area to return to civilian life. This past June, the Veterans' Administration had nine representatives in South Vietnam with the following assignments: One at Tan Son Nhut for Air Force, USARV and MACV; two at the 90th Replacement Group at Long Binh; one for the Air Force at Bien Hoa; one for the Air Force at Cam Ranh Bay; one for the 22d Replacement Group at Cam Ranh Bay; one for the Marines at Da Nang; and one for the Air Force at Da Nang.

The VA conducts regular briefings for service personnel leaving South Vietnam. These meetings usually last about 15 minutes. The men and women are then given an opportunity to confer with VA representatives on an individual basis. The representatives receive no special

training before coming to Vietnam because they do basically the same type of work at any other duty assignment. Since sending representatives to Vietnam in 1967, the VA has had a total of 69 people volunteer for duty in the combat area. Unfortunately, two of these dedicated persons have lost their lives.

In addition to the briefing session, the Veterans' Administration also make extensive use of the Armed Forces radio and TV network in order to keep servicemen and servicewomen continually informed of VA programs while they are assigned to South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress and member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I would like to take this opportunity to publically thank the personnel of the Veterans' Administration for fulfilling their responsibilities in South Vietnam.

#### CHICAGO TRIBUNE URGES NATO INTERVENE IN HELPING JORDAN

**HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune has proposed editorially, that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization undertake the difficult task of saving Jordan from Palestinian rebels and Syrian invaders thus, restoring peace to the Middle East.

This is an excellent suggestion and worthy of immediate support by the administration.

I am particularly pleased to see the Chicago Tribune urge NATO intervention because as early as April 4, 1968, I proposed here in Congress that NATO invite Israel as a member nation and through the collective security of NATO assure peace in the Middle East.

In urging the United States propose membership for Israel in NATO, I said:

The growing Soviet influence in the Mediterranean and the Middle East certainly justifies the admission of Israel into NATO and the giving of Israel the full support of the NATO nations in securing her sovereignty in the Middle East.

We now have three Mediterranean nations in NATO: Greece, Turkey, and Italy.

It is not unreasonable to suggest that Israel become the fourth Mediterranean nation to be included in NATO, and that the force of the NATO defense community be extended to the Middle East for, surely, you cannot protect Europe from Soviet aggression if the Soviet Union becomes the dominant force in the Middle East.

Tiny and heroic Israel today stands as the key to peace, not only in the Middle East, but in Africa, the Mediterranean, and, yes, Europe itself.

The Chicago Tribune editorial follows:

##### A JOB FOR NATO

President Nixon is quite properly reluctant to order unilateral American intervention to save King Hussein of Jordan from the Palestinian rebels and Syrian invaders.

It isn't that there is any doubt about the importance of saving Hussein. His downfall would plunge the Arab world into chaos. While some Americans may view this in itself

with equanimity or even satisfaction, a guerrilla victory would also shatter what hope remains for a peaceful Arab-Israeli settlement. If the Israeli war were to resume, it would be harder to stop than ever and it would inevitably involve the United States to a greater extent than we care to imagine. It must not be allowed to happen.

The trouble is that the remedies thus far mentioned are either unattainable or useless. Intervention by Israel would do more harm than good. Unilateral action by the United States would be little better, and would turn every Arab nationalist against us. A combined effort, as we said on Sunday, is infinitely preferable. But by whom? The United Nations, which nominally backed the defense of Korea, offers no hope today. Neither the Soviet Union nor the moderate Arab governments are likely to help. And the Western European governments, individually, are reluctant even to discuss intervention.

It is time therefore to consider collective action thru the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a functioning organization with readily available forces and with bases in Turkey, next door to the fighting. Of course the obstacles are great. It will be argued, for example, that the Middle East is beyond the jurisdiction of NATO.

But there is nothing in the NATO agreement which prohibits such action, and surely the obstacles can be overcome if the member countries are persuaded that joint intervention is in their own interests as well as the interest of peace. They must realize that at least 85 per cent of their oil comes from the Middle East and that if the Middle East were to go up in flames they would very likely find themselves without oil at all, or at the mercy of the Soviet Union.

These are the NATO allies, moreover, who insist that the United States keep its forces in Europe as part of a collective deterrent to Soviet expansion westward. West Germany shudders whenever the withdrawal of American forces is suggested. Greece has just received a new commitment of American arms under the NATO agreement. If these countries consider our help so important on the continent of Europe, where the threat seems rather remote at the moment, can they be blind to a much more immediate threat thru the Middle East?

It is not, as we have said, just a matter of saving Hussein's throne or Jordan's integrity. The whole Middle East is at stake. If the Israeli cease-fire falls apart, there will be no suitable alternative to international occupation of the controversial border areas. Establishing an international presence there now will be more effective than waiting until there is no choice. International intervention is vastly better than letting the war break out again.

We know that this is a long shot. But at a time like this, we cannot afford to be fussy about seeking easy or unanimous solutions. If President Nixon can persuade NATO to act, we think it would work. We urge him to try.

#### AVOIDING JORDAN'S QUARREL

**HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the civil war which has erupted in Jordan—and which presently threatens to polarize the revolutionary and conservative halves of the Arab world—is viewed by many as raising the likelihood of the kind of big-power involvement in the Middle East that both we and the Russians have

sought to avoid since before the Arab-Israeli war of 1967.

Quite clearly, the President has been walking a diplomatic tightrope for us—and we with him—these past few days, as fast-moving events have threatened to pull the United States deeper into a conflict that offers us many dangers and few rewards.

The President has hinted that the United States might take military action—without going into specifics as to the nature or extent thereof—if intervention by Syrian or Iraqi armed forces were to tip the balance against King Hussein or if American lives were threatened. But the situation in the Middle East, today, is far more treacherous than it was in 1958 when President Eisenhower moved to intervene in the Lebanese civil war, so-called, for somewhat the same purposes, and American stock among the Arab countries is at a much lower ebb.

In a rapidly changing situation such as pertains now in Jordan—and in the midst of such vast uncertainties and near-incalculable stakes—it is understandable if American foreign policy for this part of our troubled world is being made on a day-by-day, if not hour-by-hour, basis; and it is equally understandable why the President may not wish to be very explicit as to what the United States may, or may not, feel called upon to do. At the same time, however, one in my position must hope very much that the White House is keeping our congressional leadership, and the chairmen and ranking members of the committees most concerned, constantly abreast of the developing situation, and advised as to the policy decisions we may be facing, along with whatever alternative courses of action may be available.

Surely, there are compelling reasons why we would not wish to stand idly by while King Hussein's government, and he with it, goes down the drain, for he—along perhaps with Tunisia's Bourguiba—is one of our last, remaining links with reason on the Arab side of this tragic conflict, and one of the few Middle East leaders we have thought capable of making peace with Israel and then enforcing that peace. Beside that, we have understandably an instinctive desire to do something to end, or at least alleviate, the misery and appalling suffering this sudden civil war in Jordan has brought its people and the Palestinian people living therein.

However, even though the same has been hinted at by American Presidents and Secretaries of State since the days of Messrs. Eisenhower and Dulles, it would appear that we have no actual commitment to defend Hussein's throne; in any event, the precise nature of any such has never been spelled out.

For that matter, we have no specific commitment to Israel though I think it generally understood that we have accepted at least a moral commitment to protect Israel's security—something that has probably been firmed up these past few weeks as our own initiatives toward peace in the Mideast have seemed to go awry, and it has now become incumbent on us to try to negotiate a new stand-

still cease-fire, including the rectification of the violations that occurred under the first attempt threat and the roll-back of the new Russian-Arab missile sites West of the Suez.

But what, now, to do about Jordan?—where the time-bomb represented by the unresolved, and largely unnoticed, Palestinian Arab problem that has been ticking away for 22 years has finally gone off?

The right answer—the wise answer—comes exceedingly hard.

One has to hope that a similar sort of answer is being searched for in Moscow, as well as at the headquarters of the United Nations in New York, where that organization—by effective, concerted action now, as it prepares to celebrate its 25th birthday—has an opportunity to justify its existence and all the support this Nation and the other peace-minded nations of the world have poured into it through the years.

But as for us—at least for me—the right, and wise, answer seems to be suggested in this past Tuesday's lead editorial in "The Wall Street Journal," as offered now, Mr. Speaker, for my colleagues' careful consideration:

#### AVOIDING JORDAN'S QUARREL

Hints by President Nixon and Secretary of State Rogers that the United States might intervene in the Jordanian war do not necessarily reflect a serious intention. Diplomacy, particularly where the Middle East is concerned, has many intricacies and the threat of U.S. intervention might have its uses as a diplomatic ploy.

But if President Nixon is harboring serious thoughts of involving U.S. troops or airpower in the conflict there is a key and crucial question to be asked first. Why? And there are not any very satisfactory answers.

Unquestionably the U.S. has important commitments and interests in the Middle East. It is committed to protecting Israel's security, to an eventual resolution of the problems of the Palestinian Arab refugees and furthering any efforts that can be made towards re-establishing peace. It also has a strategic and economic interest in trying to protect the flow of oil from Libya, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf sheikhdoms to Europe, which has a vital dependence on these sources.

It is hard to see how any of these interests would be furthered by intervention in Jordan. Regardless of how the Jordanian army fares against the Palestinian guerrillas, it will not obliterate the Palestinians or their deep-seated hostilities born out of 22 years as a homeless people. If defeated, the guerrillas will most likely withdraw to Syria and Lebanon to regroup and continue pressing their claims.

Whatever the euphemism employed, a U.S. military intervention would presumably mean killing Palestinians. The Palestinians already have countless grievances and this is one they would not forget. Thus, potential U.S. effectiveness in bringing about any kind of eventual peace between the Palestinians and Israel would be undermined.

As to Israel's security, it is hardly endangered by the quarrel in Jordan. If anything, it is temporarily improved while the guerrillas are occupied elsewhere.

Intervention would further endanger the already shaky relationship between the U.S. and two of the major oil producing nations, Libya and Iraq. Both of these countries appear to be in sympathy with the guerrillas. A U.S. intervention would tend to harden their positions and make them more likely to take rash actions, even to their own detriment, such as cutting off oil supplies.

There is the argument, of course, that by supporting the Jordanian army the U.S. would serve notice that it is willing to support relatively conservative and pro-Western forces in the Middle East. But given the climate of opinion among the Arabs, U.S. support would probably weaken, instead of aid, such forces. King Hussein has shown, particularly in the events leading up to the six-day war in 1967, that he feels his best chance for survival rests in allying himself with President Nasser of Egypt and paying lip service to the cause of Arab unity rather than on calling for help from Western nations.

There comes the final question of what to do about some 400 Americans, including hostages of Palestinian hijackers, who are trapped in the Jordanian conflict. If an airlift can be organized to protect these lives without any suggestion of a military intervention, it should be done. But a military operation would endanger those lives even more than they already are.

Some hints from the State Department have suggested that the United States might make common cause with the Soviet Union in the Jordanian situation. To us, this sounds slightly naive. There are indeed possibilities that the Russians are not happy about the freewheeling ways of the Palestinians and that they have no love for Syria's unorthodox revolutionary regime. Still, the United States should keep in mind that the prime objective of Soviet policy is to destroy American influence wherever it exists. To get into a high-risk operation on the assumption that it has some form of Soviet assent would be reckless indeed.

There is, in fact, a great deal to be said for letting the Russians fend for themselves in trying to cope with Arab quarrels. The Russians already are directly involved, unlike the U.S., through their troops and weapons in Egypt. If they could bring peace among the Arabs it would be a notable achievement but not one that we should necessarily fear.

Sometimes the U.S. has to make bold moves to protect its vital interests; before bold moves are made, however, it should be clear that there is something important to be gained.

Once directly involved, the U.S. would find itself caught up in the imbroglio to a far greater extent than it is now. So the best course will be to stay out of this Arab quarrel.

#### NIKOLA PETKOV

### HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. CONTE, Mr. Speaker, today marks the 23d anniversary of the murder of Nikola Petkov, the Bulgarian national hero and the gallant leader of the united democratic opposition in the Bulgarian Parliament. This event was noted at a memorial meeting in New York City on September 19 and at a religious service in Washington, D.C., on September 20.

I would like to join the Bulgarian National Committee in paying tribute to Nikola Petkov, a great man and a great leader. During the Nazi occupation of Bulgaria, he was an underground leader and was imprisoned several times. When the Nazis were driven out of Bulgaria, Nikola Petkov and three other representatives of the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union—the largest political organization in Bulgaria—took part in the

first coalition government, together with Communists, socialists, representatives of the political group, "Zveno," and the independent intellectuals.

Nikola Petkov continued to fight for the freedom and independence of his country. He fought in the finest traditions of democratic government, and for this he was finally arrested and executed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues and the American people will pause for a moment today to pay tribute to that great Bulgarian hero, Nikola Petkov.

#### PRIORITIES HAVE CHANGED

### HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. BELCHER, Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is succeeding in his efforts to shift the national priority emphasis from defense to domestic spending.

The 1964 fiscal budget allotted \$81.2 billion for defense spending whereas the 1971 fiscal budget includes only \$79.4 billion. Not only is this a reduction in the total amount budgeted for defense, but also it is a percentage reduction of 8 percent.

The Daily Oklahoman discusses this change in national priorities in a recent editorial which I insert in the RECORD. [From the Daily Oklahoman, Sept. 5, 1970]

#### PRIORITIES HAVE CHANGED

Arguments that we must cut defense budgets drastically in order to be able to afford civil projects continue. In his presentation of the need for a \$5 billion cut in defense spending, for example, Sen. William Proxmire told his colleagues that we "must shift priorities from the military to the civilian sector." He added that this shift is long overdue.

The fact is that the shift has occurred already, and the shift in emphasis is greater with each succeeding budget. The fiscal 1969 budget the last prepared by the Johnson administration, included \$81.2 billion for defense—44 percent of the total federal budget and 9 percent of the gross national product in constant dollars. The first Nixon budget included only \$79.4 billion for defense. For fiscal 1971, the amount for defense dropped to \$73.6 billion, or 36 percent of the federal budget and 7.3 percent of the GNP.

The appropriations for the next year are already under debate, but will be at least \$2 billion below current spending, unless there is an unforeseen increase in international tensions.

Non-defense projects, conversely, take rapidly growing portions of the federal budget. In the current fiscal year, 63.7 percent of federal spending (\$127 billion) goes to civil programs.

Although the Nixon administration takes credit for reversing a long trend, the fact is that the reordering of national priorities has been going on for a number of years. Defense spending back in 1964, the last fiscal year before our involvement in Vietnam became a major item, amounted to more than half the total federal budget. In per capita terms, national defense cost each American \$273 that year.

Although Vietnam costs are not easy to isolate from other military expenditures, Congress has insisted each year that federal officials make some sort of breakdown. For the first Nixon budget, the figure came to

\$88 per American for the Vietnam war, by the admittedly rather arbitrary breakdown established several years earlier. All other defense costs combined, however, had dropped to \$268.

During the same period of time, non-defense federal spending rose from \$251 per person in 1964 to \$624 per person in fiscal 1971.

While this shift of emphasis was taking place in this country, another kind of change was occurring in the Soviet Union. Spending on military projects in the U.S.S.R. increased by 50 per cent in the six years beginning with 1964. Funds allocated to Soviet strategic forces grew even faster, by over 60 per cent. Our own spending for strategic forces—on which we rely to discourage potential warmakers—dropped from \$46 billion in fiscal 1964 to \$39 billion in fiscal 1971.

From any angle, it is clear that national security does not now have first place in the federal budgets, and has not occupied that spot for several years. Perhaps the politicians who keep demanding that our defense spending be reduced have other, and valid, reasons for that demand. But they should stop imputing to national defense a share of the tax burden it no longer represents.

#### PERSONAL PRIVACY, DATA SECURITY, AND A FREE AMERICA

### HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, during the years the Privacy Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations has been carrying on its work of preserving constitutional rights, I have had the steady support and intelligent encouragement of Congressman FRANK HORTON. He made especially important contributions to the hearings we held in 1966 on the proposed National Data Bank and he has continued his informed interest in the problem of computer privacy.

On Tuesday, September 15, 1970, Congressman HORTON spoke at a symposium sponsored by Computer Audit Systems. He spoke to the issues of personal privacy, the security of data within automated information systems, and he highlighted the ultimate threat to our system of government in these terms:

In such a situation of social upheaval we must soberly confront the possibility of the Federal Government overreacting or the even more frightening possibility of the people losing faith in our institutions and voting into power a Government without any awareness of the diversity which is our strength as a free society. Spearheaded by an information handling technology utilized without safeguards, without conscience and with malice, dictatorship is now an operational possibility. For technological totalitarianism can become political totalitarianism.

Mr. Speaker, my friend FRANK HORTON said very sensible things in his speech and I commend it to the attention of readers of the RECORD and my colleagues in the House:

#### PRIVACY, SECURITY, AND A FREE AMERICA

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to address this symposium conducted by

Computer Audit Systems. In 1966, as a member of the Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy of the Committee on Government Operations, I participated with Representative Cornelius E. Gallagher in pioneering hearings on the computer. At that time, we considered a proposal advanced by the Bureau of the Budget to establish a National Data Bank. The Bank would have contained almost all of the records of citizen contact with Federal Agencies: tax returns, census data, military records, educational histories, all of the vast trail of data left by the citizen as he dealt with the Federal Government.

At that time, little was really known in Washington, or at least in the Congress, about the miracle of electronic data processing. We were assured by statisticians and experts in Federal programs that such a combination and centralization of records was essential to evaluate and guide ongoing social action programs. That may well be true, for certainly none then or now would suggest that vast expenditures of Federal tax dollars should be undertaken without the most sophisticated review and analysis. Our concern then, and our concern now, is that a massive compilation of citizen records would present an unacceptable threat to the continuation of individual privacy and democratic safeguards.

After a careful analysis by our subcommittee, it was determined that a National Data Bank was not in the best interests of the American people and the formal proposal has been effectively buried. Whether this was truly a victory or merely a holding action is now under quite valid dispute, as I will discuss later. However, certain basic points were made which were quite legitimate and it is my judgment that our hearings and subsequent actions sparked a re-evaluation of the role of data processing and data processors in our evolving free society.

This is a major reason why I am so pleased to be able to share my experiences in Washington with you today. Your organizations have the fundamental responsibility to assure that your own systems do not invade privacy and one of the major ways in which data processors can take that civilized step is to build in mechanisms to guarantee the security and integrity of the data bases. The president of Computer Audit Systems has been one of the leaders in establishing security mechanisms which are a vital part of insuring a continuation of free America.

I would like to point out what I regard as a fundamental difference between security of data and privacy of data. Security means thwarting unauthorized access to the information and privacy means assuring the individual to whom the data refers the opportunity to have access himself. This is, probably, a major oversimplification, but I think both parts of that equation are vital to our society and I would like to expand on it as the focus of my speech.

Many of you are executives in firms which have computerized information systems or which are seriously considering shifting from a manual mode to an automated one. It is essential, in my view, that you understand the necessity for security of your data, and I am sure many of you have already put into practice the methods which I am about to discuss. For you must gauge the level of the threat to the data which you possess if you are to build a system secure enough to resist intruders.

Just as automated data systems make information more easily and quickly available to your organization, they offer similar advantages to potential pilferers and data-thieves. It is both easier and more fruitful to raid a computer than to raid a roomful of file drawers.

It is obvious that threats to your data do exist, and I am not engaging in the currently popular art of doomsdaymanship by pointing out the vulnerability of computer

rooms and computer systems to theft or attack.

Let me point out two brief examples:

1. When one company wishes to expand quickly, one of the easier ways is to know the salaries of executives in another similar firm and to raid that company. If the payroll information system is not protected, it is a simple matter for a rival to know the salary levels of executives and to offer opportunities just a little better than the executives now are enjoying.

2. When you undertake to bid upon a project, your bid must remain secret. But computerized information systems, which contain all the justifying data, may be vulnerable to access by a competitor and thus the very concept of free enterprise and open bidding will become a farce.

What can you do to protect your own systems: I would offer three methods which may slightly increase the cost of the system, but which can offer an acceptable level of security for the data.

1. Encoding. Simple cryptographic procedures are available which would prevent a memory dump of all your information. It appears that many casual browsings among files in a time shared environment can be thwarted by encoding of data, for individuals often will not take the trouble to decode them if they are inadvertently dumped at his terminal or if he accidentally gains access to files which he is not entitled to see.

2. Password at each terminal in a time shared system is vitally essential in my judgment. This permits the executive program in a system to assure that unauthorized access does not occur and that the terminal identifying itself really is one which has the proper purpose for entry into the data.

3. Perhaps the most meaningful technical device to assist in maintaining security of data and preventing invasion of personal privacy is an AUDIT TRAIL. This keeps a record of every access to the data and can flag any unusual activity. American Express Company, for example, uses this to determine when a credit card is much more active than usual and has been effective in stopping credit card abuse. In addition, this will show who has received what information and will facilitate the sending of corrected records to those who may have received erroneous information.

And that feature, of course, is a major aspect of privacy. When the Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy initiated Congressional consideration of the credit bureau and credit reporting industry in 1968, we found that while these files were data rich, the individuals to whom they referred were privacy poor. At the invitation of Chairman Gallagher I participated in the first three days of the subcommittee's hearings, although I was not a member of the subcommittee at that time. What we heard was truly appalling and I am pleased to report to you that legislation, The Fair Credit Reporting Act, passed the Senate in November 1969 and is now being considered by the House Banking and Currency Committee. The body of evidence which was unearthed by the Privacy Subcommittee, specifically as it referred to the growing use of the computer by an industry which knew so much about every American who had ever applied for credit, insurance, or employment, disclosed that a National Data Bank was in fact in existence and controlled by firms which were under absolutely no legal restrictions.

While we had some sense of accomplishment in the name of privacy in defeating the Budget Bureau's National Data Bank proposal, I have even greater concerns about a totally non-regulated web of data systems growing between private credit firms and credit bureaus. At the time credit firm practices were first investigated, the abuses of privacy were staggering. There were almost



no provisions for an individual's access to credit data that refers to him, and no provisions for deleting or correcting false reports, or for dropping bad credit reports which are more than one or two decades old.

Fortunately, the situation is not as bad as it was in 1968. The majority of firms in the credit industry have taken steps to improve the fairness of their operations, and at least some of the regulations contained in the Fair Credit Reporting Act seem to offer guarantees of fair treatment to the individual consumer.

An example is the provision of the Act which limits the period that credit data can be held to seven years, except for a bankruptcy report which may be held for 14 years. Hopefully, this kind of safeguard can soon be enacted into law.

Consider that a man cannot be compelled to give up his home to quarter troops, a man cannot be compelled to testify against himself, and he has the right to face his accuser in an adversary proceeding. Most important to a constitutional basis for the right to privacy is the beautifully clear concept of the Fourth Amendment. I would like to repeat some of the Fourth Amendment's language because it can never be repeated often enough as we move into the Age of the Computer:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause . . ."

Methods to breach these guarantees existed long before the computer and other advanced technologies and certainly some men in our history have occasionally had little respect for the rights of our citizens. But the computer puts a wild card into record keeping and allows the invasion of privacy on a scale never even envisioned by Adolph Hitler. One reel of magnetic tape can contain the personal histories of thousands, even millions of Americans which can be taken from a computer in one jurisdiction and run on a computer in another. Thus, all the protective legislation adopted in past technological eras can be circumvented.

In addition, the very fact that so much data is now embedded within computerized data banks poses an almost insurmountable obstacle to the technologically unsophisticated individual. How does he make sure his records are correct when they are embedded in an automated system which he scarcely knows exists much less has the technical means to question? Here again, we see the necessity for new legal actions.

Not only can private credit reporting agencies wield almost absolute power over those who seek credit, employment, or insurance, but Federal Agents even now have uncontrolled access to these records. A truly appalling fact disclosed in the recent hearings held by my colleague, Mrs. Lenore Sullivan on the Fair Credit Reporting Bill is that 50,000 visits took place by IRS and FBI agents in 1969 to these repositories of credit and personal information and that subpoenas were seldom required. While the majority of the firms in the credit reporting field are not computerized, those which are can assemble all the information in any part of the Nation to be turned over to the Federal Government.

As I said earlier, actions taken by our Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy were able to stop a formal National Data Bank, but advances in the state of the electronic data processing art make me strongly suspect that such a nationwide system really is in effect. In addition to the credit reporting industry, computers in Federal Agencies now have the ability to "talk to each other." Executive Orders have been issued to upgrade the compatibility of various Executive Branch systems and thus all files held in the Federal Establishment will

soon be able to be merged into a de facto National Data Bank.

I have been wrestling with Federal agencies to stop one seemingly simple form of privacy invasion which this de facto Federal data bank has made possible.

With computers at their disposal, Federal agencies now can compile and reproduce with ease, the names and addresses of citizens having dealings with them. Under what I consider to be a poor interpretation of the Freedom of Information Act, which guarantees public access to non-classified government data, several agencies have been selling huge lists of licensees to commercial and other buyers at about a tenth of a cent per name—generating much unsolicited mail, and in some cases, some potential dangers to persons named on these lists.

One example which I uncovered was that the Internal Revenue Service was selling, at cost, a list of all gun collectors in the United States to direct mail firms. This would not have been possible before the computer, let me add, because of the great expense. Such a dangerous practice placed a constituent of mine in a position where he felt it necessary to erect an expensive electronic warning system around his valuable collection of guns.

He felt that wide distribution of a list of 140,000 licensed gun collectors to virtually anyone able to pay the \$140 fee would be tantamount to the IRS selling a "national guide for gun thieves"—a list pinpointing private homes around the country which were likely to contain valuable or extensive collections of firearms.

After learning of this abuse, I surveyed fifty Federal agencies to learn their policies on mailing list distribution. This led to my introduction last June of legislation to stop the sale of mailing lists by Uncle Sam, while still preserving safeguards of the public's right to have access to government data. Over eighty Members of Congress joined me in sponsoring this bill, which is some indication of the sensitivity now existing in Congress to the need for protection of individual privacy.

So we see that data flows into the Federal establishment with little control and that data also flows out of the Federal establishment, due largely to our failure to provide an effective means to assess the new information handling technology in all its ramifications. We have witnessed the rapid blurring of the distinction between Federal, State and local information files and as a Member of Congress I am becoming increasingly aware that the concept of our Federal system with States having separate sovereignty and jurisdiction is suffering severe technological incursions.

By collecting all information from all files, private and public, Federal and State, in a central repository or in a unified information system we give the Federal Government immensely increased access to information about each American. And the old Cliche about knowledge being power must now be expanded to say that absolute knowledge is absolute power.

I believe that here is the ultimate threat of the computer and allied technologies to the future of a free America. Our Nation is in turmoil at the moment and the conflict between right and left, young and old, liberal and conservative, is threatening to rip apart the very fabric of our society. In such a situation of social upheaval we must soberly confront the possibility of the Federal Government overreacting or the even more frightening possibility of the people losing faith in the institutions and voting into power a Government without any awareness of the diversity which is our strength as a free society. Spearheaded by an information handling technology utilized without safeguards, without conscience and with malice, dictatorship is now an operational possi-

bility. For technological totalitarianism can become political totalitarianism.

That is why I believe that the actions taken in the Congress in the area of privacy are so important and it is another reason why I am delighted to have the opportunity to address this distinguished group of data processing professionals. You know, far more than I or any other Member of the Congress, the incredible advances in the state of your art and you know the disastrous as well as the promising long range implications of your day to day work. But the Congress does not yet fully grasp these implications, I regret to inform you.

The cover story of *Newsweek* of July 27 was on the subject of privacy and I commend it to each of you. It stated what has always seemed to me to be an indication of the failure of the Congress to rationally assess the priorities of its own operations. Congressman Gallagher, the leader in the privacy struggle in the House and a man who I am proud to have had the opportunity to work with, has been granted by our Committee on Government Operations the staggering sum of \$65,000 in the five years he has been leading the Privacy Subcommittee. As a means to correct this striking imbalance, I have joined with Mr. Gallagher in cosponsoring H. Res. 717, to establish a Select Committee on Technology, Human Values, and Democratic Institutions. I am proud to have had a part in what the Congress has been able to do thus far in this area, but I am convinced that much more must be done, and done soon.

A Select Committee focusing exclusively on the toxic elements in the obvious tonic of technology is vitally necessary for at least two reasons:

1. The institutions of representative government are now under massive attack by virtually every element of society. The young call democracy irrelevant, the "over 30 crowd" calls it destruction of valid traditions, the disadvantaged say it has ignored their needs while the "experts" contend that it cannot react quickly enough to immediately implement the solution to our social ills. The House of Representatives, that branch of the Government, most closely connected with the people, is particularly vulnerable to such attacks for we must go to the people every two years.

We have long been threatened by massive power in the Executive Branch and one of our disagreements with the concept of the National Data Bank was that it would enlarge that power by several orders of magnitude. One of the main points made in the Report of the Committee on Government Operations on the Privacy Subcommittee hearings was that standing committees of the Congress must have equal access to such a vast data system, or *de facto* data system, should it be established. Today, the Executive Branch has over 10,000 computers; the Congress has but three. This imbalance must be corrected. A Select Committee such as we propose could assemble the sophisticated expertise and the data to challenge and alter Executive Branch proposals. It could help restore the Congress to a coequal role; where as now we frequently act as merely a supine ceremonial confirming body in passing legislation devised by a better informed Executive Branch.

No matter which party controls the Executive Branch, the hot voice of humanity is often unheard in the chilly corridors of power. The experts who create innovative plans are never called to public accountability, as are those of us in the Congress who must appropriate the funds to put them into operation. Adverse social or Constitutional side effects of Federal programs are often ignored if they seem to offer a short term increase in efficiency and economy and the operating role of the Agency.

A Select Committee on Technology, Human Values and Democratic Institutions

could enable us to compete effectively and could truly make us effective spokesmen for the human values of our citizens.

Even before the establishment of the Select Committee, I think Congress, now in a self-reforming mood for a change, should very seriously consider equipping itself with the computer facilities and staff necessary to keep up with the Executive's data handling and data maneuvering capabilities. I do not propose that we create a duplicate of agency staffs and computers on Capitol Hill. I do propose that computers sufficient to borrow data held by the agencies, and to analyze it for legislative implications be made available to Congress. Without the equipment and the staff necessary to do this job, the right of Congress to access to all government information, and the right of Congress to probe, to oversee and to change Executive policies will rapidly lose all meaning in this computer age. And as these cherished legislative prerogatives are dissipated, so will the democratic protections upon which our free nation is founded.

2. The second reason why we need a new structure within the House is that the role of the Privacy Subcommittee is not consistent with the goals and jurisdiction of its parent Committee—the Government Operations Committee. The sole jurisdiction of our Committee on Government Operations is to investigate the efficiency and economy of Federal Agencies. Yet, it is regrettable that sometimes the greatest enemies of the individual's right to privacy are efficiency and economy—the achievement of short range success of missions with little attention to long range impacts.

In order to be effective, the struggle to preserve human values in a world of skyrocketing automation and technology must be freed from its contradictory role within the Government Operations Committee. Frankly, I can think of few legislative reforms which would be more important both to the House of Representatives and to the American people.

For when we talk about privacy, we really discuss a whole series of shared values and traditions which have made the American dream a reality for the vast majority of our citizens. We are talking about what is unique in the American experience and what has vitalized the American experiment—that is our supreme value on human life, on the individual and on affording the individual an ideal blend of freedom, opportunity and security.

I want to conclude this afternoon with several direct appeals to each member of my audience. First, make sure that your own information systems respect the security of the data and protect the privacy of those whose data make up your systems. You can help us implement a modern interpretation of the Fourth Amendment's guarantees if your own organizations allow the individual to have access to his own records and if you deny access to those who can illegally harm the individual.

Second, I want to ask you to write to your own Congressman and ask him to support H. Res. 717, to establish a Select Committee on Technology, Human Values, and Democratic Institutions. As we enter the twilight of the 20th Century we may very well be entering the blackness of totalitarianism unless we establish a formal mechanism to turn back the tide of unevaluated technologies.

In my judgment, it would be especially influential for those of you who are professional in the computer business to offer your support for a Select Committee. Not only would your words carry special weight because of your knowledge and expertise, but I believe that it would be in your own best interests. All around us we see computer rooms and computer complexes being attacked as a tool of repression. I hardly need to point out the number of colleges which

have seen the computer taken hostage and the work of years of research destroyed. The computer industry is going to have to assert its informed conscience and its moral leadership. Yours is the fastest growing industry in the world and to protect the environment of that growth, it is essential that you support sound suggestions at the local, State and National levels. You must help us in Congress to insure that the beneficial applications of your trade are permitted to flourish, while those which threaten to stifle the freedom and innovation which fostered your industry will be firmly leashed. We are past the time when any industry can operate in a vacuum, particularly an industry which is as future-oriented as yours.

We in the Congress need your help to assess particular problems presented by information handling and we need your help to establish an atmosphere of trust in which we may go forward together to assure the freedom, which has allowed us to prosper, will be the birthright of our children. I hope you will join with us or else I am deeply afraid that it will be our common destiny to be folded, mutilated, and spindled by events we let slip from our grasp.

#### A CALL FOR REASON—AMERICA IN PERIL

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, for many years those in Government and I do include our Presidents, have turned to the weekly column of John S. Knight for guidance on national and international affairs.

The veteran publisher of the Knight newspaper chain has the faculty of evaluating our Nation's problems and then presenting constructive solutions.

I believe that his column of September 13 is of such importance that it should be read by all of my colleagues.

The column follows:

#### A CALL FOR REASON—AMERICA IN PERIL

(By John S. Knight)

What has happened to America?

Why, in our madness, do we turn to riots and destruction, to contempt for revered institutions which made the American dream possible, to nostrums instead of cures for our economic ills, to sleazy, cheap political devices rather than exercising at least a modicum of statesmanship?

Are we indeed a part of the world revolution which seeks only to destroy while parading under the banners of democracy, Marxist style?

Why are Americans, who enjoy greater freedoms under our Constitution than are permitted anywhere else in the world, berating "the system" which makes these precious liberties possible?

How long must we permit a small band of revolutionaries to disrupt our colleges and universities, to bomb government research centers, kill innocent people and ruin the careers of devoted scientists?

What kind of a country do we live in where the flouting of law has become a national pastime, where a law officer automatically becomes a "pig," an object of derision and attack by an untutored, undisciplined and unprincipled rabble?

Where indeed, are our leaders, the parents of our youth, the educators and the great body of law abiding, responsible citizens?

Are the leaders too politically oriented, too concerned with their personal ambitions to stand up and be counted?

Have the educators become so supine, so dependent upon government grants or so cowardly that they stand meekly by while their institutions of learning are defiled and brought to heel by roving bands of professional anarchists?

Must we yield to the sophistry that the right of dissent—as stated so forthrightly in Article I of the Bill of Rights—can be taken as license by those willful violators of the law who cannot distinguish between dissent and disobedience?

Ironically, the destroyers who abuse our Constitutional liberties would find themselves prisoners of the Marxist police state of the authoritarian world to which they give such frenetic devotion.

The greatest of all government documents—the United States Constitution—provides ample safeguards against tyranny and injustice.

Yet the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions has drafted a new constitution for the United States that would concentrate all authority in the national government, strengthen the Presidency, weaken the national judiciary and create new branches of government to oversee planning, elections and economic regulations.

Dr. Rexford G. Tugwell, 79-year-old former member of Franklin D. Roosevelt's "brain trust" and author of the document, observes that cherished traditions and institutions which no longer serve the needs of modern society must be pulled down as "impediments to progress."

Along with the Black Panthers, who have also put together a new constitution, Dr. Tugwell typifies the fuzzy and radical left who would tear apart our system of government while offering the absolute authority of statism in its place.

These are the true revolutionaries—along with socialists in the teaching profession—who are more to be feared than college youths expressing their frustrations on the campus.

Yes, our young people are being taught that there is something inherently evil about the capitalistic system, that its rewards for the industrious and thrifty segments of our society are unfair, that a "people's capitalism" would somehow solve all of our problems.

Why is it, Americans, that we of the world's most affluent society now wish to embrace the fatuous economic doctrines which have failed so miserably wherever they have been tried?

Are we like the lemmings who migrate at intervals to their own destruction?

Where were our statesmen when Congress fueled the fires of inflation by passing a "tax reform measure" which insured a huge deficit?

Can you tell us, please, why such responsible Negro leaders as Whitney Young and Roy Wilkins constantly criticize the total community for the excesses of young blacks while making no substantial contribution of their own in the direction of restraint?

Does it bug you that elementary school teachers once dedicated to character building are now setting a sorry example for our youth with their union-directed strikes on the eve of a new school year?

Or that labor's power monopoly is able to cripple the economy by making a farce of collective bargaining?

Can these distortions of an orderly society be attributed solely to the war in Indochina? Or is the current unrest symptomatic of a world society in revolution?

Whatever the cause, this is a time for the rededication of all Americans to the proposition, as stated in the preamble of the Constitution, that this nation was conceived to "form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for

the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

These were the wise and profound thoughts of our Founding Fathers.

That we have strayed so far from the paths of righteousness is a serious indictment of the weaknesses of man who in the almost 200 years of our Republic now finds himself for the first time seemingly incapable of constructive self-government.

For our enemies within would destroy the Union make a mockery of justice, insure domestic anarchy, gut the national defense, disregard the general welfare and repress the blessings of liberty.

This is what is happening to America, known in happier days as the land of the free and the home of the brave.

#### LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

**HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, what the House has done in passing the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 is to realize that—at least in this case—reform, even more than charity must begin at home. It is incredible, but true, that for the first time in 25 years we have examined our own consciences and come to the conclusion that it was time to take action to make the Congress a more responsive body.

It is time that we achieved this realization. Citizens have frequently leveled the justifiable criticism that Congress, and particularly the House of Representatives, is an anachronism—that it does not serve, and indeed often defies, the wishes of the people supposedly represented. The desire to achieve a more responsive Congress is in the best American tradition.

The framers of the Constitution, in providing for a two-house legislature, consciously chose to make the House of Representatives the more directly responsible to the people. Thus, Members of the House have always been elected directly, and have stood for reelection more frequently to insure a more accurate reflection of the voters' wishes. Unfortunately, however, the House has too often failed to live up to this intent because tradition-bound procedures within the House actually operate to frustrate it.

Recognizing the disparity between theory and practice, the House acted decisively in 1910 to limit the power of Speaker Joe Cannon. At that time the objective was to take arbitrary control from the Speaker and disperse the power to the committees and the whole House, and ultimately to respond to the Nation's demand for widespread progressive change.

But now many of these earlier structures have become objects of criticism and attempts at reform. They developed in a less complex age when Congress was a smaller body, dealing with simpler issues; before modern communications allowed the public immediate access to

official decisions. With time and different circumstances, the needs of Congress and the Nation have changed. Institutions must be adapted accordingly.

My constituents in Missouri's Second District have traditionally been interested supporters of reform and for that reason I introduced in July 1969 a bill very similar to the one which passed the House. We should feel heartened by the action taken here today—and proud that our efforts have produced results.

Not only the relevance but also the credibility of the current congressional structure have been called into question. There is indeed something of a contradiction when those of us in political life call upon young people and others to take the responsibility for and accept the consequences of their actions, while we in Congress too often transact our business hidden beyond a cloak of anonymity. It is not remarkable then that the most fundamental issue dealt with in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 is the matter of secrecy within the House.

We have attacked secrecy on three fronts in this legislation: in the standing committees, in the Committee of the Whole, and in the attempt to make more information available to the Members.

Such a large proportion of the House's significant action takes place in committee that it is incumbent upon us to make serious efforts to achieve greater public accountability at that level. The provision in the bill which requires the recording of names and numbers on record committee votes is a step toward this end. Likewise, larger investigatory staffs for minority committee members and a longer time for minority Members to file supplementary views will work to make the committees more representative.

It would be a great step toward an open House if the bulk of committee meetings were open to the press and the public. Unfortunately, the provision of the bill which allows a committee to vote at the beginning of a Congress to close all their meetings will probably perpetuate the current practice of several influential committees who hold all but the most innocuous of their sessions behind closed doors. This practice not only thwarts the public's accessibility to vital information, it also effectively prevents Members of Congress themselves from knowing what occurred during the committees' debates. The provision to allow radio and television coverage of some committee hearings will increase public understanding of committee procedure providing the media are allowed to cover sessions of some significance.

As Representative SCHWENGL described, we escalated our attack on secrecy from the committees to the Committee of the Whole. On July 27, the House passed an amendment which I cosponsored, aimed at one of the most flagrant manifestations of secrecy—the unrecorded teller vote. Although the members of the British Parliament were fully justified in instituting this procedure to protect themselves from reprisals from the Stuart monarch, it has long outlived its usefulness. The British Parliament ended the practice of unrecorded teller

votes in 1832. We were only 138 years behind.

Hopefully, this amendment will accomplish a twofold purpose. It will first of all make Representatives more accountable to their constituents for their votes on crucial matters. In addition, the knowledge that voters will be aware of their votes should encourage Members to be present and participate on the House floor with greater regularity.

The volume of information with which a Congressman must deal if he hopes to be an effective legislator is tremendous. In addition to the provision increasing the size of committee staffs, I welcome the other moves to provide greater access to information. Making the Legislative Reference Service a more comprehensive Congressional Research Service, increasing the budgetary information required from executive departments, and developing an automatic data processing system will assist all of us in making more intelligent legislative decisions.

Reform in the Congress is long overdue, and with the passage of this act we cannot sit back and congratulate ourselves on our accomplishment. Much remains to be done and reform to be truly meaningful must be an ongoing process. Other institutional practices need updating, and some must be discarded entirely. We must also continue to search for new and more appropriate mechanisms to aid in our legislative efforts. In the meantime, the 91st Congress should be remembered for its contribution to an open House policy.

#### WBBM EDITORIAL

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Christmas will soon be upon us and one of the organizations which deserves support is the USO with its program to serve GI's scattered throughout the globe. A very timely editorial carried over WBBM Radio—Chicago—urged Chicago area listeners to support the USO.

The editorial follows:

USO

WBBM has for some time been running public service announcements urging support of the USO, which works to ease the loneliness of GIs in Vietnam and other posts far from the comforts of home.

I'm sure you've heard these announcements by people such as Bob Hope, and also seen television spots and print ads urging donations to the USO. But it seems a lot of people are now taking the USO for granted, and others unfortunately feel that assisting the USO is tantamount to endorsing the American Involvement in Southeast Asia.

According to one official, the Christmas Gift program in Vietnam was 30 to 40 per cent off the level of previous years. Homefront participating in the Vietnam pen pal program is off by about 40 per cent. And fewer show business stars are touring Vietnam to provide entertainment and boost morale.

The American GI doesn't make foreign or military policy. He has been assigned to Viet-

nam, to a difficult job, and he needs help. Whether we support the war or not, we have an obligation to assist the GI who is in Vietnam. It's not the place he would prefer to be.

A lot of people these days look at the radicals and then say how proud they are of the GIs willingly doing their duty in Vietnam. It's time we did our duty. It's time we assisted the USO in making life better for a kid under fire halfway around the world.

It has nothing to do with politics. It's a matter of compassion.

#### FAIR TRADE

### HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the textile industry asks only for fairness and equity, not for protection. The Honorable R. Cooper White, Jr., mayor of Greenville, S.C., the "textile center of the world," in a recent letter to the editor of the Greenville News made this point crystal clear.

The Mills Trade Act of 1970 promotes fair trade and should be passed without further delay. I commend to the attention of Congress and to the American people the Honorable R. Cooper White's splendid and timely letter.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Sept. 13, 1970]

#### TEX INDUSTRY ASKS FAIR TRADE

In his letter of September 1, 1970 entitled, "Protectionism In Trade Scored" Mr. R. M. Pope Jr. of Clemson seems to feel that the textile industry, in their endeavor to seek restraints on textile imports, is returning to the protectionism of the '30's. I can in no way agree with Mr. Pope.

As mayor of "The Textile Center of the World" I have obtained answers to the questions he raised and feel as if, with help from many people, I can shed a different view. The people of this area need to know the theory of free trade and the facts as they exist today.

The fact is that what the textile industry is seeking is fair trade; there is no such thing as free trade in the world today. Actually our nation is, as has been said by Secretary of Commerce Stans, "the only virtually free market in the world". Other nations have raised a multitude of non-tariff barriers to American goods as for example, Japan, the biggest textile importer to the United States has 98 import quotas against our commodities and 16 other types of restrictions including custom practices, financing arrangements, etc.

As for our textile industry, they have not sought to shut off the flow of foreign textile imports but rather to slow the rate of growth. They are asking through a bill now before Congress that this growth rate be 5 per cent per year while still permitting foreign textiles to come in at a very high level. The important growth rate in the past few years has been beyond belief. For instance, wool imports now account for one out of every four yards of goods sold in the United States. Man-made fiber imports of textiles and apparel doubled between 1963 and 1965, doubled again from 1965 to 1967 and doubled again to 1.8 billion square yards in 1969. With such rapid growth as this the domestic industry cannot plan intelligently its own investments in production, new plants and equipment, research or jobs. With a reasonable predictable rate of growth the textile industry will know where it stands.

Further, regarding the trade bill, assurance

of continued availability of foreign textiles is built into several provisions. The President is given authority to exempt any textile product if he deems this in the national interest, if the product does not threaten disruption of our market, or if supplies are inadequate. Any nations which negotiate voluntary agreements with the United States—either now or after passage—are exempt from the bill's restrictions. The net effect of all this will be to assure a continuing flow of foreign textiles generally available in the quantities and at the prices now prevailing.

The restraints suggested do not call for taxes but again only restraints on growth. Mr. Pope need have no fear that he will have to choose between a \$6 American shirt or a \$2 foreign shirt carrying a \$5 tax. He will still be able to buy his \$2 foreign shirt—if he wants it—for \$2.

Also, if history is any criteria, Mr. Pope should know when he speaks of "inflationary forces" that our textile industry is the most inflation-proof in the country. This is a fact that any one can check and by checking it will be found that textile prices on the wholesale index have risen only 1 per cent since the inception of the index in 1957-59. By contrast, all commodities have jumped 17 per cent.

I feel that with over 700 companies competing bitterly for the sale of every yard of goods that textiles need no additional pressures to keep prices low.

There are many basic and compelling reasons why our government should put some restraint on the growth of textile imports. I would recite some of these, not just because the textile business is so very vital to our area but I feel that as an American first, a South Carolinian second, and a Greenville third, this is in the best interest of all and in the order in which I have mentioned.

These imports are destroying American jobs: some 300,000 in the last five years, 87,000 in the last year alone. People without jobs cannot buy anything or pay taxes, but more importantly they cannot enjoy the finer things of life that every American has the right to expect. The textile-apparel complex is one of the nation's largest employers. 2.4 million people, plus another million in cotton, wool, man-made fibers and machinery depend upon it directly for their livelihood. Another important factor to me is that minority employment in textiles is 14 per cent and in apparel 13.5 per cent which is considerably higher than the 10 per cent average for all manufacturing.

Our nation's balance of payments is in a serious deficit condition and the importation of textiles is the biggest contributor to this situation. To set the record straight, Mr. Pope should know, contrary to his letter, that American industry does not sell more goods to Japan than Japan sells to America. In 1969 Japan exported \$4.9 billion in goods to the United States while we sold \$3.5 billion to her. The difference is \$1.4 billion—in Japan's favor.

R. COOPER WHITE, Jr.,  
Mayor of Greenville.

#### FRAMEWORKS OF FREEDOM

### HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial in the current Kiwanis magazine is of such quality of thought and on a topic of such wide general interest at this point in our national history that I would like to commend it to the

attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. The author is a fellow Kiwanian and Californian, Herb Klein. The editorial entitled "Frameworks of Freedom" follows:

#### FRAMEWORKS OF FREEDOM

(By Herbert G. Klein)

The United States will soon celebrate its 200th anniversary, marking a history which has brought greatness and high responsibility to a nation.

The Constitution which has served the nation so well has been challenged often. It is challenged today. But as we mark Constitution Week, we do so in the knowledge that it stands as a strong framework of freedom.

It is true that today, some of those who cling closest to its provisions of freedom, try hardest to destroy it. A strong nation and a strong people, who recognize such enemies of liberty for what they are, will survive such attack without endangering their constitution or the rights it offers.

The United States Constitution is now 183 years old and the equally strong Canadian Constitution was born 80 years later—July 1, 1867. Both have served remarkably well.

If one sees the current play "1776" (incidentally, it recently was presented at the White House) one regains the sense that Constitutions, like other documents, were written by individuals with both human failings and extraordinary strength and vision.

There are wide differences between the United States Constitution, which is in legal theory at least contained in one instrument with later amendments, and the Canadian Constitution, which consists of the several British North America Acts and also includes unwritten conventions and historical usages.

Different as the Constitutions of these two great nations are, they share with that of their common mother country the common purpose of assuring the right of the majority to rule, the right of the minority to be heard, and the safeguarding of the rights of individual citizens as against the claims of the state.

Standing above the contention of rival political parties and differing governmental philosophies, the constitutions establish a structure of government designed to outlast the tenure in office of any political party or philosophical creed.

In these times, during which nations throughout the world have seen a sharp increase in civil turmoil and acerbic protest, it is worth harking back to fundamental constitutional provisions in order that we may not lose sight of the ground rules which they establish.

Under constitutional systems such as these, the majority, within limits, is given the right to govern; the minority is given the right to freely criticize, and to be afforded regular opportunities to persuade a citizen electorate that the reins of government should be turned over to it.

Reminders to the majority of its covenant to respect the minority's right to dissent, to criticize, and to seek to become the majority are commonplace. They should not for that reason be thought trite. Less commonplace, but fully as important, is the reciprocal covenant which minorities must be regarded as making with the majority under any constitutional system. The minority covenants to obey any enactment of the majority which is the "law of the land"—an enactment regularly passed and consistent with the provisions of the constitution.

Only if the majority keeps its covenant with the minority to both permit dissent and to afford a regular opportunity to challenge its electoral mandate, can there be guaranteed the freedom of expression and popularly representative government which have so long been prized by both of these

great nations. Only if the minority keeps its covenant to obey the laws enacted by the majority can there be civil order, a condition every bit as indispensable to constitutional government as is freedom of expression.

The great virtue of the Constitutions of our two great North American nations is that, greatly differing as they do in specific provision, each provides the machinery for a system of government which tolerably balances the claims of freedom and order. Freedom without order is anarchy; order without freedom is tyranny. Order with freedom—freedom with order—is the hallmark of constitutionalism.

#### MEANY'S ATTITUDE ENCOURAGING

### HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we must eliminate the strike and lockout as outmoded and barbaric techniques for settling labor-management disputes.

If a strike or lockout involved only the disputants perhaps it could be tolerated.

But a strike or lockout that wastes resources or products, that injures or penalizes innocent third parties, that bankrupts employers, that cripples and wrongs the employees and their helpless families should not be tolerated in a civilized society whose woof ought to be good will and whose warp ought to be justice and order under law.

Mutual cooperation is necessary. Good will between employer and employee must be expanded. Coercion is detrimental to everyone. Work stoppages cause injury and losses to both sides. After the strike has wreaked its damage, there still must be negotiation. So why not negotiate and arbitrate first and avoid the losses.

This no-strike concept has been long recommended by the independent scholars and experts in the field of labor-management relations. But few oldtime labor leaders have had the courage or foresight to seriously advocate the concept.

For too long, the new groping insecure labor leaders have insisted and preached that the strike, with all the strife of picketing, intimidation and threats of violence, was their ultimate weapon. Untrue; a false shibboleth.

Labor is making, and can expect in the future to achieve greater advances through negotiation than by striking.

George Meany is the patriarch, the seer, of the labor movement. None can dispute his sincere and aggressive commitment to the betterment of the workingman. Mr. Meany's developing attitude toward arbitration is encouraging. He is demonstrating great foresight and breaking ground for important advancement in labor-management relations.

Clayton Fritchey, an astute columnist writing in the Washington Evening Star, grasps this breakthrough in the difficult, rough-and-tumble business of labor-management relations. His column of September 21, 1970, should be read and contemplated by all Members who are

interested in bringing labor-management relations into a new era for the benefit of all involved.

I include Mr. Fritchey's column at this place in the RECORD:

#### MEANY'S ATTITUDE ON ARBITRATION ENCOURAGING

(By Clayton Fritchey)

With General Motors struck by the United Auto Workers, the railroad unions also ready to go out, and organized teachers closing many schools around the country, this may be a good moment to pause for a brief announcement from George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO.

It's not easy these days to get Meany off his pet current hates—Vietnam doves, student rebels, and Democratic "extremists"—but when he does get back to what he knows the most about (labor-management relations) he is surprisingly open-minded.

In a pre-Labor Day session with the press, for instance, he had the courage to talk openly and hopefully about a formula which, if adopted, would have prevented the present big strikes by resolving them through peaceful, orderly means, in short, by binding arbitration.

For many decades, opposition to the arbitration process (like opposition to wage and price controls) has been as dogmatic with labor as it has been with management. Meany is the first national labor leader to show any flexibility on either issue—and he is now flexible on both.

This is certainly an advanced and controversial position for the head of the AFL-CIO to take. But Meany, now 76, is so secure in his position that he is virtually immune to serious challenge by other union leaders. Even before Lyndon Johnson retired as president, Meany was so alert to the danger of inflation that he began hinting labor would accept economic controls if employers would.

Meany's Labor Day political opinions made so many headlines that his strike views got little or no attention. And yet, he said that some of his federation's "real solid unions," including the United Steel Workers, were thinking about voluntary arbitration in contract disputes. In fact, the federation has already agreed to establish a committee to meet with the American Arbitration Association to explore the idea.

"Actually," Meany says, "what it adds up to is that while strikes have their part and all that, we certainly have advocated for years that you have got to have the right to strike, we find more and more that strikes really don't settle a thing. Where you have a well established industry and a well established union, you are getting more and more to the point where a strike doesn't make sense."

The head of the AFL-CIO has chosen a propitious moment to launch this trial balloon, if that is what it is, for the Nixon administration, which has been unexpectedly benign toward labor, has also been showing some interest in the idea.

The previous administration promised to draft and send to Congress legislation "which will enable us to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest," but it never did. The issue was too touchy. It is all the more remarkable, therefore, that Nixon earlier this year did walk in where Johnson feared to tread.

Nixon's bill would bring the railroad, airline, maritime, longshore, and trucking industries under the same rule. To prevent strikes, the bill, as a last resort calls for a form of arbitration under which the President could give the rival parties three days to submit one or two final offers. Then, if there is no agreement, the parties, or the President, would name a "selector commit-

tee" to decide which of the final offers would become binding on both sides.

Unfortunately, there has been very little administration follow-up, so there has been no action on Capitol Hill, where the lawmakers are notoriously wary of new labor legislation. Their timidity may be tempered by the Meany statement, but there also needs to be a show of interest on the part of management.

Actually, there is more management support for arbitration than is generally surmised, and it is growing. Many business leaders now share the view of John H. Kauffmann, president of The Star, who recently told the Economic Forum that arbitration "would benefit management and labor and the public at large." For the practicality of this solution, he said, "we need only look to Sweden where for 31 years newspaper labor and management have had an arbitration agreement which works."

#### ARMS FOR THE GREEK COLONELS

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the embargo placed on arms shipments to Greece, the repressive military regime in Athens manages to maintain its weapons stockpile through the generosity of the United States. The following editorial from the September 22 issue of the New York Times is, I believe, a frank and timely indictment of U.S. support for the Greek junta:

#### ARMS FOR THE GREEK COLONELS

Ambivalence and timidity have marked American policy toward Greece's military rulers since their seizure of power in April 1967. The decision to resume full-scale arms shipments to the Athens regime symbolizes the bankruptcy of that policy.

The timing of the decision doubtless owes much to the Middle East crisis and the need that might arise for emergency American use of Greek naval and air bases. Such Mediterranean facilities have become steadily less available with the rise of nationalism in many lands and a lessening of cold-war tensions.

It made little sense at the outset to embargo shipments to Greece of the heavy weapons, artillery, ships and planes supposedly needed to carry out assigned NATO functions, while continuing to send the small arms, jeeps and other equipment the colonels could use to enforce repression at home. In any event, over the last three years the Pentagon has breached the spirit of the embargo by sending \$162 million worth of arms to Greece.

Whatever the wisdom or demerits of the embargo, to lift it at this time represents success for diplomatic blackmail long practiced by Colonel Papadopoulos and his agents. Their argument—that the United States needs Greece more than Greece needs this country—is accepted by Americans who should know better.

While giving the colonels a badly needed prestige boost, the decision leaves the United States more of an odd-man-out than ever with its European partners, some of whom led the fight to oust Greece from the Council of Europe and to condemn the Athens regime for its systematic use of torture on political prisoners.

Concern for adequate air and naval facilities is understandable in this time of expanding Russian naval presence in the Medi-

terranean and outright Soviet military involvement in Egypt. But the Pentagon always seems unable or unwilling to find alternatives that would save the United States the embarrassment of bolstering a repressive regime in the avowed interest of defending freedom.

**POW IS NO CLOSER TO HUMANE TREATMENT**

**HON. JOHN M. ZWACH**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, on September 17, 1969, I joined with a number of my colleagues in sponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 362, which called upon North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam to comply with the requirements of the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war.

These provisions, which North Vietnam signed in 1957, include making public the identification of prisoners, free exchange of mail between prisoners and families, impartial inspection of prisoner camps, and release of seriously ill or injured prisoners.

A year has passed since that resolution was introduced but we are no closer to humane treatment of our prisoners now than we were then.

My heart bleeds for these men, for their families, and their wives and sweethearts.

Picture the plight of the wife or sweetheart whose husband or fiancé has been missing for years. Is he dead or alive? Should she start to rebuild her shattered life or should she continue to wait?

Never before has America been treated so contemptuously. Never before have the tenets of civilization been so completely ignored.

We have waited in vain for Hanoi to warm to our suggestion for humane treatment of these prisoners.

We have pursued the philosophy that an outpouring of indignation by our citizens would move Hanoi to soften its policies, but the only outpouring of indignation that we had was directed at political prisons in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the United States should take whatever steps now considered necessary to obtain information on these prisoners of war and to convince Hanoi of the necessity to treat them in a civilized manner.

**JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION OF EQUAL EMPLOYMENT**

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in Louisiana we now have a judicial interpretation by a Federal judge of equal employment opportunity in State jobs.

"Blacks to fill all vacancies."

Mr. Speaker, I include a newsclipping from the August 26 Times Picayune of New Orleans, as follows:

**BLACKS TO FILL ALL VACANCIES—JUDGE SETS REFORM SCHOOL HIRING GUIDELINES**

Federal Judge Alvin B. Rubin Tuesday ordered that any staff vacancies occurring in the state's three main reform schools must be filled by Negroes.

In addition, he approved a plan presented by the Department of Corrections which would give special placement to boys tested at a new diagnostic center, for which the 1970 Legislature allocated funds.

After testing at the center, and rated according to mental and physical age, the lowest and highest would be sent to the Louisiana Training Institute in Monroe, with those in the middle bracket remaining in Scotlandville. Girls below 15 years of age would be placed in the LTI in Pineville and others will be located in Scotlandville.

Judge Rubin stressed that staffing of the diagnostic center must be done on an equal racial balance, and he ordered that the administration of the schools follow guidelines which he established for equalizing staffs in regard to Negro and white personnel. His quotas for the various departments called for virtually 50-50 ratio of blacks to white.

"I am aware of the employment problem, however," Judge Rubin said. "And I am not requiring that persons be hired who are incompetent. Rather, in order to achieve a racial balance, I am saying that it may be necessary to hire the second best. Nevertheless, if it seems impossible to fill vacancies for this purpose, I will consider other suggestions. Any deviation from the guidelines, however, must be done by court consent."

The judge said he believes the action will create motivations to seek out personnel from minority groups.

**SENATE—Thursday, September 24, 1970**

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Lord of this world and the worlds beyond, we pray for Thy whole creation. Order unruly powers, crush every tyranny, rebuke injustice, and satisfy the longing peoples. Send peace on earth, and by Thy grace put down the pride, greed, and anger that turn man against man and nation against nation.

O Thou whom we cannot love unless we love our brother, remove from us and from all men all hate and prejudice, that Thy children may be reconciled with those whom they fear, resent, or threaten, and thereafter live in peace.

Regard Thy servants in this Chamber, O Lord. Direct them in all their efforts by Thy most gracious favor, and strengthen them with Thy continual help, that in all their works begun, continued, and ended in Thee, they may glorify Thy holy name, and finally by Thy mercy obtain everlasting life.

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

**MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT**

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

**EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED**

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

**MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE**

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to House Joint Resolution 589, expressing the support of the Congress, and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private, for the international biological program.

**ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED**

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 3637. An act to revise the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 which relate to political broadcasting;

H.R. 11953. An act to amend section 205

of the act of September 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 736), as amended;

H.R. 18127. An act making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Quality Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution providing for the designation of a "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival Week";

S.J. Res. 228. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning October 5, 1970, and ending October 9, 1970, as "National PTA Week";

H.J. Res. 589. Joint resolution expressing the support of the Congress, and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private, for the international biological program; and

H.J. Res. 1178. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the month of October 1970 as "Project Concern Month."

**THE JOURNAL**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 23, 1970, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.