

the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

*To be lieutenant general*

Maj. Gen. John Norton, xxx-xx-xxxx, U.S. Army.

**U.S. NAVY**

Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Vice Adm. Charles K. Duncan, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

**IN THE NAVY**

The nominations beginning Richard C. Adams, to be captain, and ending Tanya Zatzariny, to be lieutenant commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Sept. 14, 1970;

The nominations beginning Carl A. Armstrong, Jr., to be lieutenant, and ending Richard D. Webb, to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Sept. 14, 1970; and

The nominations beginning Herman C. Abelein, to be captain, and ending Muriel J. Lewis, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Sept. 14, 1970.

**IN THE MARINE CORPS**

The nominations beginning James W. Abraham, to be colonel, and ending Arnold G. Ziegler, to be colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Aug. 24, 1970;

The following-named temporary disability retired officer for reappointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Stevens, Arnold T., xxx-xx-xxxx USMC.

The nominations beginning Arthur R. Anderson, Jr., to be lieutenant colonel, and ending James R. Ziemann, to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Sept. 16, 1970.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### MEN OF MEDICINE MEET THE CHALLENGE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR RANDOLPH

#### HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 25, 1970

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, one of the great challenges of the 1970's is the provision of adequate medical care at a reasonable cost. I consider that our Nation's doctors are acutely aware of this difficult problem.

On Monday, September 21, members of the Kentucky Educational Medical Action Committee met in Louisville and, I am informed, sought to define the physician's role in society and Government and the Government's role in medicine. The keynote speaker for the occasion was Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, the senior Senator from West Virginia, chairman of the Committee on Public Works and who as ranking majority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has been a leader in the field of health legislation during his service in the House and Senate. Senator RANDOLPH is uniquely qualified to discuss health legislation and the role of the Government. His grasp of the interplay of public interest and congressional action in the fields of health, education, and the environment is broad and profound.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator RANDOLPH's address to the Kentucky Educational Medical Action Committee be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### MEN OF MEDICINE MEET THE CHALLENGE

(By Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH)

Our American society stands as a symbol of success to virtually every other nation.

We have achieved unparalleled prosperity. We have made affluence obtainable to our people to an extent unknown in recorded history.

Our ability to produce material prosperity is a goal actively sought by all the world's developing nations.

But America is not the historic America of our forefathers' dream. . . . of a prosperous people living in freedom. The historic America was a land of hope and promise and

example—not a land of civil disorder and mass misery and battered cities. Our greatest responsibility today is to our historic American heritage . . . a land of plenty and promise and good purpose.

It is freely acknowledged that the society we have built contained the seeds of its own destruction. Today, for the first time in our nation's history, we face a tragic prospect—the cities of the richest nation on earth may soon be uninhabitable.

Americans are rightfully alarmed about the continued survival of a good society. Americans have looked beyond our shores for threats to our survival. We have concerned ourselves with world-wide aggression and colonization carried forward by Communism. We have agonized over nuclear proliferation and the possibility of nuclear war. We have earmarked more than half of our nation's wealth for a military defense system designed to deter any and all aggressors.

Threats continue to exist. They cannot be dismissed.

Yet, it seems to me as we begin the 1970s, that the greatest threat to our civilization looms not from external aggression . . . but from weakness within our own society.

As citizens and as members of one of the largest single groups of individual taxpayers—I know you share with me the concern that has been building in recent years—concern for the future of the United States.

Most of our political leaders, government specialists, educators and businessmen appear to be in agreement. The predominately urban society we have created represents the greatest threat to our continued existence. It is a threat perhaps far more immediate than any from outside.

The urban environment we have created is polluted, noisy and ugly. It is an environment that cannot be allowed to continue.

We must eliminate air and water pollution, dispose of our solid wastes more effectively, make our streets safe from criminals and homes and schools safe from vandals . . . conserve our resources, improve transportation and eliminate urban blight and unplanned suburban sprawl.

We must create central cities that make it possible for our urban dwellers to live rather than to exist. We must enhance and provide access for our rural areas to make them more attractive for development.

Our population is approximately 209 million. Approximately 130 million—or two-thirds of all Americans—live in urban areas. In another generation, our nation's urban population will double to some 250 million. Three out of every four Americans will live in urban areas.

I am convinced that our economic prosperity cannot be preserved if most of our nation's people are clustered in a dozen major megalopolitan environments rapidly becoming uninhabitable.

One of the leading functions of the private sector must be to cooperate with all levels of government to reverse this trend. The cliché—"the only proper business of business is business"—has been changed.

Today's business and professional men and women acknowledge and accept their social responsibilities and increasingly involve themselves in the solution of social problems.

Considerable public debate has been focused on corporate social responsibility.

You are concerned with involvement of the medical profession in government . . . and the involvement of government in the medical field.

The question of the business or professional man and his political role is an old one. The debate began with the founding of our republic.

Jefferson at first took the negative side. He wanted a nation of small farmers. He wrote "While we have land to labor, let us never wish to see our citizens occupied at work-bench or twirling a distaff."

Hamilton took the other side. He wrote the "Report on Manufacturers" arguing that the interests of the new country "would be advanced, rather than injured, by the due encouragement of manufacturers."

This basic level demonstrated the different views held by the founding fathers. But there was a question of fear—fear of economic wealth and potential political power of businessmen.

Henry Wallich in his book, "The Cost of Freedom," wrote that "Throughout American history, liberals and conservatives alike have feared and sought to guard against concentration of power."

In those beginning days the equation seemed simple. Daniel Webster spoke for many when he observed: "Power naturally and necessarily follows property. . . ." To which John Taylor echoed: "As power follows wealth, the majority must have wealth or lose power."

Despite the fear of the businessman's potential political power, he was allowed a place at the national table. In 1805 President Jefferson said, apparently in some surprise, "As yet our manufacturers are as much at their ease, as independent, and as moral as, our agricultural inhabitants." And, by 1816, he dropped even this hedge. Jefferson said: "Experience has taught me that manufacturers are now as necessary to our independence as to comfort."

If we substitute the words business, or service industry, or lawyer or doctor, we begin to see that anti-establishment feelings are not new.

Some of you may not think of yourselves as allied with the businessman because of your primary mission as healer, but it is axiomatic that there can be no physical

health without economic health. Emerson wrote: "The first wealth is health."

American science and technology have achieved significant accomplishments toward the betterment of people. But we have seen some shameful failures in the area of human needs.

We have learned to wipe out scarcity—but we do not know how, or we do not want to provide opportunities, to distribute the abundance.

We have reached that stage where man and machine are no longer coupled to lift a heavy load. In many cases, we no longer need the man, as machines can do the job.

We are on the threshold of becoming a nation of leisure. Yet we have inadequate schools and curricula to teach our citizens how to fashion this new-found leisure to worthwhile use.

Farmers are fleeing fields as fewer workers raise huge surpluses of foodstuffs while one-fifth of our citizens are suffering malnutrition or living on inadequate diets.

Medical science transplants kidneys and works the miracle of open heart surgery while millions of our citizens cannot afford an annual physical examination.

Man's greatest problem in the decades ahead will not be the H-Bomb or the population explosion. It will be the question of how much change the human being can accept, absorb and assimilate—and the rate at which he can take it.

Senator Kennedy, in introducing the Health Security Act on August 27, referred to health care in America as "the fastest growing failing business in the nation." Senator Yarborough, Chairman of our Labor and Public Welfare Committee, contends that it is not simply a matter of money in changing our system of health care. Some authorities estimate that \$13 billion of the \$63 billion we spend on health care each year is wasted. One of the reasons cited is that hospital overuse runs more than 25 percent of the beds.

The lessons of medicare and medicaid should teach us that the system needs to be changed so as to provide the motivation for better care at a more reasonable cost—not the motivation to provide more health care whether needed or not.

America has tried to be good to the underdog. When the aged on fixed incomes could no longer cope with rising medical costs, we provided medicare. Then we turned to the poor and provided medicaid. Between these groups, the average American worker and taxpayer finds himself increasingly squeezed to pay his own medical bills.

No longer can the average private health insurance policy cover the gaps in medical care, because such insurance coverage continues to emphasize the payment of expenses related to being in a hospital. Practically no emphasis is placed on diagnostic or preventive health care. At the same time, 36.3 million Americans were without any health insurance coverage according to a 1968 survey by the National Center for Health Statistics.

Proponents of the National Health Insurance proposal describe it as an idea whose time has come. Supporters of Representative Griffiths' bill say the same words. I'm sure that many of you feel that way about the "Medicredit" concept embodied in the bill introduced by Representatives Fulton and Broyhill.

The important fact is that leaders in both government and the health industry are agreed that time has come for a change. Just as the "Ma and Pa" store is being replaced by the supermarket, sole practice in medicine must inevitably give way to consolidated clinic and group practice if the health industry is to remain efficient and viable.

At the risk of embarrassing Howard Cook,

I tell you that the American Medical Association has been most efficient in making its views known on Capitol Hill. In some cases the views have seemed to be contrary to the mainstream of public expression.

I feel that after a dozen years of discussion over various proposals for a national health system, Congress will look long and hard at any legislation involving sweeping change. It will depend on you for advice and counsel, for without your consent and cooperation there can be no valid change.

This is the challenge to you in your political involvement. Congress is not the enemy; you are a vital part of government and a sound segment of our society. We turn to you for help in assuring the survival of this society. In the past, you men of medicine have produced many miracles. I ask you now for one more. I urge you to give serious and objective consideration to how we can best assure a fair and equitable system of adequate health care for all Americans. The ancient proverb tells us: "He who has health has hope, and he who has hope has everything."

#### AIRPLANE HIJACKERS

### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 25, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an editorial column entitled, "U.N. Force Could Arrest Hijackers," appeared in the September 16, 1970, issue of the *Florence Morning News* in Florence, S.C., under the byline of Columnist David Lawrence.

Mr. Lawrence reports that there is every reason to believe that the hijacking of five airplanes and kidnaping of several hundred passengers was designed by Palestinian elements to frighten those governments which have started to engage in the peace parleys.

Mr. Lawrence accurately charges that the bulk of the weapons the Palestinians are using in their rebellion comes from Russia, the Communist East European bloc, and Red China.

Mr. President, in my judgment, these air pirates should be arrested and punished as common felons. I agree with Mr. Lawrence that air piracy has become a serious threat to air travel. All nations of the world should work together in finding a way to make our airlines safe from criminal interference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the *Extensions of Remarks*.

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

#### U.N. FORCE COULD ARREST HIJACKERS

WASHINGTON.—There is every reason to believe that the hijacking of five airplanes and the detention of several hundred passengers with threats of execution was part of a deliberate plan to influence the current negotiations designed to settle the future relationships of the Mideast countries. While most of the prisoners were released, as the planes were blown up, about 40 were held as hostages. The whole operation was intended by Palestinian elements to frighten those governments which have started to engage in the "peace" parleys.

For the "Palestinian commandos" are comprised of several organizations, some of them peaceful. While only one group handled the

hijacked prisoners and destroyed the planes, all the refugees from Palestine who are concentrated in different parts of Jordan and Lebanon have been worried about what's going to happen to them in the coming Mideast "settlements," if there are any.

"U.S. News & World Report," in its current issue, quotes an expert in the Mideast as follows:

"Palestinians had to demonstrate dramatically—yes, ruthlessly—their conviction that the only way for them to recover Palestine is by fighting, not negotiating. As the commandos see it, nobody else, but themselves is either capable or willing to do that fighting."

But where are these Palestinians getting the money for their rebellion? The bulk of the weapons for their arsenal has been coming from Russia, the Communist East European bloc and Red China. Funds are being supplied by the rulers of some of the oil-producing countries in the Arab world.

What influence will these factors have on the making of peace in the area? Israel is well aware of what is going on and is doubtless anxious that the British and American governments likewise take into account that the situation is more complex than it appears on the surface.

For one thing, the western countries whose citizens were seized and brought to a desert in Jordan by Palestinian bandits—operating under instructions from the revolutionary organizations—cannot ignore what has happened and fail to insist on the punishment of the air pirates. Compensation must be demanded for the destruction of the planes and warning proclaimed that further occurrences of this kind will not be tolerated.

The problem is obviously one for the United Nations to handle. A sharply worded resolution which would arrange for the sending, if necessary, of an international military force to the Jordan area to arrest those guilty of the hijacking is essential. Israel and Egypt will hardly be able to conduct peace negotiations unless the kidnaping has been firmly dealt with and the principal governments of the world have agreed to take action in event of a repetition. Also, the remaining hostages must be immediately released without harm and pledges given that there will be no more such incidents. If these are not forthcoming some of the airports in the Middle East probably will be cut off, and it would not be surprising if even more severe steps have to be taken.

President Nixon and Secretary of State Rogers are not announcing their next move in the hope that the Palestinian commando chiefs will recognize the dangers they face and release the prisoners. Until this is done, punitive action may be delayed, but if the prisoners aren't freed, pressure of other kinds may be applied and the active cooperation of the governments of Egypt, Jordan and other Mideast countries sought.

Although only citizens of the United States and a few other countries were involved in the incidents this time, air piracy has become such a serious threat to air travel that all the nations of the world have a deep interest in finding a way to discourage interference.

#### MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

#### BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR

### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions the Federal Government and its various agencies have been the target of severe criticism for being cold, impersonal and unfeeling creations of a bureaucracy, bent only on extracting their pound of flesh from the American public. This criticism may have been warranted at times, but certainly not in all cases. Too often the sincere and earnest efforts of men who lead these departments and who seek to help their fellow Americans go unrecognized.

For example, Mr. Speaker, late last spring Mr. Lewis E. Conman, Director of the U.S. Department of Commerce division in Pittsburgh, came to my office with a unique proposal. He wanted to help the small businessman and manufacturer in the Mon-Yough Valley of the 20th Congressional District in Pennsylvania. He knew they faced a multitude of problems today, many of them seemingly insurmountable. He was deeply concerned over their plight and he wanted to help. He wanted to bring the services, facilities, abilities, and experience of Federal experts directly to the small and troubled businessman. He felt personal consultation with Federal specialists from various fields could well make the difference between a profit or a loss for the individual and the community.

The seminar, Mr. Conman explained, would be the first of its kind in Pennsylvania and it would be followed by smaller spin-off sessions with community leaders or business organizations. It would, he felt, trigger similar seminars throughout the State. How right he was. The potential benefits to be derived from such a meeting were so great that before we held our initial seminar, there were several others put on the planning boards.

Mr. Conman graciously asked if I would care to cosponsor this first Government-to-people seminar, and I readily agreed to the request. He secured the Federal experts while I, working with the cooperation of several chambers of commerce, explained the purpose of the seminar to the business community. Our "business development seminar" was held Friday, September 18, in West Mifflin, and, from all reports, it proved to be successful. Within a day or two my office was receiving inquiries as to when and where the next one would be held.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Mr. Conman and the others who participated in this program. It was a coordinated effort to show the public their Government is, indeed, interested and

concerned about their welfare. It was an attempt to restore public trust and confidence in the Government. These qualities, I fear, are lacking among too many Americans today.

I take great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in singling out for recognition by my colleagues and the public the men who worked so diligently to make this seminar a success. From the Federal Government there were: Mr. Conman and William Bradley from the Department of Commerce; Joseph Sambolt from the Department of Labor; Charles Conley from the Small Business Administration; Edward G. Coll, postmaster for the city of Pittsburgh; and H. Alan Long, director of the Internal Revenue Service in the Pittsburgh district.

In addition to what they have already done, these men have volunteered to participate in any spin-off seminars which may be conducted by business groups, industrial organizations, or by individual communities.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to commend the representatives from the various chambers of commerce which cosponsored the initial seminar: Arthur Parker, of the Mon-Yough Chamber; Robert Mehaffey, of the Duquesne-West Mifflin Chamber; Mrs. Roberta Smith, of the South Side Chamber; William Tindall, of the Steel Valley Chamber; Karl Kraft and William Casey, of the 15th Ward Chamber; and Mrs. Dorothy Bell and William Pardini, of the Braddock Chamber.

#### BRAKES ON THE DIRECT-VOTE PLAN

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as I please to insert into the Record an editorial from the Monday, September 21, Chicago Today, I note that the other body is still involved in debate on the constitutional amendment which would provide for direct vote for President. Having voted against the measure when it was stamped through the House, I am pleased to note that many of the Senators are showing proper concern over the adverse consequences of this proposal. The editorial I place into the Record at this time makes the point well:

#### BRAKES ON THE DIRECT-VOTE PLAN

The Senate's failure to cut off debate on the proposal for direct popular election of Presidents has probably doomed the proposal for this year. That's fine with us. The sweeping plan to scrap the electoral college and substitute direct popular voting—in which only the totals of individual votes would count—needs all the study and debate it can get, and another year of study won't hurt.

The direct-vote idea has a rough, appealing simplicity. But it could lead to far messier complications—for instance, endless recounts of Presidential ballots—than the present system. In our view, the direct vote would sacrifice every other consideration in favor of a score-board simplicity in which nothing counted but totals—as the voters were just so many million units facing an either/or choice.

Election issues are not as simple as that. Presidential campaigns should not be based solely on running up quantities of votes, as tho they were pinball games. Such things as minority representation, regional needs, the quality of ideas and issues, count too.

The electoral system, clumsy as it is, keeps these elements in perspective, and it shouldn't be junked till someone finds a system that is not only simpler but better.

#### DOLLARS FOUND FOR DRONES

### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette illustrates the questionable sense of economic priorities that the Nixon administration displays.

The House and Senate have approved a \$400,000 budget for the Subversive Activities Control Board, whose function many of us in Congress have tried for the past decade to determine. This budget item received no threatened veto from the Nixon administration. Does this mean that this do-nothing sop to right-wing extremism is more important to this Nation's welfare than education or housing bills?

Granted the amount of money for this "useless appendage of government," as the Post-Gazette calls the SACB, is much smaller than the money in the HUD appropriations bill or the hospital construction bill, however, if Mr. Nixon is truly interested in economy in Government, here was as good a place as any to start. In fact it was a better budget item to trim than most.

But as long as there are substantial elements who look under their beds at night for Joseph Stalin, there will always be a Subversive Activities Control Board.

I only hope that some evening when one of these "patriots" checks under his bed for Joe Stalin, he finds him. I will have no doubts then where the encounter took place.

The editorial follows:

#### DOLLARS FOUND FOR DRONES

Sandwiched between the Soldiers' Home and Tariff Commission listings on page 658 of the 1970 Congressional Directory is an agency known as the Subversive Activities Control Board. Its mission is to do nothing, and its obscure members who are paid \$36,000 a year surely merit Sen. William Proxmire's description as the "highest-paid group of bench warmers in the government."

The board was created 20 years ago, ostensibly with the "power" to designate organizations as Communist-front units. But as a result of repeated federal court decisions, the SACB is barred from publishing the names of persons identified as members of the Communist party, or, in fact, from doing anything. Attorney General John Mitchell says he will remedy that by giving the board some cases to handle, a promise that is far from reassuring to those who value due process of law.

In fact, the SACB serves as a comfortable refuge for those beached by the ebb and flow of Washington political tides. One member is Otto F. Otepka, a former State Department security officer, whose demotion for an alleged security breach within his department

became a cause celebre among right-wing groups who, of course, saw it as the work of subversives.

On another occasion, possibly for repayment for past services, possibly for laughs, former President Lyndon Johnson appointed the 29-year-old husband of a former secretary to the board. Patronage jobs at \$36,000 a year, especially when the jobs entail no work at all, have some utility to a president, presumably.

Despite this staggering record of do-nothingism and mediocrity, the board was given Senate approval for an operating budget of \$401,400. In light of the crocodile tears shed by the Nixon administration over a budget situation which necessitated cuts in education and domestic welfare programs, it is strange that the White House did not give serious thought to cutting out this useless appendage of government.

Defending the board's appropriation, Sen. John L. McClellan declared: "There's never been a time when there's been so much bombing, so much rioting, so much subversion as now."

So, what has the Subversive Activities Control Board been doing for the past 20 years—besides drawing paychecks?

#### THE INITIATIVE THAT WENT WRONG

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial by Tom Wicker in the September 22 New York Times analyzes the reasons for Israel's recent withdrawal from the Mideast peace talks and points cogently to the weakness of the American response to evidence of Soviet-Egyptian violation of the truce terms. Mr. Wicker makes it clear that our deep obligation to help Israel maintain its self-sufficiency is more imperative than ever, and I include the full text of his article for the benefit of my colleagues:

#### THE INITIATIVE THAT WENT WRONG

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, Sept. 21—The remarkable Mrs. Meir has now departed and much of the strain in Israeli-American relations seems to have been eased. But that does not mean that the substantive damage of the summer has been rectified or that the dangers it brought have been removed. Instead, the American "initiative" that opened the period in June has been reduced to a tenuous cease-fire across the Suez Canal, and the situation in general appears more threatening than ever.

After Mrs. Meir's visit, it is possible to see a bit more clearly what happened in these confusing months. In the first place, it is now known that Israel never had any belief at all that the American proposals would lead to a negotiated settlement (and it has even less confidence in them now). Mrs. Meir's Government agreed only under the most intense American pressures, the most telling of which was what the Israelis thought was a tacit American threat to provide no more of the Phantom jets Israel believes vital to its security.

This coincided with the advent of Soviet pilots over Suez, and the loss by the Israelis of Phantoms that suddenly seemed irreplaceable. Hence, against its inclination, the Israeli Government entered the cease-fire,

only to find the Soviets and Egyptians immediately taking advantage of it to improve their missile defenses. When the United States disputed whether these violations had occurred, that meant to the Israelis that Washington was so committed to its peace plan that it "preferred not to see" the new missile sites or their military significance. Ultimately, the United States had to concede the violations—which meant that either the Israelis had been right about American motives, or that American monitoring of the cease-fire had been inadequate, or both.

Mrs. Meir, therefore, was on solid moral, political and military ground when she insisted here that Israel would not enter peace talks until the missiles had been "rolled back" to the original cease-fire line. American officials, from President Nixon down, do not appear even to have argued the point with any conviction.

It is nevertheless apparent that the missile sites are not likely to be rolled back, short of a military attack eastward across the canal. But since Mrs. Meir went home expressing herself as reasonably satisfied with her visit, no doubt she took away an understanding that there would be enough new American planes and other hardware to cope with the new military situation on the Suez.

So, militarily, at best, this dangerous situation may soon be stabilized—but at a distinctly higher level of tension and potential violence than was the case last June. The net effect is of one more lethal round in the arms buildup on both sides of the canal, and perhaps a greater likelihood that a crossing will be attempted from one side or the other.

The Egyptians, so far from appearing more tractable, as might have been thought last June, appear to have seized a quick military opportunity. The Soviets, then widely hailed as more conciliatory for their attitude in the Middle East and at the SALT talks, now appear as ruthless and unprincipled as ever (to the obscene glee of this country's cold warriors).

Moreover, the Soviet power position in the Middle East has been enhanced. (When Mr. Nixon invaded Cambodia last spring, one of the reasons Administration sources gave was that such a power play would dispel any notion that the President could be trifled with or pushed around. The Soviets apparently did not get the message.)

As for the United States, it failed to sustain its assurances that Israel would not suffer military disadvantage by the cease-fire, thus appearing to the Israelis to have risked their vital interests, as well as endangering the credibility of future assurances; now Washington can redeem that situation only by the kind of arms shipments it had hoped to avoid in the first place.

Thus, Mrs. Meir may have been "feeling better" as she flew home, but it could hardly have been because she was reconciled to all that happened. Rather, she seemed to be relieved that things may have stopped getting worse.

#### NEWS CENSORSHIP AGAIN SUPPRESSES COMMUNIST ACTIVITY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, September 23, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 337 to 14—with 78 not voting—passed House Resolution 1220, certifying to the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia that Arnold S.

Johnson had declined to be sworn and refused to testify before the congressional Committee on Internal Security and thereby asking for criminal action as our laws provide.

Who is Arnold Johnson?

According to Chairman ICHORD—page 33270, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD September 23, 1970—Arnold Johnson is more than a New Mobe leader; he is a national legislative director for the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Following Johnson's refusal to be sworn before the congressional committee and offer testimony which could well bear on saving American lives in Vietnam, if not on ending the war, Johnson held a press conference and among other charges and whitewash, said, in a prepared news release:

I am a member of the Steering Committee of New Mobilization as a representative of the Communist Party USA.

Which membership he said he had held since 1936. He also stated:

Yes, I am proud of my Communist Party Membership.

Additionally, last month, before Wednesday's vote, Johnson dispatched letters to attendees of a Milwaukee peace conference, addressing them "Dear Friends in the Peace Movement," appealing for their help in visiting and writing Congressmen to vote "No" on the contempt resolution. Interestingly enough, this brazen appeal was on the letterhead of the Communist Party U.S.A.

Strangely enough, there has been little news interest shown in the Johnson contempt of Congress matter. The mass American people are unaware of the action or the vote in Congress, although short articles in the two local Washington papers barely mentioned "New Mobe Man Cited by House for Contempt." Communism was played down.

A dual standard of reporting, when one recalls the earlier actions, for example, on holding officers of the Ku Klux Klan in contempt in 1966, for refusing to produce certain papers as ordered by the committee subpoena.

In that particular case, the American people were supplied with generous news coverage. The vote was 344 to 28, with 60 not voting—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 2, page 1763.

It is strange indeed that with the Bolshevik Communist menace threatening the entire free world—with over 50,000 American boys already dead in Southeast Asia fighting Communist imperialism—with a reported crisis in the Middle East receiving much news reporting as being Communist instigated—the action of Congress on investigating internal Communist activity and threatened turmoil is of paramount importance to all our people, and worthy of detailed news coverage.

Are we to assume that the press can be entrusted with censorship over who are the enemies of the American people?

Mr. Speaker, I include a statement by Arnold Johnson, a copy of the August 24 letter from Arnold Johnson, and two press releases:

### WHY I REFUSE TO TESTIFY BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERNAL SECURITY COMMITTEE

(By Arnold Johnson)

In addition to the legal grounds presented by my attorney, John Abt, in his motion to quash the subpoena and to cancel this hearing, I refused to be sworn and to testify before this House Committee on Internal Security today because I will not lend myself to any of the purposes of the Committee. These hearings are obviously calculated to intimidate and subvert the peace movement at a time when the role of the peace movement and the New Mobilization Committee is more urgent than ever before and has been made ever more important by the Nixon-Agnew escalation of the war from Vietnam to Cambodia, Laos and Thailand, and all Indo-China. This escalates the threat of world war and nuclear holocaust. That course of disaster must be reversed. That is the area of criminal violence, of imperialist aggression, of brutal atrocities that calls for an escalation of the peace movement!

At this same time, the repression within our country and the constitutional crisis has been intensified with the killings at Kent, Augusta and Jackson; and the earlier murder and jailings of Black Panthers and other black Americans. That is where the genocidal violence is at in this country, and this House Committee fails to investigate the source of that violence.

The New Mobilization Committee and the peace movement, in massive demonstration on November 15, gave expression to the desire of the majority of the American people to end the war in Vietnam, to end racism, repression and poverty at home, to give peace a chance. That is all a matter of wide public knowledge. I am a member of the Steering Committee of New Mobilization as a representative of the Communist Party, U.S.A. That is also a matter of public knowledge. There are some 100 or more persons on the Steering Committee representing all sectors of the peace movement and a wide diversity of political opinion. I have been active in the peace movement in this country for some 44 years and hold that my membership in the Communist Party since 1936 has only served to strengthen my devotion and dedication to the struggle for peace and democracy, freedom and social progress. I also hold that these objectives will be better guaranteed when this country changes from capitalism to socialism. Yes, I am proud of my Communist Party membership. I am confident that the peace movement and the interests of the American people will be best served by my refusal to testify at this hearing and by the abolition of the successor committee to the discredited House Un-American Activities Committee.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 24, 1970.

DEAR FRIEND IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT: This letter is being sent to all who attended the recent Milwaukee peace conference.

On August 13, five of the nine members of the House Internal Security Committee, voted to recommend that the U.S. Congress cite me for contempt because on June 11, when under subpoena to appear before the committee, I refused to be sworn and to testify before that present version of the Un-American Committee (HUAC) and challenged its right to subpoena me or anyone else in the New Mobilization Committee. My reasons for refusing to testify and for challenging the committee's authority are expressed in the enclosed statement which I issued at that time. Thus far I am the first and only member of the New Mobe to be subpoenaed. I believe my stand is valid and can halt the committee in its campaign against the peace movement. Therefore this is not a personal issue.

The House Committee plans to ask Congress to cite for contempt, when Congress returns on September 9. Any serious debate

by a number of Congressmen can convince the Congress to reject the H.I.S.C. recommendation. I want to urge that these days be used to visit your Congressman when he or she is at home, and to send letters to her or him at House Office Building, Washington, D.C.—urging "Vote No" on the request to cite. This is a time when the H.I.S.C. should be abolished. That will be a blow to repression and will give more strength to the peace movement.

I would appreciate any comment.

Sincerely yours,

ARNOLD JOHNSON.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 24, 1970]

#### PROSECUTION SOUGHT

The House voted 337 to 14 to seek the contempt-of-Congress prosecution of Arnold S. Johnson, public relations director of the U.S. Communist Party, for refusing to answer questions about the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

Now the Justice Department will present a federal grand jury with the charge, which originated in the House Internal Security Committee.

Rep. \_\_\_\_\_ (D.-N.Y.) wondered whether the action would intimidate antiwar activity. But \_\_\_\_\_ (R.-Ohio) said it intended simply "to uphold the dignity of the House."

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 24, 1970]

#### NEW MOBE MAN CITED BY HOUSE FOR CONTEMPT

Arnold S. Johnson, a member of the New Mobilization Against the War in Vietnam who refused to be sworn in to testify before the House Internal Security Committee in June, has been cited for contempt of Congress.

Voting 337 to 14 yesterday the House sent the case to the U.S. District Court.

HISC Chairman Richard H. Ichord of Missouri called Johnson's defiance a "clear, open and patent" violation of law. Johnson contended HISC had no authority to investigate the New Mobe.

Ichord said Johnson also is publicity director of the Communist party, USA. Conviction of contempt carries a maximum penalty of a \$1,000 and a year in jail.

### PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

#### HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1970

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's speech at Manhattan, Kans., may go down as a historical landmark in which the President suggested a wise course for administrators, faculty members, and students to pursue on our college campuses.

His appearance on September 16 at Kansas State University clearly demonstrated that clear-thinking students could understand what the President was trying to say.

The students at Kansas State demonstrated in the finest tradition of the State what proper behavior should be. The fine conduct of the vast majority so overshadowed the conduct of a confused few. It was heartwarming to watch the President plunge into the crowd after his speech and to receive such a warm reception. This is a credit to both the Kansas State University students and the Presi-

dent. The Manhattan appearance proved that the President could go to the American student and properly be received if the President spoke clearly and honestly and if the student would be honest in his response.

Many of my colleagues have commented on the President's speech. Many millions of Americans who viewed the speech and who may have a chance to see the speech again on television can testify to the President's well-stated case and the sincere reception of the students.

The President came right to the point when he said:

The time has come for us to recognize that violence and terror have no place in a free society.

His speech was a model of self-restraint and decency.

The President was correct when he warned that those people who bomb, who ambush policemen, who hijack airplanes, who hold their passengers hostage "all share in common not only a contempt for human life but also a contempt for those elemental decencies on which a free society rests."

He was also correct when he called an end "to passive acquiescence, or even fawning approval" of violence.

The President said—

What corrodes a society even more deeply than violence is the acceptance of violence, the condoning of terror, excusing of inhuman acts in a misguided effort to accommodate the community's standards to those of the violent few.

Several of my colleagues have placed excerpts of the President's speech into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Because I thought the President's words on Vietnam were so important and which appear in the complete text, I would like to insert into the RECORD the complete text.

Also many of the fine editors in my district have made some excellent comments on the President's speech. Thus, I insert some of these editorials and also an excellent editorial comment from radio station WIBN in Topeka:

#### REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT

Governor Landon, President McCain, Senator Pearson, Senator Dole, all of the distinguished guests on the platform, and all the distinguished guests in this audience for this Landon Lecture Series:

I want to express first on behalf of both Mrs. Nixon and myself our warm appreciation for your welcome. It is good to be on the campus of one of America's great universities. And for the benefit of our television audience, I should explain this tie. We were flying out to Kansas on Air Force One and Senator Pearson, Senator Dole, the Members of the Congressional Delegation and others presented this tie to me and said, "You must wear it when you speak at Kansas State."

So, I put it on. Then the television director for today saw it and said, "You can't wear that tie." I said, "Why not?" He said, "Because purple doesn't go with a blue suit."

All I can say is I am proud to wear the purple of Kansas State.

I also want to thank those who made the arrangements for this meeting for having as the waiting room before we came into the auditorium here, the dressing room for the Kansas State basketball team. It is nice to be in a room with a winner, believe me.

At this great university, in this very distinguished company, I cannot help but think

about the twists of fate—and of how we learn from them.

I think of the fans of Wildcat football here today who have known what it is to lose—and then who have known what it is to win.

I think back to 1936. You were not born then. But I think then, when Governor Landon—who already knew what it was to win—the only winner among governors on the Republican side in 1934—a man who knew what it was to win up to that time, learned what it was like to lose.

And I think, too, of some of the moments of my own career: as a football player who spent most of his time on the bench; as a candidate who knew the great satisfaction of winning—and then as a candidate to learn what it is to lose.

Having won some and lost some, I know—as you know—that winning is a lot more fun. But I also know that defeat or adversity can react on a person in different ways.

He can give up; he can complain about "a world he never made"; or he can search the lessons of defeat and find the inspiration for another try, or a new career, or a richer understanding of the world and of life itself.

When Alf Landon lost to Franklin Roosevelt in 1936, he was not a man to waste his life in brooding over what might have been. In the 34 years since then, the world has been transformed. And enriched by his experience, Alf Landon has continued to grow with the world—until now he is one of the great elder statesmen of America, a man whose wisdom and common sense, and whose outspoken concern for the welfare of this nation, have inspired and aided generations that have come thereafter.

We applaud him and commend him today for that distinguished career.

Or in a completely different field, but related, take Kansas State and its football team.

As some of you may have noted, I am somewhat of a football buff. Just three years ago, the Wildcats had a dismal seven-year record of eight wins and 60 losses. But there was a dogged spirit here, a determination, a readiness to learn new ways—and when Vince Gibson came to the campus it was that spirit, that determination, that "Purple Pride" that he helped translate into the Purple Power of today.

As for myself, I doubt that I would be President today if I had not learned from the lessons of defeat in 1960 and 1962—and I hope that I can be a better President because of those lessons.

I cite these examples not only to suggest that we here today have something in common—but also because this pattern of playing by the rules, of losing some and winning some, of accepting the verdict and having another chance, is fundamental to the whole structure on which our liberty rests.

There are those who protest that if the verdict of democracy goes against them, democracy is at fault, the system is at fault—who say that if they don't get their way the answer is to burn a bus or bomb a building.

Yet we can maintain a free society only if we recognize that in a free society no one can win all the time. No one can have his own way all the time, and no one is right all the time.

Whether in a campaign, a football game, or in debate on the great issues of the day, the answers to "losing one" is not a rush to the barricades but a study of why, and then a careful rebuilding—or perhaps even a careful re-examination of whether the other fellow may have been right after all.

When Palestinian guerrillas hijacked four airliners in flight, they brought to 250 the number of aircraft seized since the skyjacking era began in 1961. And as they held their hundreds of passengers hostage under threat of murder, they sent shock-waves of alarm around the world to the spreading disease of

violence and terror and its use as a political tactic.

That same cancerous disease has been spreading all over the world and here in the United States.

We saw it three weeks ago in the vicious bombing at the University of Wisconsin. One man lost his life, four were injured and years of painstaking research by a score of others was destroyed.

We have seen it in other bombings and burnings on our campuses, and in our cities; in the wanton shootings of policemen, in the attacks on school buses, in the destruction of offices, the seizure and harassment of college officials, the use of force and coercion to bar students and teachers from classrooms, and even to close down whole schools.

Consider just a few items in the news:

—A courtroom spectator pulls out a gun. He halts the trial, gives arms to the defendant, takes the judge and four other hostages, moves to a waiting getaway van—and in the gunfight that follows four die, including the judge.

—A man walks into the guardhouse of a city park and pumps five bullets into a police sergeant sitting quietly at his desk.

—A Noble Prize winner working on a cancer cure returns to the cages of his experimental rats and mice to find them vandalized, with some of the animals running loose, some thrown out of windows into the sea, hundreds missing.

Just think, years of research which could have provided some progress to bring a cure to this dread disease destroyed without reason.

A police patrolman responds to an anonymous emergency call that reported a woman screaming. He arrives at the address. He finds the house deserted but a suitcase is left behind. He bends over to examine it. It explodes, blows off his head and wounds seven others.

These acts of viciousness all took place not in some other country, but in the United States, and in the last five weeks.

America at its best has stood steadfastly for the rule of law among nations. But we cannot stand successfully for the rule of law abroad unless we respect the rule of law at home. A nation that condones blackmail and terror at home can hardly stand as the example in putting an end to international piracy or tensions that could explode into war abroad.

The time has come for us to recognize that violence and terror have no place in a free society, whatever the purported cause or perpetrators may be. And this is the fundamental lesson for us to remember. In a system like ours, which provides the means for peaceful change, no cause justifies violence in the name of change.

Those who bomb universities, ambush policemen, who hijack airplanes and hold their passengers hostages, all share in common not only a contempt for human life, but also the contempt for those elemental decencies on which a free society rests—and they deserve the contempt of every American who values those decencies.

Those decencies, those self-restraints, those patterns of mutual respect for the rights and feelings of one another, the willingness to listen to somebody else, without trying to shout him down, those patterns of mutual respect for the rights and the feelings of one another—these are what we must preserve if freedom itself is to be preserved.

There have always been among us those who would chose violence or intimidation to get what they wanted. Their existence is not new. What is new is their numbers, and the extent of the passive acquiescence, or even fawning approval, that in some fashionable circles has become the mark of being "with it".

Commenting on the bombing three weeks ago at the University of Wisconsin, the Wisconsin State Journal recently said:

"It isn't just the radicals who set the bomb in a lighted, occupied building who are guilty. The blood is on the hands of anyone who has encouraged them, anyone who has talked recklessly of 'revolution,' anyone who has chided with mild disparagement the violence of extremists while hinting that the cause is right all the same."

What corrodes a society even more deeply than violence itself is the acceptance of violence, the condoning of terror, the excusing of inhuman acts as misguided efforts to accommodate the community's standards to those of the violent few.

When this happens, the community sacrifices more than its calm and more even than its safety. It loses its integrity and corrupts its soul.

Nowhere should the rule of reason be more respected, more jealously guarded, than in the halls of our great universities.

It is the rule of reason that is the most important.

Yet we all know that in some of the great universities small bands of destructionists have been allowed to impose their own rule of arbitrary force.

Because of this, we today face the greatest crisis in the history of American education.

In times past we have had crises in education. I remember them. We faced shortages of class rooms, shortages of teachers, shortages that could always be made up, however, by appropriating more money.

These material shortages are nothing compared to the crisis of the spirit which rocks hundreds of campuses across the country today. And because of this, to put it bluntly, today higher education in America risks losing that essential support it has had since the beginning of this country—the support of the American people.

America, and Americans, from the time of our foundation, and particularly those that did not have the opportunity to go to a great college or university, has been proud of our enormous strides in higher education. They have supported it.

The number of students in college today has doubled in the past ten years. But at a time when the quality of education is going dramatically up, its quality is massively threatened by assaults which terrorize faculty, students and university and college administrators alike.

It is time for the responsible university and college administrators, faculty and student leaders to stand up and be counted. We must remember only they can save higher education in America. It cannot be saved by Government.

If we turn only to Government to save it, then Government will move in and run the colleges and universities, and so the place to save it is here among those, the faculty, the Administrators, the student leaders. To attempt to blame Government for all the woes of the universities is rather the fashion these days. But, really, it is to seek an excuse, not a reason, for their troubles.

Listen to this: If the war were to end today, if the environment were cleaned up tomorrow morning, and all the other problems for which Government has the responsibility were solved tomorrow afternoon—the moral and spiritual crisis in the universities would still exist.

The destructive activists of our universities and colleges are a small minority. But their voices have been allowed—

My text at this point reads: The voices of the small minority have been allowed to drown out the responsible majority. That may be true in some places, but not at Kansas State.

As a result, there is a growing, dangerous attitude among millions of people that all

young are like those who appear night after night on the television screen shouting obscenities making threats or engaging in destructive and illegal acts.

One of the greatest disservices that the disrupters have done in fact is precisely that, to reflect unfairly on those millions of students, like those in this room, who do go to college for an education, who do study, who do respect the rules, and who go on to make constructive contributions to peaceful change and progress in this country.

But let us understand exactly where we are. I would not for one moment call for a dull, passive conformity on the part of our university and college students, or an acceptance of the world as it is. The great strength of this nation is that our young people, the young people like those in this room, in generation after generation, give the nation new ideas, new directions, new energy.

I do not call for a conformity in which the young simply ape the old or in which we freeze the faults that we have. We must be honest enough to find what is right and to change what is wrong in America.

But at the same time we must take an uncompromising stand against those who reject the rules of civilized conduct and of respect for others—those who would destroy what is right in our society and whose actions would do nothing to right what is wrong.

Automatic conformity with the older generation—and I say this as one of the older generation—automatic conformity with the older generation is wrong. At the same time, it is just as wrong to fall into a slavish conformity with those who falsely claim to be the leaders of the new generation, out of fear that it would be unpopular—or considered square—not to follow their lead.

It would be a tragedy for the young generation simply to pursue the policies of the past, and it would be just as great a tragedy for the new generation to become simply parrots for the slogans of protest, uniformly chanting the same few phrases—and often with the same four letter words.

Let us take one example—one example that deeply troubles, and I understand why it does deeply trouble, many of our young people today: The war in Vietnam. We know the slogans. I have heard them often. Most of them simply say end the war.

There is no difference between Americans on that. All of us want to end the war. And we are ending this war.

Ending the war is not the issue. We have been in four wars in this century. We ended World War I. We ended World War II. We ended Korea. The great question is how we end a war and what kind of a peace we achieve.

If it was a peace now that would encourage those who would engage in aggression and would thereby lead to a bigger and more terrible war later, it would be peace at too great a price.

As we look back over the 20th century, as we look at that whole record of this century, only 70 years, we in America have not yet in this whole century been able to enjoy even one full generation of peace.

So, the whole thrust, the whole purpose of this Administration's foreign policy—whether it is Vietnam, or the Middle East, or in Europe, or in our relations with the developing countries or with the Communist powers—is to meet our responsibilities in such a way that at last we can have what we have not had in this century: A full generation of peace. I believe we can have it.

That is why, in Vietnam, we are carrying out a policy that will end the war. It will do it in a way that will contribute to a just and a lasting peace in the Pacific, in Vietnam, and, we trust, also in the world.

There are those who say that this is the worst of times in which to live.

What self pitying nonsense that is.

I am perhaps more aware of the problems this nation has at home and abroad than most of you. But we in America, I say proudly today, have a great deal to be proud of—and a great deal to be hopeful about for the future.

Let us open our eyes. Let's look around us. We see, as we look at the whole sweep of history, that for the first time in the whole history of man, it is becoming possible here in America to do things that nobody even dreamed could be done, even 50 years ago.

We see a natural environment, true, that has been damaged by careless misuses of technology. But we also see that that same technology gives us the ability, the ability to clean up that environment, to restore the clean air, the clean water, the open spaces, that are our rightful heritage. And I pledge we can do that and shall do it.

I know the fashionable line among some: Wouldn't it be great to live in a country that didn't have all these problems of material progress?

Not at all. I have been to them. I have seen them. And I simply would like to say to you that great as our problems are as a result of our material progress, we can do things, do things for ourselves and for others that need to be done, and we must see it in that way.

Look at our nation. We are rich, and sometimes that is condemned because wealth can sometimes be used improperly. But because of our wealth, it means that today we in America cannot just talk about, but can plan for a program in which everyone in this nation, willing and able to work, can earn a decent living, and so that we can care for those who are not able to do so on some basis.

We see a nation that now has the capacity to make enormous strides in these years just ahead, in health care, in education, in the creative use of our increasing time.

We see a nation poised to progress more in the next five years, in a material sense, than it did in the last 50 years.

We see that because of our wealth, because of our freedom, because of this much maligned system of ours, we can go on to develop those great qualities of the spirit that only decades ago were still buried by the weight of drudgery, and that in 75 percent of the world today are still buried by the weight of drudgery.

We see that we can do this in America, lift that weight of drudgery, allow the developments of the qualities of the spirit, and we can do it not just for an elite class, not just for the few, but for the many. All this can happen in America. The question is how shall we use this great opportunity? Shall we toss it away in mindless disruption and terror? Shall we let it wither away in despair? Or shall we prepare ourselves, as you are preparing yourselves, and shall we conduct ourselves in a way that we will be looked back upon as the beginning of the brightest chapter ever in the unfolding of the American dream.

Making its promise real requires an atmosphere of reason, of tolerance, and of common courtesy, with that basic regard for the rights and feelings of others that is the mark of any civilized society.

It requires that the members of the academic community rise firmly in defense of the pursuit of truth—that they defend it as zealously today against threats from within as they have in the past defended it against threats from without.

It requires that the idealism of the young—and indeed, the idealism of all ages—be focused on what can be done within the framework of a free society, recognizing that its structures of rights and responsibilities

is complex and fragile and as precious as freedom itself.

The true idealist pursues what his heart says is right in a way that his head says will work.

Idealism lies in the respect each shows for the rights of others. Despite all the difficulties, all divisions, all troubles that we have had, we can look to the future, I believe, with pride and with confidence. I speak here today on the campus of a great university, and I recall one of the great sons of Kansas, Dwight David Eisenhower. I recall the eloquent address he made at London's famous Guildhall immediately after victory in Europe.

On that day, the huge assemblage of all the leading dignitaries in Britain were there to honor him.

In his few remarks, one of the most eloquent speeches in the history of English eloquence, he said very simply, "I come from the heart of America."

Now, 25 years later, as I speak in the heart of America, I can truly say to you here today you are the heart of America—and the heart of America is strong. The heart of America is good. The heart of America is sound. It will give us—you will give us—the sound and responsible leadership that the great promise of America calls for—and in doing so, you will give my generation what it most fervently hopes for: The knowledge that your generation will see that promise of the American dream fulfilled.

[From the Caney Chronicle, Sept. 17, 1970]

#### PURPLE PRIDE

President Nixon spoke at Kansas State University at noon today and I went home to catch his talk on TV. I am glad I did.

A handful of radicals, occupying rear seats, tried to shout down the President at several intervals. They received, I believe, an education in Americanism—not only by the President—but by the thousands of Kansas State University students and faculty members who arose after almost every anti-Nixon outburst to give the President roaring and sustained ovations.

I was completely enraptured by what I saw and beheld. Frankly, in late years, I have become suspect of our two great universities, K.U. and Kansas State. But no longer am I worried about Kansas State.

As the camera zeroed in on the youthful listeners you became aware of their intense concentration upon the President's words. They leaned forward and sat almost motionless.

But they jumped to their feet, roaring approval, at such Nixon expressions as the following:

"We cannot stand for the rule of law abroad unless we observe law at home."

"Violence has no place in a free society no matter what the cause."

"The willingness to listen to somebody else without trying to shout him down—those patterns of mutual respect must be wanted by all of us."

But the remark made by the President that obtained most support from his audience followed some shouting from the back of the room.

Said Nixon:

"It is time for responsible students, faculty members and administrators to stand up and be counted."

Then he continued: "Sometimes it seems that the activists, the small minority, are the only voices coming from the campuses. That may be true in some universities, but not at Kansas State."

As of 12:30 today noon I put aside all worries about the student body at Kansas State. K-Staters have Purple Pride not only for their football team but for the America all of us love and want to keep intact.—HKG.

[From the Chanute Tribune, Sept. 17, 1970]  
WARMLY RECEIVED

It took the President of the United States, but they finally found someone at Kansas State more popular as a speaker than football coach Vince Gibson.

Despite cat-calls from a group of approximately 30, Richard Nixon learned quickly Wednesday that he was in friendly territory when the 15,500 repeatedly shouted their approval.

And well they might have. For a start, the President called Kansas State a great university. And those kind words were preceded by an explanation on nation-wide television of why he was wearing a Purple Pride necktie with a blue suit. And mixed in freely were words noting that two losers have risen from the ashes together—Richard Nixon from political defeat and Kansas State from gridiron ignominy.

The repeated spectacle of the President playing the crowd's cheers of approval against the hooting ignoramus at the back tended to obscure a plain-spoken repetition of themes that have been field tested by Spiro Agnew:

There are no places in a free society for violence and terror.

In a system that provides means for peaceful change, no cause justifies violence in the name of change.

At Manhattan Wednesday, these words were met with wave after wave of roared approval. Richard Nixon knew that they would be; this foreknowledge is why he chose Kansas State for a rare campus visit.

One might speculate at the reception had he not swaddled himself in Purple Pride, the better to be embraced.

Nonetheless the rally to praise the values cherished in Middle America came off as planned, and the President can surely forgive us the fewer than 30 among more than 15,000 who displayed boorish ways.

Richard Nixon came to praise Alf Landon, and he did. With a virtuoso performance that shows he knows the fears and hopes of Middle America.

[From the Coffeyville Journal, Sept. 18, 1970]  
THEY STOOD UP AND CHEERED

Thousands of students cheered President Nixon at Kansas State University Wednesday while a handful of protestors attempted to heckle him. It was a dramatic illustration of the fact that troubles on America's campuses are the work of a small minority.

The fact that they are few does not make them any less a threat to orderly educational processes, but the public should understand that the so-called militants represent less than one percent of the nation's students.

Kansas State University may not be typical of all universities in the nation, but it can't be much different from others in the Middle West, including Kansas University at Lawrence which is catching so much criticism from its alumni and others.

K-State has been lucky in that its burnings happened some time ago when such events were still rightly looked upon as the work of a few mentally disturbed or distorted individuals. Today some unthinking members of the public seem to believe that burnings and bombings on campuses are condoned by faculty and administrators.

President Nixon had some pertinent things to say at Manhattan. One of the most important was this:

"The time has come for us to recognize that violence and terror have no place in a free society, whoever the perpetrators and whatever their purported cause. In a system that provides the means for peaceful change, no cause justifies violence in the name of change."

The students cheered this mightily for all of us.

He pointed out that higher education in America can not be saved by government, but must be saved by college administrators, faculty, and student leaders.

The President's experience at Kansas State was a heartening one. It must have raised his spirits and his confidence in the responsible students of our land. And just as importantly, those who watched or read about it know now that the great majority of students are not radicals at Kansas State. If they think about it they must realize that the same thing is true, with minor percentage changes, at other American universities.

The radicals have had their day in the public view. As the President said, now is the time for the others to stand up and be counted.

We think they'll do that very thing in the long run.

[From the Emporia Gazette, Sept. 18, 1970]  
COMMENTS ON NIXON'S SPEECH

President Nixon's speech at Kansas State University drew comments from nearly every daily newspaper editor in the state this week. Most of the comments about the speech were favorable, but there were a few sour notes too.

Here is a sampling:

Topeka State Journal, "Just how accurate the President was when he warned that Americans may decrease their support of higher education undoubtedly will be demonstrated in legislatures throughout the land in upcoming sessions that will be considering appropriations for state colleges and universities."

Manhattan Mercury, "Although the occasion was primarily to deliver a lecture on the increasingly prestigious Landon Series in honor of the widely respected elder statesman and former governor, Alf M. Landon, the two other thrusts of the appearance cannot be ignored. Without any attempt to assign priority, they must be listed as: (1) a major attempt on the part of Nixon to establish better and more direct communications with the campus community, and (2) to work whatever political wonders possible for Republicans in Kansas . . ."

Russell Daily News, "Alf Landon remains Kansas' most deserving—and least recognized—citizen. And we believe it is time that the people join in a belated effort to see that this Kansan is, at last, duly honored."

Hutchinson News, "The show has become greater than the substance. In other words, it has become more newsworthy at such affairs these days to review the audience than to review the speaker's content, even when the speaker is the President of the United States . . ."

Wichita Eagle, "The President made statements that should be made, and by and large, students and faculty extended the courtesy and respect due the President of the United States, or any speaker for that matter . . ."

Iola Register, "We suspect (the students') response was a good deal more thoughtful than it was naive. We think it entirely possible that our young people, along with their elders, have had their bellies full of violence—either in word or deed—and are ready to applaud the condemnation of nihilism and anarchy . . ."

Lawrence Journal-World, "Unfortunately, Kansas University has been left far behind in this field, and only by asking some of the Kansas State Speakers to stop by Lawrence on their return trip from Manhattan to the Kansas City airport have school officials been able to corral several of the Kansas State speakers for an appearance at K. U."

Hays Daily News, "The Nixon administration billed the speech as nonpolitical. Hoggwash. No President can speak without politics."

University Daily Kansan, ". . . The various Kansas politicians, who in this election year

hunger for any campaign boost, all claimed some hand in finally securing that political Kewpie doll for their constituents. . . . If nothing else, Nixon's visit will have added to the prestige of Kansas and Kansas State University, but the ludicrousness of the situation has cast a rainy-day pall over whatever plaudits were gained from the presidential sortie."

Of course the Republican candidates in Kansas were glad to be seen with President Nixon when he came in for the speech at K. S. U. (So was Governor Robert Docking, no doubt.) But the Landon Lecture Series should not be branded as a partisan political rally. Other speakers in the series have included Robert Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey, Nelson Rockefeller, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, and George Romney. Future speakers in the series will be Robert S. McNamara and Earl Warren.

That is hardly a list of conservative Republicans.

[From the Independence Daily Reporter, Sept. 17, 1970]

#### SHAMEFUL BEHAVIOR INEXCUSABLE

Kansans everywhere, with the obvious exception of the radical and liberal New Left, must have felt keenly embarrassed at the heckling by a minority of dissident Kansas State University students of President Richard M. Nixon when he spoke at Ahearn Field House on the K-State campus Wednesday. Ironically, the text of his address to kickoff the Landon Lecture Series honoring Alfred M. Landon, former governor, 1936 GOP presidential candidate and former citizen of Independence, was on the prevailing campus disorder in this county.

The overwhelming majority of the 16 thousand attending the event many times interrupted Nixon with thunderous applause. Only a handful of rebels high in the balcony frequently heckled the President with shouts of "End the War" with some obscenities and vulgarities thrown in for good measure, rising to give the clenched-fist salute of international communism and hoisting a banner reading "How many more will you kill?" The placard was hauled down and tossed away by plainclothes security men.

Knowing of the dissident students' pre-occupation with outrageous behavior, K-State authorities made an attempt to appease them by providing two areas on campus for the demonstrators to do their thing. Signs and banners were banned from the field house but were smuggled in any way by the radicals of the liberal New Left.

At one point Nixon departed from his text to acknowledge the cheers which had drowned out the handful of hecklers during his speech.

"My text reads: The voices of the small minority have been allowed to drown out the voices of the responsible majority," the President said at one point ignoring the sporadic heckling. "That may be true in some places, but not at Kansas State," he continued lifting his voice as the vast majority of the students and others attending gave him a standing ovation.

Nixon appropriately pointed out higher education in this country today is on trial as never before, fast losing that essential support it has had since the beginning of this country—"the support of the American people."

"It is time for responsible university and college administrators, faculty and student leaders to stand up and be counted. Only they can save higher education in America. To attempt to blame government for all the woes of the universities is to seek an excuse, not a reason for the troubles," the President said.

"If the Vietnam war were ended today, the environment cleaned up tomorrow and all



other problems in the realm of government responsibility were solved," Nixon said, "the moral and spiritual crisis in the universities would still exist."

Like the Communists and other subversives have done for years, the student radicals of the liberal New Left are using the United States Constitution to their advantage. They abuse the right to peaceably assemble and petition, and of free speech and press at every turn. The underprivileged perhaps could be excused for such disgraceful behavior but for others it is inexcusable. Even the collegiate press, both underground and otherwise, gets carried away with printing vulgarities and obscenities. The underground press might be overlooked on the basis it is not intended for general public consumption but for the weak, often drug-laden minds of the mental cripples. But the official campus publications can never be forgiven for their poor taste.

It is unfortunate the millions watching on nationwide, network television President Nixon's appearance in Kansas at Kansas State University Wednesday should be given such an unfavorable impression as the result of the outlandish behavior of a few who have no business being in any college or university as students in the first place.

But happily, the overwhelming majority did Kansas and Kansas State proud.

[From the Iola Register]

Emerson Lynn, in the Iola Register, agreed that Nixon had nothing new to say. But, said Lynn, "Such overwhelming student enthusiasm for a public official was new and must have surprised a good number across the nation.

"... Does the K-State response mean the administration has won over the students, that campus violence is on the decline and that extremism—even in defense of the right—is a thing of past? Probably not. . . . We suspect (the) response was a good deal more thoughtful than it was naive. . . . We think it entirely possible that our young people, along with their elders, have had their bellies full of violence. . . . and are ready to applaud the condemnation of nihilism and anarchy. . . . After going on an emotional binge which started about the time of President Kennedy's assassination, perhaps we are headed back to rationalism. . . . (The) response was convincing and enormously encouraging. It was an hour full of promise for the nation."

[From the Parsons Sun, Sept. 17, 1970]

GOOD SHOW

President Nixon came to Kansas and staged a good show.

He put down a handful of student hecklers, real boos without the decency to display respect either for the office of the presidency or the man who currently occupies it.

It was a clean, quick knockout and really no contest at all. The microscopic minority at Manhattan was outmatched and outwitted. It would have done better to have stayed at home on Nixon's day in Kansas.

The President talked reason. No rational person can quarrel with his evaluation of violence and terror as practiced by a heedless few in our society. His homilies pleased the immediate audience and doubtlessly fell on receptive ears beyond.

Left unanswered is the status of relations between the President and the campus in general.

There is no doubt that Kansas State University is typical of Kansas. That's not the question. Rather it is whether Kansas is typical of the nation in its political and social attitudes, for plainly the state has been at odds with the majority for most of a generation.

The President came off well on a political-

ly-antiseptic campus. He might not do as well among the ivy in other regions, which says something about the lack of political sophistication and wisdom of his young critics, however sincere their views.

Until and unless the student majorities succeed in disassociating themselves irrevocably from the unthinking few and send the motley street crowd packing, there will be political points to be made in labeling the campus as a festering source of iniquity.

Aroused public emotions will exceed the carefully-measured distinctions laid down by a President when they are pursued with more vigor and vinegar by lesser lights in the public arena.

Those on the campus, students and faculty alike, who wish to escape such a fate must learn there are several ways of skinning political cats and indeed the least effective route is by making one's self obnoxious and odious. Patience, a luxury they can afford because most have full lives ahead, can be one of the most useful tools.

If, as one suspects, the differences between the campus and the President center more on a personality conflict than on issues, all of this becomes doubly true because Mr. Nixon has succeeded in defusing some of the throbbing problems he inherited 20 months ago—all but economic, and it is of the least direct concern in affluent academic surroundings.

#### A GREAT WEEK FOR KANSAS

This was a great week for Kansas. On Wednesday, President Richard M. Nixon flew to Manhattan to speak at the Landon Lecture Series at Ahearn Fieldhouse at Kansas State University. Perhaps no event in history has reaped so much good publicity nor done so much for the image of Kansas and its youth. The President spoke on "Order in Our Society."

When a couple of dozen creepy kids who had no common courtesy for the office of the President nor the 15,500 who came to listen to the President began shouting, it was obvious they were really in the minority—by a ratio of about 500 to 1—and about as effective as a raindrop in the ocean. The response of the K-State students was overwhelming. With coverage on all three national television networks and a number of independent stations, the radio networks, and numerous big city daily newspapers from coast to coast, it was indeed a bright day in America and in Kansas—for clearly the K-State students supported the concept of working within the system to bring about change.

What impressed us was the response around the country. KSU President, Dr. James A. McCain, received telegrams from all over America applauding K-State and its students. In New York City the next day, I visited with several people. Everyone brought up the Nixon speech at K-State. They commented on the "good-looking students," the well-behaved, respectful crowd, and the enthusiasm. Indeed, all three major New York TV stations featured lengthy stories on the late evening newscasts and one New York station re-ran the entire speech Wednesday night. The NEW YORK TIMES was most complimentary of K-State and termed it Nixon's finest performance.

So . . . it was a great day for Kansas and especially Kansas State for it showed again that here in the heartland of America are the really great people of our country—the ones whose background and up-bringing give them a really fine understanding of what life in America is all about.

To the Kansas Congressional delegation—especially Bob Dole—a vote of thanks for urging the President to come to Kansas State.

To Kansas Governor Robert Docking—a salute for the non-partisan way in which he welcomed the President to Kansas.

To Alf Landon—thanks for giving K-State the vehicle through which it has been possible to attract men of great distinction to Kansas State.

But a special vote of thanks goes to K-State's President, Dr. James A. McCain. It was Dr. McCain who envisioned the Landon Lecture Series. His idea of having Governor Landon invite men of both parties to come to K-State has given Kansas State a real place in history.

Indeed . . . the Landon Lecture Series has made a great university even greater and on Wednesday showed America on national television that in Kansas . . . the people make the difference.

DR. C. J. "SHORTY" ALDERSON

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, probably every man in this body can think back upon his early years to some person who greatly shaped his thinking and his character. Dr. C. J. "Shorty" Alderson was just such a person for many young men in Texas.

Although he started out to be a lawyer, several generations of Texans knew Dr. Alderson best as a coach and as a teacher. His teaching spanned just about every phase of physical and health education known to man, and it is questionable if he had many peers at it.

He had a way with words such that many men now in their 60's can still recite pep talks he gave them as school-boys. He had the knack of instilling in his young charges a fierce competitive spirit in line with the highest ideals of sportsmanship. Tough as nails, and never one to put on a show, he always attacked each situation with top enthusiasm and an amazing incisiveness that never failed to bring out the best in those he taught.

He was the University of Texas' first swimming coach, and it was there that I came under his tutelage. Swimming and water safety were among the many fields in which he was especially adept. One Austinite recalls that when he was 16 he was entered in the breaststroke in a city meet. He knew little about the event and called upon Dr. Alderson for some quick coaching. Alderson schooled him in the then-revolutionary butterfly stroke for just 1 hour, and the fellow ran away from the orthodox swimmers and took a whole second off the city record.

"Shorty" Alderson pursued knowledge with the same energy. During his lifetime he chalked up a bachelor of arts degree, a bachelor of law, and a masters in sociology at the University of Texas, and a masters in physical education and a doctorate in the same field at Columbia. At last count, over a decade ago, he had at least 388 hours of university credit.

He has had a great impact on college football rules in an advisory capacity. He officiated at well over 800 football games, and whenever some discrepancy or need for clarification arose, the chairman of the rules committee was sure to hear from him.

He had the knack of bridging the so-called generation gap, a knack which lasted all his long life. And despite his age and position as professor emeritus at the University of Texas, he was still going at top speed until the final day of his life, earlier this month, when a heart attack and car accident combined to stop him at the age of 82.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Alderson is gone, but, as is the case in the finest of teachers, the energy, the competitive spirit, and the high ideals of this man have been passed on to countless younger men.

I pause today before my colleagues of this great legislative body to honor him, and I include an eloquent article by Lou Maysel in the *Austin-American* in the *RECORD*. It is as follows:

#### ALDERSON'S LIFE UNBELIEVABLY FULL

Wednesday would have been his wedding anniversary, but the day was a sad one. Instead of celebrating the date with him, his friends attended his funeral.

Saddened though they were by his death, friends of Dr. C. J. "Shorty" Alderson all speak in wonderment of the full and rich life he lived before a heart attack and car accident claimed him a few weeks short of his 82nd birthday.

Alderson's diverse attainments and posts he's held are such that they boggle the mind. They would seem to be the accumulation of three lifetimes, or more.

And despite his age and position as professor emeritus of the department of physical and health education at the University of Texas, he was still whirling like a dervish until his final day of life.

"I'm busier since I've retired than I was when I was teaching," Alderson told a friend recently.

Alderson's teaching spanned just about every phase of physical and health education known to man, and it's questionable if he had many peers at it.

Alderson had a way of bridging the so-called generation gap, and two of his one-time pupils put him up as the best teacher they ever had.

"I think I took every course he taught at the University because he, in my estimation, was the greatest teacher I've had," said Bobby McLean, who is principal at both Andrews and Winn Elementary Schools.

"There's no question about that. He was the greatest teacher of any person I've ever had teach me anything," claims Tex Mayhall, the owner of a local hearing-aid firm. Mayhall's statement wasn't prompted by any thoughts of eulogy. It's one he's voiced to this listener before.

#### HIS PHYSICAL VIGOR WAS AMAZING

Clyde Littlefield, under whom Alderson served as freshman football and track coach from 1927-34, speaks of him the same way.

"He was a great instructor," Littlefield said. "Why, he even taught dancing."

Not only taught it, but he was ready to dance all night, especially if it was good old-fashioned square dancing. Tales of his physical vigor may sound exaggerated, but McLean and Mayhall, both over 30 years his junior, claim they aren't.

"I've talked to folks who lived around him, and nobody cut his grass or weeded his yard but him," McLean said.

Mayhall recalls seeing Alderson, who learned the blacksmith's trade as a youngster at Hillsboro, chop down eight- and 10-inch trees with a couple of swings with his own well-sharpened axe after he was 70. And only a few years ago Alderson came out to Mayhall's place and put on an amazing bit of horsemanship.

The time finally came a few years back for Alderson to give up active football officiating.

During his long career at it, he handled well over 800 games. The exact count isn't available, but you can bet Alderson knew exactly how many it was.

His last game was thought to have been a Blinn Junior College-Southwest Texas State B-team game at Brenham in which he was involved in an embarrassing episode. SWT had a quarterback who was slick at running the belly series and when he ran the play on one occasion, the referee blew his whistle when the fullback got stopped.

Up stepped Alderson, who was the umpire, and while he was reaching into the pileup for the ball, there was the quarterback scooting around end for a touchdown that had to be called back.

#### HIGHLY REGARDED AS RULES EXPERT

Despite that one unhappy play, Alderson was held in high regard in the football officiating game, both as a rules expert and a tutor and supervisor of officials. This latter capacity is one in which he would have served again this fall with the Austin chapter of the football officials.

He also has had an impact on the college rules in an advisory capacity through the years, and whenever some discrepancy or need for clarification arose, the chairman of the rules committee was sure to hear from Alderson.

His work with football rules also included helping to write the original rules for six-man football in 1937 and helping write touch football rules for women at UT.

Alderson came to the University of Texas in 1912 to study law already branded with his nickname, which was placed on him by someone when he was playing shortstop for Hillsboro High School.

Alderson followed through on that goal and started to practice law after getting his degree in 1922. But business was slow and he went to Calvert as an intermediate grades principal and coach of all sports.

He returned to Austin as a junior high instructor the following year and continued what is an amazing academic record. In addition to degrees in bachelor of arts, law and masters in sociology at UT, he added a master's in physical education and a doctor's in the same field at Columbia.

During his pursuit for knowledge, he at one time had 388 hours of university credit. That count, however, is at least a decade old and the figure may have gone higher.

#### HE WAS MAN OF MANY, VARIED WORDS

The declamation champion at UT in 1914, Alderson had a way with words of all kinds.

"He had a great command of English words, including cuss words," McLean recalled. McLean claims he enjoyed drawing Alderson out because Shorty was so great at putting him down.

"I saw you in the cradle two hours after you were born," Alderson liked to tell McLean. "You were red and wrinkly and you haven't improved a bit in looks in 45 years. You're still as ugly as you were then."

It was all in jest, of course. Alderson actually was a very gracious and courtly person, but he didn't affect many airs.

Billy Gilstrap, then a UT assistant football coach, remembers the time he had a prospect visiting. He took the prospect around to visit some professors and when he spotted Alderson's car outside his house, Gilstrap decided to include him on the tour.

Alderson shouted down the stairs for Gilstrap to come on up. There was Alderson buck naked lying on his bed reading.

When he saw Gilstrap had company, he jumped up and shook hands warmly with the prospect and his father but never once made a move to put on any clothing. Needless to say, the prospect was impressed—and not unfavorably since he came to Texas.

#### LIFE DEVOTED TO WORKING WITH YOUNG

Littlefield, Mayhall and McLean all speak of Alderson's dedication of his life to work-

ing with young people. He obviously had contact with many through his teaching and coaching, which included a stint as UT's first swimming coach in 1932-34.

Swimming and water safety were among the many fields in which he was especially adept. McLean recalls when he was 16 he was entered in the breaststroke in a city inter-parks meet. He knew little about the event and called upon Alderson for some quick coaching.

Alderson schooled him in the then-revolutionary butterfly stroke for an hour and McLean ran away from the orthodox breast-strokers and took a whole second off the city record.

Mayhall recalls vividly his first association with Alderson when he was a struggling football aspirant with the lowly Austin High Goldshirts. Alderson once stopped practice and shouted, "Damn it, that's the way to do it, Mayhall!"

Alderson didn't stop with that. He turned the interlude into a pep talk that made such a vivid impression on Mayhall he can recite practically all of it today.

Alderson's friends figured he would be a life-long bachelor, but he fooled them. Finally in 1959 at the age of 70, after retiring from the University, he took himself a bride—Dr. Mary E. Buice, an assistant professor of physical and health education.

McLean and Mayhall served as the ushers but Alderson had no best man. When the apparent oversight was called to his attention, he told them, "There ain't no better man than me."

And though he was kidding, he may have been right.

#### PRISONER OF WAR WEEK

#### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the *RECORD* this excellent proclamation by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Raymond P. Shafer, to set aside September 27 to October 3, 1970, as "Prisoner of War Week," a time for further and renewed reflection, prayer, and action on behalf of our captured servicemen in Southeast Asia.

The special designation of this week has come about through the good work of a particularly courageous and devoted organization of our citizens, the National League of Families of American Prisoners in Southeast Asia. On Tuesday, September 22, I was privileged to welcome several western Pennsylvania members of the league in my Washington office for extensive discussion of the plight of our American prisoners of war. Since I have maintained a sustained and active interest in the situation of our U.S. prisoners of war, as a U.S. Congressman and former U.S. Navy serviceman, I heartily commend action on all levels of government showing such concern.

Governor Shafer's proclamation follows:

PRISONER OF WAR WEEK: SEPTEMBER 27-OCTOBER 3, 1970

It is a matter of deep concern to every citizen of Pennsylvania and of the United States that our American Servicemen who are prisoners of war in Southeast Asia are not treated in the true spirit of the Geneva Convention.

The National League of Families of American Prisoners in Southeast Asia are setting aside September 27-October 3, 1970, as a week during which all citizens are urged to pay special tribute to those brave men who, in the service of their Country, are known to be in the hands of the enemy or missing in action.

All officials in our cities and municipalities are asked to join their fellow citizens in demanding that the government of North Viet Nam abide by the provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1954 and to provide

the United States Government with a complete list of all American prisoners; release the sick and wounded; see that all prisoners receive a proper diet and medical care; allow impartial inspection to be made of all prison facilities and permit a free flow of mail between the prisoners and their families.

Therefore, I, Raymond P. Shafer, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby proclaim September 27-October 3, 1970, as Prisoner of War Week in Pennsylvania, and urge all citizens to cooperate in this worthy effort to persuade Hanoi that

these men are remembered by their fellow citizens. Furthermore, I urge that special prayers be offered in all churches and synagogues during this week in behalf of these brave men and their families.

Given under my hand and the Great Seal of the State, at the City of Harrisburg, this third day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy, and of the Commonwealth the one hundred and ninety-fifth.

RAYMOND P. SHAFER,  
Governor.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, September 28, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*We are laborers together with God.* 1 Corinthians 3: 9.

O Lord, our God, we thank Thee for the gift of another day and pray that through all its hours we may live with Thee as we labor for the life of this land of liberty. Strengthen us that we may stand steady in this shaken world and amid constant change keep our faith firm with a growing trust and a deepening confidence.

Deliver us from petty concerns about ourselves, place us in the center of great needs, and open our hearts to all that we may share the glory of our human endeavors and the goal of our human energies. Reveal the heights above us that we may be mindful of Thy presence in the common routine of daily living and so bless us that we may work with integrity for the good of our fellow men. Let the gentle power of the Great Spirit be our strength in all we think and say and do; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 24, 1970, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On September 22, 1970:

H.R. 18725. An act to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia and to provide for a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia.

On September 23, 1970:

H.R. 16539. An act to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide that the Secretary of Transportation shall be a member of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

On September 25, 1970:

H.R. 11060. An act for the relief of Victor L. Ashley;

H.R. 16968. An act to increase the contribution by the Federal Government to the cost of health benefits insurance, and for other purposes;

CXVI—2132—Part 25

H.R. 17613. An act to provide for the designation of the Veterans' Administration facility at Bonham, Tex.; and

H.J. Res. 1247. Joint resolution to amend section 19(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 1366. Joint resolution to provide for the temporary extension of the Federal Housing Administration's insurance authority.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 370. An act to amend chapter 39 of title 39, United States Code, to increase the amount allowed for the purchase of specially equipped automobiles for disabled veterans, and to extend benefits under such chapter to certain persons on active duty;

H.R. 12807. An act to amend the Act of February 11, 1903, commonly known as the Expediting Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16710. An act to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to remove the time limitation on the use of entitlement to loan benefits, to authorize guaranteed and direct loans for the purchase of mobile homes, to authorize direct loans for certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 236. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week of August 1 through August 7 as "National Clown Week."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, joint resolutions, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 708. An act for the relief of Lawrence J. Nunes;

S. 3657. An act to amend chapters 31, 34, 35, and 36 of title 38, United States Code, in order to make improvements in the vocational rehabilitation and educational programs under such chapters; to authorize an advance initial payment and prepayment of the educational assistance allowance to eligible veterans and persons pursuing a program of education under chapters 34 and 35 of such title; to establish a work-study program and work-study additional educational assistance allowance for certain eligible veterans; and for other purposes;

S. 3785. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize educational assist-

ance to wives and children, and home loan benefits to wives of members of the Armed Forces who are missing in action, captured by a hostile force, or interned by a foreign government or power;

S. 4368. An act to extend and amend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 236. Joint resolution authorizing the preparation and printing of a revised edition of the Constitution of the United States of America—Analysis and Interpretation, of decennial revised editions thereof, and of biennial cumulative supplements to such revised editions; and

S. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on Copyright Law Revision (S. 591, Ninetieth Congress).

### PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON CAMPUS VIOLENCE

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend the people of America were exposed to the report of the President's Commission on Campus Violence. I have read the summary and analyses of the report by various columnists. I also heard the report discussed by three of the Commission members on national television yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, this report is about as useful as a fur coat on the equator. It appears to be a 300-page plus example of mediocrity and whitewash. There is no telling how much of the taxpayers' money was spent for this Commission to run around the country for 3 months to become so-called experts on campus violence. Judging from public statements made by some of the Commission members, I would say they had already reached their final conclusions the day they were appointed.

I hope President Nixon will accord the Commission report its proper status by placing it in file 13.

### ANOTHER CUBAN CRISIS

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, another crisis which may be just as ominous as the one involving Russian missiles has now been uncovered. The development of a naval base in Cuba, which is intended as an operating facility for Rus-