

### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 8, 1970, at 10 a.m.

### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 7, 1970:

#### OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

John Oliver Wilson, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, vice William P. Kelly, Jr.

#### BUREAU OF MINES

Elburt Franklin Osborn, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, vice John F. O'Leary, resigned.

#### U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

##### To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Jonathan Owen Seaman, xxx-xx-xx, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

##### To be general

Gen. Ferdinand Joseph Chesearek, xxx-xx-xx, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

##### To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Austin Wortham Betts, xxx-xx-xx, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

#### UNESCO REPRESENTATIVES

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Confer-

ence of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization: John Richardson, Jr., of Virginia.

Louise Gore, of Maryland.  
Pierre R. Graham, of Illinois.  
Harold Tate King, of Colorado.  
Kimon T. Karabatsos, of Virginia.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization:

Edward T. Brennan, of Massachusetts.  
Edward O. Sullivan, Jr., of New York.  
R. Miller Upton, of Wisconsin.  
Tom R. Van Sickle, of Kansas.

Louise Gore, U.S. member of the Executive Board of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to serve on the Executive Board with the rank of Ambassador.

#### U.S. CIRCUIT COURTS

Paul H. Roney of Florida, to be a U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice George H. Carswell, resigned.

#### U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

William C. Frey, of Arizona, to be a U.S. district judge for the district of Arizona vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

Samuel Comtl, of California, to be a U.S. district judge for the northern district of California vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

Gordon Thompson, Jr., of California, to be a U.S. district judge for the southern district of California vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

J. Clifford Wallace, of California, to be a U.S. district judge for the southern district of California vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

Feter T. Pay, of Florida, to be a U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

James L. King, of Florida, to be a U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

Gerald B. Tjoflat, of Florida, to be a U.S. district judge for the middle district of Florida vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

Charles A. Moye, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of

Georgia vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

William C. O'Keiley, of Georgia, to be a U.S. district judge for the northern district of Georgia vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

C. Rhodes Bratcher, of Kentucky, to be a U.S. district judge for the western district of Kentucky vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272 approved June 2, 1970.

John Felkens, of Michigan, to be a U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272 approved June 2, 1970.

Philip Pratt, of Michigan, to be a U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272 approved June 2, 1970.

Clarkson S. Fisher, of New Jersey, to be a U.S. district judge for the western district of New Jersey vice Reynier J. Wortendyke, Jr., a retired.

John J. Kitchen, of New Jersey, to be a U.S. district judge for the district of New Jersey vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272 approved June 2, 1970.

Frederick B. Lacy, of New Jersey, to be a U.S. district judge for the district of New Jersey vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

Robert B. Krupansky, of Ohio, to be a U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272 approved June 2, 1970.

Nicholas J. Wallinski, Jr., of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice Gerald E. Kalbfleisch, retired.

Owen D. Cox, of Texas, to be a U.S. district judge for the southern district of Texas vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272 approved June 2, 1970.

Robert M. Hill, of Texas, to be a U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272 approved June 2, 1970.

William M. Steger, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Texas vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272 approved June 2, 1970.

John H. Wood, Jr., of Texas, to be a U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

George J. Long, Jr., of Kentucky, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Kentucky for the term of 4 years vice Ernest W. Rivers, resigned.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

POPE PAUL VI AND PRESIDENT NIXON SEND GREETINGS TO THE MOST REVEREND CHRISTOPHER J. WELDON, D.D., FOURTH BISHOP OF ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS., AND TO PEOPLE OF GOD IN THE DIOCESE ON OCCASION OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF DIOCESE OF SPRINGFIELD BY POPE PIUS IX IN 1870

### HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 7, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the 100th anniversary of the creation of the Roman Catholic diocese of Springfield, Mass., was celebrated in solemn and memorable services in St. Michael's Cathedral, Springfield, on Saturday, September 26.

More than 1,000 of the people of God assembled in the beautiful cathedral for the Mass of Thanksgiving, whose principal celebrant was the Most Reverend Luigi Raimondi, apostolic delegate to the United States, who imparted the apostolic blessing of Pope Paul VI on those attending.

The mass was sung in the presence of more than a score of archbishops, bishops, monsignori, priests, and nuns of the diocese. Adding an ecumenical note to the occasion was the presence of the Right Reverend Alexander D. Stewart, the new and recently consecrated bishop of the Episcopal diocese of western Massachusetts; Rabbi Herman E. Snyder, rabbi emeritus of Sinai Temple in Springfield, and several ministers of Protestant denominations.

Concelebrating the mass with Archbishop Raimondi were the Most Reverend Christopher J. Weldon, D.D., fourth bishop of the diocese of Springfield; Auxiliary Bishop Thomas J. Riley of the

mother archdiocese of Boston; Bishop Bernard J. Flanagan of Worcester and Auxiliary Bishop Timothy J. Harrington of the diocese of Worcester; the Right Reverend Monsignor Walter C. Connell, prothonotary apostolic and vicar general of the Springfield diocese; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Timothy J. Leary, rector of St. Michael's Cathedral; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Eugene E. Guertin, pastor of St. Rose de Lima Church, Aldenville, Mass.; Rev. John E. Aubertin, pastor of St. John Cantius Church, Northampton, Mass.; Very Rev. Adam Zajdel, O.F.M. Conv., president of St. Hyacinth College and Seminary, Granby, Mass., and Rev. Camillo Santini, C.S.S., pastor of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church, Springfield.

Mr. Speaker, I attended the Thanksgiving mass and the dinner which followed with my colleague from western Massachusetts, Congressman SILVIO O. CONTE, whose congressional district also embraces the diocese of Springfield. Joining

us was the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

The program of sacred music was one of the finest I have ever heard sung at mass. This excellent presentation was by the choir of St. Paul's Choir School in Cambridge, Mass., under the direction of Theodore Marler. The enthusiastic singing participation by the congregation, under the leadership of Rev. James P. Sears, director of music for the diocese of Springfield, reached its peak with the offertory hymn, "The Church's One Foundation."

President Richard M. Nixon telegraphed his greetings to Bishop Weldon and the religious and laity of the diocese, and Archbishop Raimondi read the greetings of Pope Paul VI.

Mr. Speaker, on this momentous occasion of the centennial of the creation of the diocese of Springfield by Pope Pius IX in 1870, I have included with my remarks in the Record the messages from Pope Paul VI and President Nixon, Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, Bishop Weldon, to the people of God of the diocese of Springfield; a translation from Latin of the decree by Pope Pius IX establishing the diocese of Springfield on June 14, 1870. Also, messages from Senator KENNEDY, Mayor Frank H. Freedman, of Springfield, and my message; and the sermon of Archbishop Raimondi and news stories from the Springfield Sunday Republican of September 27, 1970.

TELEGRAM FROM PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., September 25, 1970.

MOST REV. CHRISTOPHER J. WELDON,  
Roman Catholic Bishop of Springfield,  
Springfield, Mass.

It is a great pleasure to greet you and all the members of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield as you celebrate its one hundredth anniversary. In the decade of the seventies, the work of America's religious institutions will be more needed than ever and the proud history of your diocese contains many examples of civic-minded men and women inspired by their faith to meet the responsibilities of community life. Just as this milestone is an inspiration for all your fellow citizens, so too I am confident will it set the tone of another ten decades of spiritual and moral leadership which will assist us all in recording new victories in our unwavering search for human dignity and social justice.

RICHARD NIXON.

CABLEGRAM FROM POPE

VATICANO.

Auspicious occasion hundred years Diocese of Springfield. Holy Father joining in joy of diocese imparts participants ceremonies and all faithful of Springfield, Massachusetts special apostolic blessing.

Cardinal VILLOT,  
Vatican Secretary of State.

BRIGHTON, MASS.,

September 1, 1970.

The Most Reverend CHRISTOPHER J. WELDON,  
Springfield, Mass.

DEAR BISHOP WELDON: With my heart's full measure of love, blessings and felicitations, I send you this message of greetings and good wishes on the occasion of the centennial celebration of the Diocese of Springfield. This is a year indeed which the Lord has made!

I have happy memories of your consecra-

tion as a bishop on March 24, 1950 and your subsequent installation as the fourth bishop of Springfield. During the past twenty years we have been more than neighboring bishops. We have been spiritual shepherds with common aims and interests. We have been mindful at all times of our responsibility to bring the good news of the gospel to those whom we are privileged to serve. In the words of The Pastoral Constitution On The Church In The Modern World: "All pastors should remember that by their daily conduct and concern they are revealing the face of the church to the world and men will judge the power and truth of the Christian message thereby. By their lives and speech, in union with religious and the faithful, may they demonstrate that the church is an unspent fountain of those virtues which the modern world needs the most. . . . It is more necessary than ever that priests, under the guidance of the bishops and the supreme pontiff, erase every cause of division so that the whole human race may be led to the unity of God's family."

To your faithful priests and religious, to the wonderful people of western Massachusetts under your jurisdiction and to you, my dear Bishop, I offer my heartfelt congratulations. I pray that you may find continued happiness and fulfillment in your apostolic work. I am confident that the Diocese of Springfield, faithfully adhering to the gospel, will continue to "foster and elevate all that is found to be true, good and beautiful in the human community and will strengthen peace among men for the glory of God."

Accept a remembrance in your prayers and wishing you every blessing, I am  
Yours fraternally in Christ,

RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING,  
Archbishop of Boston.

BISHOP'S RESIDENCE,

Springfield, Mass., September 26, 1970.

DEAR FRIENDS: It is a pleasant duty to welcome you in the name of the People of God of the Diocese of Springfield to our diocesan centennial celebration.

This is an event which puts all of us for a moment into the center of a continuum. It cannot be understood without reference to the past or to the future.

The past is easier to evaluate because its symbols surround us. The Diocese is today no less than the sum total of the efforts of a legion of priests, religious and laity who down the years cooperated with God's grace and poured out their lives and their labor for its progress. Truly, the words of Scripture apply to them: "By their fruits you will know them." In every county of the Diocese—and in Worcester county as well—stand the proofs of their dedication: the crosses above the churches, schools, convents, rectories and myriad charitable institutions.

But more importantly, there stands also a host of families whose members continue to draw upon the heritage of the past to enrich the parishes, the towns and cities of the present.

The Christian, who must be concerned for the future, cannot stop long to count and recount his inheritance. He must, as did the prudent servant of Scripture, invest what he has received. He must take the heroic efforts of the pioneers and the self-sacrifice of his forebears and add to them his own effort, his own dedication. Each generation contributes to the building of the Kingdom of God; none completes it.

This centennial celebration, then, is a pause between centuries. May that pause help us to appreciate more deeply a century past and challenge us to move prayerfully into a century ahead with gratitude for what has been done and with awareness of what still needs to be done.

Let us be conscious of, use effectively and glory in the bonds of Christ's love that unite us to one another, particularly to His Vicar on earth, our beloved Holy Father, Pope Paul VI.

Sincerely yours in Christ,  
CHRISTOPHER J. WELDON,  
Bishop of Springfield.

A TRANSLATION OF THE DECREE OF ESTABLISHMENT—POPE PIUS IX

The Record of an Act—In the discharge of heavy responsibilities incumbent upon Our pastoral office, We are accustomed to perform with an eager and willing heart all those acts which We acknowledge to be important to the good of the Christian cause and to the advantage and welfare of the Lord's flock.

Our Venerable Brothers, the Archbishop and Bishops of the ecclesiastical Province of New York in the United States of America have earnestly requested that We separate from the very extensive Diocese of Boston, which lies within the limits of this New York Province, some sections, to wit, those counties which bear the name of Berkshire, Franklin, Hampshire, Hampden and Worcester, and that from these counties We erect by virtue of Our Apostolic Authority a new See in the State of Massachusetts.

The matter has been carefully and maturely considered by their Eminences, the Cardinals charged with the Propagation of the Faith. Since We recognize that this would greatly enhance the welfare of religion and cause an increase of the Faith, We are favorably inclined to comply with this request and have decided with the advice of Our Venerable Brothers to proceed to the erection of a new See in the State of Massachusetts.

Wherefore, from the fullness of Our Apostolic Power, We hereby create a new Diocese in the State of Massachusetts, which will be composed of the Counties of Berkshire, Franklin, Hampshire, Hampden and Worcester. Accordingly, we separate those counties from the Diocese of Boston, and free them altogether from the jurisdiction of its Bishop and cede them to this new Diocese.

The new Diocese is constituted a Suffragan See of the Bishop of New York, Its Episcopal See is established in the City of Springfield and We order that this Diocese is to derive its name from that self-same City.

We further enjoin that this new Diocese of Springfield is fully to enjoy all the rights, honors and privileges which are enjoyed by other Bishops.

This We order and command ordaining that this document is and will remain an enduring and valid one and that it possesses full and integral force. We also ordain that it must be sustained fully and in every way by those to whom it may concern and in time might concern. We further order that it must be defined and interpreted by those ordinary Judges and even those delegated Auditors of the Apostolic Palace. Finally, We enjoin that it would be null and void for anyone by whatever authority to seek either knowingly or not to annul this document.

Notwithstanding Our legal regulation and that of the Apostolic Chancery whereby vested rights are not to be taken away and the legislation of Our Predecessor Benedict XIV on the separation of goods and notwithstanding all other general or special Constitutions and Ordinances, whether: Apostolic or promulgated by universal, provincial or synodal councils, and all other things to the contrary.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, under the Seal of the Fisherman the fourteenth day of June 1870, the twenty-fifth of Our Pontificate.

For his Lordship,  
CARDINAL PARACIANI CLARELLI,  
F. PROFILI,

Substitute.

Seal of Pope Pius IX.

U.S. SENATE.

Washington, D.C., August 1, 1970.

The Most Reverend CHRISTOPHER J. WELDON,  
Bishop's Residence,  
Springfield, Mass.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: It gives me great pleasure to join in the 100th anniversary celebration of the establishment of the Diocese of Springfield. On this historic occasion, we look with pride to the spiritual and community leadership that has grown within the Diocese over the past century. And we look with confidence to the future of continued growth and service.

With my respectful regards, and my gratitude to you for your twenty years of dedicated service to the Diocese of Springfield.

Sincerely,

EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

September 9, 1970.

The Most Reverend CHRISTOPHER J. WELDON,  
Bishop of Springfield, Bishop's Residence,  
Springfield, Mass.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: It is an honor for me, as Mayor of the City of Springfield, to host the centennial observance of the Diocese of Springfield and to take part in the celebration of the Mass of Thanksgiving noting 100 years of service to God and our community.

Equally important, it is a source of great personal pleasure to be able to express my own deep friendship for you and for the members of your flock by joining in observing this 100th anniversary of the founding of the diocese. Springfield and the entire area have benefited tremendously from the labors and the accomplishments of our friends of the Catholic faith, and I am happy to be given the opportunity to exemplify the gratitude of the entire community on such an auspicious occasion.

May I extend a most cordial welcome to the Most Reverend Luigi Raimondi, D.D., Apostolic Delegate to the United States, to all the visiting clergy and to members of the laity and officials on this 100th anniversary, and a wish for many more years of the cordial relationship which has existed between us personally and among all persons of all faiths in our home area.

With warmest personal regards,

FRANK H. FREEDMAN,

Mayor of Springfield.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

August 14, 1970.

Most Reverend CHRISTOPHER J. WELDON, D.D.,  
Roman Catholic Bishop of Springfield,  
Springfield, Mass.

DEAR BISHOP WELDON: On this momentous and solemn occasion marking the Centennial of the establishment of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield, I wish to bring the greetings of the Congress of the United States to Your Excellency, the Monsignor, priests, religious brothers and sisters, and the laity of Western Massachusetts.

Our immigrant forebears who came onto American shores during the 19th Century in search of economic opportunity or in flight from political oppression were proud and impoverished people. They brought with them multiple native cultures, a tremendous capacity for hard work, a love of family, and a deep and abiding faith in their Catholic religion.

Pope Pius IX in 1870 created the See of Springfield embracing some 100,000 laity, 43 priests, two orders of religious nuns and 38 parishes in Central and Western Massachusetts, and the College of the Holy Cross in Worcester. Succeeding decades saw a fantastic growth of the Diocesan population and a manifestation of the zeal of the Bishops of Springfield, the priests and the nuns in their mission to preach, to teach, and to pray; to care for the sick and the elderly; and to fight the unceasing battle for social justice.

I join with all people of good will in our community in praying for you and the continuing successful benefits of the Diocese of Springfield as you offer Thanksgiving Mass to Almighty God on this Centennial Anniversary.

Respectfully yours,

EDWARD P. BOLAND,  
Member of Congress.

APOSTOLIC DELEGATE'S TALK

(NOTE.—The following is the text of the message given by Archbishop Luigi Raimondi, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, at the end of the Mass of Thanksgiving marking the 100th anniversary of the Diocese of Springfield.)

When your beloved Bishop Weldon asked me to share in your festivities commemorating the centennial of the Diocese, I accepted with pleasure and gratitude.

Nothing could give greater satisfaction to the Holy Father's representative than to be able to have his presence felt whenever any portion of the Church is experiencing a significant moment in its life.

This is certainly true in the case of the Diocese of Springfield today.

Established one hundred years ago, this Diocese, under the wise and zealous guidance of dedicated prelates, has developed along the lines of a solid Christian spirit.

The many institutions, churches, and organizations, which have sprung up during the century of its existence, stand as witness to the faith, loyalty and spiritual sensibility of this splendid community.

Formed of groups diverse in origin and cultural background, the faithful of Springfield have found in the Church, in the bishops, priests and religious a unifying element; the Church has been their spiritual home—in a sense—their mother.

Their Christian life has been assiduously cared for; the sacraments nourished their souls; in a spirit of brotherhood they found a genuine sense of community; in their common effort they found the solution to many moral and spiritual problems.

The ceremony of today takes on the character of grateful recollection and remembrance, of thanksgiving for the accumulated benefits received and inherited, and it also offers an opportunity of pausing, in order to assess the work done, what has been achieved and what remains to be done.

The problems of our age are different in many ways from those of yesterday.

The Church and its individual members have to adapt themselves to these external changes, lest they be cut off from the mainstream of life.

It is clear, however, that this adaptation does not mean a departure from the love and loyalty due to Christ and His Church as founded by Him.

It is from this Church that we continue to receive the benefits of the redemption wrought by Christ.

It is in this Church that the means of sanctification are deposited and in it that we have to live our lives as children of God.

Methods and means may vary, but not the essentials.

As a result of the Second Vatican Council and under the inspiration and guidance of Pope John XXIII and Pope Paul VI, the faithful all over the world, while striving to overcome initial difficulties and uncertainties related to the spirit of the renewal movement set in action, are most anxious to respond to their vocation and to fulfill the duties which are theirs by reason of their baptism, their acceptance of the faith and their dignity as sons of God.

We are hopeful because of these new and promising developments.

Everywhere we find signs of searching for

new depths and for commitment to the apostolic tasks of the Church.

We realize that this challenge is not exempt from dangers, illusions and, perhaps, overconfidence and reliance not so much on the power of the Holy Spirit but rather on purely human resources.

The mission to be carried out is not our own, but Christ's; the means are not those of human wisdom, but those willed and guaranteed in efficacy by Christ Himself.

What is most expected is that in all things we proceed with genuine faith, in full awareness of the constant loving presence, the action, the power and the love of God.

Viewed at that level, the Church is strong, not so much because of the determination of her own members, but because of the power of grace made effective through their humble service.

The lesson of the past calls for renewed determination, a new awareness of our Christian responsibility to measure up to and to accept our duties as Christians, as people enjoying salvation through Christ and called to cooperate in building up the kingdom of God on earth in a spirit of justice and charity.

As the Council put it so precisely:

"Our work as Christians is to be directed to manifest Christ's message by words and deeds, and also to penetrate and perfect the temporal sphere with the spirit of the Gospel" (Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, n. 5).

We may add that this tremendous task calls for unity and wholehearted cooperation with those who have received from Christ the grace and the charisma to perform those essential services in the Church which are contained in the office of authentic teachers of the faith, ministers of the grace and leadership of the People of God.

This has been the beautiful example and the precious heritage of the generations throughout the first ten decades of this Diocese's history.

And we like to see the future of Springfield in this perspective.

For this we have been praying this afternoon.

Today is a milestone in the life of this exemplary and loyal community, but it must also be the beginning of a new era of generous Christian service, of praiseworthy Christian spirit, of dedicated selfless Christian responsibility.

On this special day of rejoicing and celebration, I wish to congratulate your dear Bishop very warmly; his untiring service for twenty years finds a most deserved reward today.

Our cordial congratulations also go to the devoted and loyal priests, cooperating zealously with him, and indeed these sentiments extend to the entire Diocese.

I am particularly happy, then, to announce the paternal participation of the Holy Father in this historic and beautiful event, as expressed in the following message. . . .

"Auspicious occasion, hundred years Diocese of Springfield, Holy Father, joining in joy of Diocese, imparts participants ceremonies and all faithful of Springfield, Massachusetts, special apostolic blessing."

"CARDINAL VILLOT".

CATHOLIC DIOCESE MARKS 100 YEARS

[From the Sunday Republican, Sept. 27, 1970]

Celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Diocese of Springfield began Saturday in St. Michael's Cathedral.

Principal celebrant of the Mass of thanksgiving was Archbishop Luigi Raimondi, apostolic delegate to the United States, who brought a greeting from Pope Paul VI and the blessing of the Vatican.

The Mass was offered in the presence of

more than a score of archbishops and bishops, a large number of priests and nuns, representatives of all parishes in the diocese and all faiths, and civic dignitaries, including Mayor Frank H. Freedman.

Celebrating the Mass with Archbishop Raimondi were four bishops, The Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon of Springfield; the Most Rev. Bernard J. Flanagan and the Most Rev. Timothy J. Harrington, both of Worcester, and the Most Rev. Thomas J. Riley of Boston.

Several special practices were observed during the service.

Faithfuls exchanged the "sign of peace," and received an ancient custom, centennial commemorative medallions struck for the occasion and bearing the message of peace and a map of the diocese.

The prayers of intercession were read in 10 languages, representing the major ethnic groups which make up the diocese. The languages were English, French, Polish, Lithuanian, Italian, Slovak, Spanish, Lebanese, Portuguese and Gaelic.

Ten youngsters from the Cathedral Elementary School presented gifts of altar decorations during the offertory. The gifts were received by Archbishop Raimondi.

The nearly two-hour Mass of thanksgiving was preceded by a procession of dignitaries, led by an honor guard from the Fourth Degree of the Knights of Columbus, in special crimson and black costume, and carrying the American, State and diocesan flags.

The procession formed at the school. Following a thrifter, crucifer and two acolytes were members of the clergy, which included priests, nuns of various orders, seminarians Eabhl Herman E. Snyder and several Protestant ministers.

At the chancery office, Knights of Malta, in long, black robes, and the Ladies of Malta, in long, black dresses and veils, joined the procession with the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre.

At this point, the concelebrants joined the line.

At the cathedral rectory, the three archbishops and 20 bishops who participated in the service took their positions. Each of the prelates was accompanied by two priest-chaplains.

The procession wound down Elliot Street to the front of the cathedral and entered to an organ processions, Bach's Fantasy in G Major. The congregation joined in the refrain of the processional hymn, "Lift High the Cross," sung by the choir.

Music for the Mass was provided by the St. Paul Choir School of Cambridge under the direction of Theodore Marler. John Dunn was organist and Edward Haugh, trumpeter. Cathedral organist was George Hart.

Upon entering the sanctuary, Archbishop Raimondi bearing the gilt, jeweled staff, incensed the altar and gave the greeting and penitential rite.

Following the singing of the Kyrie ("Lord have mercy; Christ have mercy") the service continued with the Liturgy of the Word, necessary preparation for the Liturgy of the Eucharist.

The first reading, from Deuteronomy 7, 6-9, was read by Earl V. Gauntt, lector. The second reading, from the First Epistle of Peter 2, 4-10, was given by Harry G. Graham, lector.

Following each reading, the Bible was kissed by the Archbishop.

[From the Sunday Republican Sept. 27, 1970]  
DIOCESE LOYALTY PRAISED

A message of congratulations on the 100th anniversary of the creation of the Diocese of Springfield was carried to St. Michael's Cathedral Saturday by the papal representative from Rome.

Archbishop Luigi Raimondo, apostolic delegate to the United States, was the principal celebrant of the Mass of thanksgiving the beginning of Diocesan centennial observances.

"Today is a milestone in the life of this exemplary and loyal community," he said. "But it must also be the beginning of a new era of generous Christian service, of praiseworthy Christian spirit, of dedicated, selfless Christian responsibility."

Archbishop Raimondo praised the Diocese's loyalty to the papal seat in Rome and its dedication in the following decision of the Vatican.

He said church officials were "hopeful" because of "new and promising developments" of the Second Vatican Council.

"The Church and its individual members have to adapt themselves to these external changes, lest they be cut off from the mainstream of life," he said.

"The celebration of today takes on the character of grateful recollection and remembrance, of thanksgiving for the accumulated benefits received and inherited, and it also offers an opportunity of pausing, in order to assess the work done, what has been achieved and what remains to be done," Archbishop Raimondo said.

"This Diocese, under the wise and zealous guidance of dedicated prelates, has developed along the lines of a solid Christian spirit," he said. "The many institutions, churches, schools and organizations which have sprung up during the century of its existence stand as witness to the faith, loyalty and spiritual sensibility of this splendid community."

POPE PAUL VI AND PRESIDENT NIXON SEND GREETINGS TO THE MOST REVEREND CHRISTOPHER J. WELDON, D.D., FOURTH BISHOP OF ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS., AND TO PEOPLE OF GOD IN THE DIOCESE ON OCCASION OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF DIOCESE OF SPRINGFIELD BY POPE PIUS IX IN 1870

### HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 7, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on September 26 the Roman Catholic diocese of Springfield, Mass., celebrated its 100th year anniversary, a truly memorable occasion in the lives of all the religious and laity of that diocese.

I was honored to be invited to both the Mass of Thanksgiving at St. Michael's Cathedral in Springfield and to the centennial banquet which followed at the Highpoint Motor Inn, Chicopee.

The Most Reverend Christopher J. Weldon, bishop of the Springfield diocese since 1950, celebrated the mass and delivered a stirring sermon on the church, the diocese, and the role it has played in western Massachusetts over the years and during these changing times.

The occasion was a joyous one of thanksgiving and celebration. The beauty of the recently remodeled cathedral, the splendor of the music, and the obvious enthusiasm of the participants all blended with the glory of the mass to make the occasion an unforgettable one

for those who had the honor of attending.

More than 1,000 persons attended the banquet following the mass and were thrilled by a most powerful talk on the role of the church by the Most Reverend Luigi Raimondi, D.D., the apostolic delegate to the United States.

Along with my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), I felt a great pride in being a member of this fine diocese which has made such great progress over the decades.

The See of Springfield was created by Pope Pius IX in 1870. At that time the four western counties that comprised the diocese held nearly 100,000 Catholics, 38 parishes, and 43 diocesan priests.

The first bishop was Patrick Thomas O'Reilly, a native of Ireland and, at 37 years of age, a man possessed of great capacity for work. This was a fortunate attribute for the infant diocese as he began a tradition of ceaseless work for Springfield bishops that has carried down to the present day.

Today the diocese under Bishop Weldon has 427 priests serving in 136 parishes and 115 missions, stations, and chapels, as well as 38 brothers and 631 sisters staffing 10 high schools, 52 elementary schools, two homes for the aged, two orphanages, and four hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, these impressive statistics of growth, as inspiring as they are, certainly do not tell the entire story of the Springfield diocese's first 100 years.

They only indicate how a strong Christian life has been emphasized throughout those four counties. They only hint at the faith in God that has been fostered and strengthened, the solace that has been given to thousands, and the love that has been given to all through the teachings of God.

These were the real accomplishments that were celebrated at that very impressive ceremony and banquet in Springfield last month. And these are the thoughts and impressions I wanted to share with my colleagues today as I take this opportunity to congratulate all of the faithful of the Springfield diocese as they begin their second century of service to God.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include with my remarks in the Record the letter from President Nixon, messages from Archbishop Raimondi, Massachusetts Gov. Francis W. Sargent, Senator EDWARD W. BROOKE, and my message; also Bishop Weldon's homily for the centennial mass, and the news-story from the diocesan newspaper, The Catholic Observer of October 2, 1970, detailing the centennial celebration:

THE WHITE HOUSE, Washington, D.C.,

July 22, 1970.

To the members of the Diocese of Springfield, Mass.:

It is a great pleasure to send each of you my warm congratulations on the one hundredth anniversary of your Diocese, and to express the hope that the occasion will be as memorable as the community service it reflects.

Your leadership in the future will be more needed than ever. And I know that it will continue to help America record new vic-

ories in our unwavering search for true human dignity and social justice.

May you continue to derive joy and satisfaction from the strength and success of your commitment to this goal.

— RICHARD NIXON.

—  
 APOSTOLIC DELEGATION,  
 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
 Washington, D.C., July 20, 1970.

The Most Rev. CHRISTOPHER J. WELDON,  
 Bishop of Springfield,  
 Springfield, Mass.

**YOUR EXCELLENCY:** On the joyous occasion of the Centenary Anniversary of the Diocese of Springfield, it gives me great pleasure to extend to you my heartiest congratulations and prayerful best wishes.

This is indeed a memorable and significant occasion which commemorates great accomplishments for the honor and glory of God. During these one hundred years the Shepherds of the Diocese of Springfield as well as the clergy, religious, and apostolic laity have striven whole-heartedly for the propagation of the faith, their own spiritual perfection, and the salvation of souls.

I know that this Anniversary will be replete with special blessings from on high, and it is while conscious of this that I join Your Excellency and the Flock of the Diocese of Springfield in offering thanks to God for His many graces and countless blessings of the past, and a prayer that the future will be marked with plentiful benediction.

With renewed felicitations and sentiments of esteem, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

LUGI RAIMONDI,  
 Apostolic Delegate.

—  
 THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,  
 State House, Boston, July 21, 1970.

The Most Rev. CHRISTOPHER J. WELDON,  
 Bishop's Residence,  
 Springfield, Mass.

**YOUR EXCELLENCY:** I am pleased to extend the greetings of the Commonwealth to you, the clergy, and laity of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield on the occasion of the 100th Anniversary of the establishment of the Diocese.

I note also that this year you are observing your Twentieth Anniversary as the fourth Ordinary of the Diocese of Springfield.

In this dual observance the people of the Springfield Diocese have much for which to be grateful.

The Catholic Church, like most institutions of society today, faces the task of renewing its mandate in order to better meet the needs of today's world.

However, for both Church and Government, the task of renewal does not mean we must abandon cherished traditions. We must make of these traditions viable instruments in the renewal process.

And so, as you observe the 100th Anniversary of the establishment of your Diocese, as you note the progress made, you have all the more reason to appreciate the rich harvest which your traditions have made possible.

I extend my hope that in its second century of service, the Diocese of Springfield will continue to enjoy the choicest blessings of Providence.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

— FRANCIS W. SARGENT.

—  
 U.S. SENATE,  
 Washington, D.C., August 13, 1970.

The Most Reverend CHRISTOPHER J. WELDON,  
 Bishop's Residence,  
 Springfield, Mass.

**DEAR BISHOP WELDON:** Though I wish I could be present as the Diocese of Springfield celebrates its One Hundredth Anniver-

sary, I send my warmest greetings to you and your parishioners on this joyful occasion.

In the century that has passed since the establishment of the Diocese, Springfield and the nation have undergone many changes. But the Church has continued to serve the religious, social and educational needs of its people.

I extend my sincere best wishes to all of those attending the Mass at St. Michael's Cathedral. I know it will be an inspiring opportunity to join together in the true spirit of Christianity.

Sincerely yours,

— EDWARD W. BROOKE.

—  
 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
 Washington, D.C., Aug. 4, 1970.

The Most Reverend CHRISTOPHER J. WELDON,  
 Bishop's Residence,  
 Springfield, Mass.

**DEAR BISHOP WELDON:** As the Diocese of Springfield celebrates the completion of its first century of service to God, I extend to you and to all the faithful of the diocese my warmest congratulations.

The growth of our diocese over the past 100 years has truly been remarkable. We can all be proud of the many churches, schools, hospitals and extensive exercises in charity which symbolize our dedication to doing God's work on earth.

As necessary and laudatory as these accomplishments are, however, they do not by themselves tell the entire story of the Springfield Diocese's first 100 years. For how does one measure the fostering of love of God and fellow man; the inspiration which leads toward a strong Christian life; the love, hope and solace given to hundreds of thousands through the teachings of Christ?

These spiritual activities of 100 years are the real bases for this celebration and, as one beneficiary of these accomplishments, I am pleased to add my voice to those giving thanks on this joyful occasion.

To you, Bishop Weldon, and to all the religious and laity of our diocese, I send my most sincere best wishes at this happy time. Through your leadership, and that of your predecessors, the Springfield Diocese now begins its second century with faith and confidence in its ability to continue God's work.

Cordially yours,

— SILVIO O. CONTE,

Member of Congress.

[From the Catholic Observer, Oct. 2, 1970]

TEXT OF BISHOP WELDON'S HOMILY AT  
 CENTENNIAL MASS

(NOTE.—The following is the text of the homily preached by Bishop Christopher J. Weldon at the Centennial Mass of Thanksgiving celebrated in St. Michael's Cathedral, Sept. 26, 1970.)

"I am, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself unless it remain on the vine, so neither can you unless you abide in me. I am the vine you are the branches." (John 15:4-5)

One hundred years ago yesterday they assembled here in this very Cathedral Archbishop John McCloskey from New York, Bishop John J. Williams of Boston and Bishop John J. Conroy of Albany to consecrate a new bishop, Patrick Thomas O'Reilly.

While they were here in their own right exercising their own episcopal powers, it was, however, to implement the decrees of another bishop, the Supreme Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ on earth, Pope Pius IX.

On the fourteenth day of June, that year, 1870, Pope Pius IX had signed a decree separating the five western counties of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts—Worcester, Hampden, Hampshire, Franklin and Berkshire—from the Diocese of Boston and erecting them as a new ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

In a subsequent decree he designated Patrick Thomas O'Reilly, a priest of the Boston Diocese, pastor of St. John's Church, Worcester, to be the first bishop of the new diocese, which was to have Springfield as its Episcopal See.

During the intervening one hundred years and a day a great deal of human living has been written into the history books of both the Church and the world and it can be simply and factually stated that the now centennial diocese has made and is making a substantial contribution in both categories.

God alone knows the full record.

Few human beings would have the capacity to comprehend and appreciate even as little as 10 or 15 per cent of the total story.

We all can understand, however, that the ramifications of what was done here for God and for man during those hundred years go almost to the four corners of the earth and are still on the march.

Likewise we can understand that the story has many facets any one of which can be a lengthy study in itself.

I, therefore, will restrict myself to an expression of heartfelt gratitude and the consideration of one aspect of our lives that most appropriately can and should be highlighted on an occasion such as this and which for all too many of us is not given the attention it deserves on a day-to-day basis.

I refer to our relationship, individually and collectively, to the Vicar of Christ on earth, our Holy Father, the Pope.

We exist as a diocese because of the solicitude and care shown the people of this area by Pope Pius IX.

We have been greatly enriched through all these years by the equally dedicated spirit and service of the seven popes who have succeeded him in the Chair of Peter.

Though far removed from us in distance, and for the major part of this century in travel-time as well, they none the less have been aware of and concerned about us.

While their fatherly care has been extended to all the peoples of the earth they still have been of very great service to us.

When our first bishop died in 1892 Pope Leo XIII designated Thomas Daniel Beaven to succeed him.

Some twenty-two years later upon Bishop Beaven's death Pope Benedict XV sent us Thomas Mary O'Leary.

Following Bishop O'Leary's death in late 1949, Pope Pius XII divided the Springfield Diocese and on January 14, 1950 erected the new Diocese of Worcester.

In Christ's name he sent Bishop John Wright to the new diocese and called me to the episcopacy to come here to serve you.

It is over twenty years now that we have been laboring together for the Lord and always with a deep sense of loyalty to and union with His Vicar, whom we acknowledge ourselves privileged to call our Spiritual Father.

When the Diocese of Springfield was inaugurated in territory from the jurisdiction of Boston, both Springfield and Boston were suffragan dioceses of New York.

In 1875 New England was constituted a new ecclesiastical province with Boston as the Archdiocese by decree of Pope Pius IX.

In 1953 Pope Pius XII gave New England another ecclesiastical province covering Connecticut and Rhode Island with Hartford as the Archdiocese.

While military strategists subscribe to the principle of "Divide and Conquer," it is quite clear that the papacy, advancing the Kingdom of Christ, proceeds on the basis of "Divide and Strengthen."

All the foregoing, however, is merely the tabulating of necessary efficient procedures in the administration and development of the Church.

The more important matter of the spiritual nourishment of Christ's flock has been car-

ried on devotedly, generously, courageously and with similar efficiency, at the same time. Over one hundred and seventy-five encyclical letters were sent us by the eight popes covering this past one hundred years.

These dwelt with practically every subject concerning or touching on man's life as an individual or on his relationships to his fellow man in that life.

They have confidently and courageously led us on the path to God and true peace even when there has been extreme turbulence and distrust in the family of man.

Popes Leo XIII and Pious XI teamed to give us "Magna Chartas" as it were on the Condition of the Working Classes and Social Reconstruction.

These documents have influenced and benefited the thinking of men of practically all faiths, cultures and traditions.

Pope Pius IX and Pope John XXIII called ecumenical councils into session and Pope Paul VI reconvened the second Vatican Council interrupted by Pope John's death.

Pope St. Pius X served us well in the liturgy and the sacrament of the Eucharist.

Pope John XXIII through his encyclicals "Christianism and Social Progress" in 1961 and "Peace on Earth" in 1963 stirred the whole world in days when a steady influence was clearly, not to say desperately, needed.

Our present devoted Holy Father by his encyclicals, advancing the work and spirit of Vatican Council II, particularly "The Development of Peoples" in 1967 and "Of Human Life" in 1968; by his several journeys to lands far from the Vatican has made clear his selfless commitment to us in Christ's name.

We are deeply grateful to Christ for having so constituted His Church that we have such an office as His Vicar on earth, the successor to St. Peter who was the leader of the college of the Apostles.

Innumerable blessings came to the members and friends of the Diocese of Springfield during this first century.

With full hearts we thank both God Himself and all those He has sent us in the role of benefactors, but in a particular way we express our thanks for all we have received from and through the Holy See.

At the time Springfield started out as a diocese conditions in the world and in the Church were somewhat similar to what they are today—except, of course, for the magnification and intensification that the speed and "efficiency" of the news media give to all our problems today.

There was much trouble about the temporalities.

The so-called papal states in Italy were under military attack and eventually were overwhelmed and practically speaking confiscated.

This difficulty led to the Pope considering himself a "prisoner," as it were, in the Vatican from about 1870 to 1929.

The loss of this temporal power was, however, only one of the many trials besetting Pope Pius IX.

A false liberalism gathering momentum in many areas threatened to destroy not just the structured Church as we might call it today, but also the very essence of spirituality, faith, trust, love.

Things looked very dark and discouraging. Yet the Pope, the servant of the servants of God, stood up to the challenge of the times, to the responsibility of his office and gave a demonstration of heart-warming strength and leadership.

Pope Pius IX gave us a thrilling example of love for and trust in both God and his fellow man.

Undaunted by the calamities, misunderstandings and burdens, which might understandably have crushed him, he served the longest period of anyone as pope—some thirty-two years.

He called Vatican Council I to help straighten things out.

He gave great service to the Catholic Church throughout the world, but I would like to refer to some of his services to us here in America. He erected some 36 dioceses in this country (presently we have about 160—31 archdioceses and 129 dioceses) and created nine Vicariates Apostolic.

He even established at his own expense in Rome in 1859 a college for seminarians from the United States.

In 1854 he proclaimed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of our Blessed Lady—and as we all know, she is, under that title, the heavenly patroness of our country.

As we start our second century it is fitting that we place and keep in clear focus our relationship to the Vicar of Christ.

The same Lord gave us Pope Pius IX in the troubled times of a century ago, has given us all his successors to face and solve varying problems and puzzles since then.

He has given us our present Holy Father, Pope Paul VI, to meet the present need and challenge and to lead us safely on to the fulfillment of Christ's mission, the recognition and acceptance of our Heavenly Father's will.

We are privileged to have his personal representative in the United States as the principal celebrant of this jubilee Mass today.

We thank the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Luigi Raimondi, for being with us on this joyous occasion and we ask him to convey our message of love, loyalty and devoted service to His Holiness, Pope Paul VI.

We want very much to be branches tied in through him to the vine who is Christ.

With our Holy Father and with Christ, we want mightily to bear much and excellent fruit.

[From the Catholic Observer, Oct. 2, 1970]

CENTENNIAL MASS BEAUTIFUL, MEMORABLE

SPRINGFIELD.—One thousand of the People of God assembled in St. Michael's Cathedral on Saturday, Sept. 26, to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the Diocese of Springfield.

Untold thousands more watched the solemn, colorful ceremonies on television or listened to an account of the Mass of Thanksgiving on one of the four radio stations which broadcast the impressive ritual.

Despite unseasonal heat and a brief power failure—which stymied organists John Dunn and George Hart long enough to preclude the singing of the Gloria by the 50-voice choir of St. Paul's Choir School—the liturgy was performed admirably, with reverence and elan.

The temperature outside the Cathedral had reached 85 degrees and a slight breeze was blowing at 4 p.m., when the honor guard of the Knights of Columbus, a page out of history in their medieval dress, led the procession up the broad, hedge-lined sidewalk from State Street and into the Cathedral, where congregants were already making use of programs to create their own breeze.

Members of the honor guard carried four flags which they later positioned in the Cathedral sanctuary: the U.S. flag, the flag of Massachusetts, the flag of Springfield and the Papal flag.

Following the Knights of Columbus in the procession were the thurifer; the crucifer and acolytes; the choir; scores of priests; several provincials of Religious orders; Monsignor; more than 20 bishops (led by newly consecrated Episcopal Bishop Alexander D. Stewart), each flanked by two chaplains; Knights of Malta; Knights of Ladies of the Holy Sepulchre; the two lay readers, Earl V. Gaunt and Harry G. Graham; the deacon of the Mass, the Rev. Mr. William Cyr; and the 11 concelebrants.

Bishop Christopher J. Weldon and Archbishop Luigi Raimondi, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, were the last to enter the church.

They paused at the entrance for a brief ceremony, during which Bishop Weldon officially welcomed the Delegate for the first time to his church and Diocese by presenting him with a crucifix, which the Delegate kissed. Then Archbishop Raimondi sprinkled holy water on the congregation.

As the procession, which had initiated at the Cathedral School on Elliot Street, walked up the aisle of the Cathedral a thousand voices gave life to the thrilling words of "Lift High the Cross."

Arriving at the altar, the Archbishop first kissed and incensed it and then took his place at the president's chair, against the back wall of the church facing out over the altar at the congregation.

He pronounced the Sign of the Cross to begin the Mass proper.

It was a mass made beautiful and memorable by many elements:

The dignity of Archbishop Raimondi; The participation of the congregation. Enthusiastic throughout the Mass, it reached a peak in the singing of the Offertory hymn, "The Church's One Foundation." Father James P. Sears directed the congregational singing.

The excellence of the choir of St. Paul's Choir School, of Cambridge, directed by Theodore Marler.

The vigorous readings of the word of God by Mr. Cyr, Guantt and Graham. Graham gave an especially moving presentation of First Peter 2: 4-10, "You are a holy nation, a purchased people . . ."

The timely homily of Bishop Weldon, with its stress on the role of the Papacy.

The touching Offertory procession, which had 10 youngsters from Cathedra. School carrying the bread, wine and other materials used during the Sacrifice and presenting them, one by one, to Archbishop Raimondi.

The children were Anne Noonan from Grade 3; Lynn and Lisa Nelsen, twins from Grade 2; Rosemary Richards, Grade 3; Mary Beth Driscoll, Grade 6; Michael LaValley, Grade 4; John LaPorte and George Stec, Grade 5; Joseph Brzyz and John Ingar, Grade 6.

The unusual Prayer of the Faithful. Petitions were offered in nine languages, representing the various ethnic groups of the Diocese: English, by Atty. James Egan; French, by Wildred Forbes; Polish, by Bruno Chmura; Italian, by Pat Romano; Slovak, by Mrs. Ann Grzycki; Spanish, by Mrs. Norma Carr; Lebanese, by James Elsamar; Portuguese, by Aginaldo Santos; and Gaelic, by Father John Corbett, C.Ss.R.

A person of Lithuanian ancestry was to offer a petition in that language, but was unable to attend the Mass. In his place, Father Howard W. McCormick prayed another English petition.

The Sign of Peace. Priests distributed to everyone in the church quarter-sized medallions bearing the seal of the Diocese and the words "God's Peace Be With You" on one side, and an outline map of the four counties of the Diocese on the other.

In addition to Archbishop Raimondi and Bishop Weldon, the concelebrants of the Mass of Thanksgiving were Bishop Bernard J. Flanagan and Auxiliary Bishop Timothy J. Harrington, of Worcester; Auxiliary Bishop Thomas J. Riley of Boston; Msgr. Walter C. Connell, diocesan vicar general; Msgr. Timothy J. Leary, Cathedral rector; Msgr. Eugene E. Guerin, pastor of St. Rose de Lima Parish, Aldenville.

Also, Father John E. Aubertin, pastor of St. John Cantius Parish, Northampton; Father Adam Zajdel, O.F.M. Conv., president of St. Hyacinth College and Seminary, Granby; and Father Camillo Santini, C.S.S., pastor of O. L. of Mt. Carmel Parish, Springfield.

The bulk of the congregation was made up of four representatives from each of the 141 parishes in the Springfield Diocese.

Adding an ecumenical note to the occasion

was the presence of Bishop Stewart and Rabbi Herman E. Snyder, Rabbi emeritus of Sinai Temple, Springfield.

A centennial banquet, was held at the Highpoint Motor Inn, in Chicopee, Saturday evening.

The mass and banquet took place 100 years and a day from the date of another major event in St. Michael's Cathedral—the consecration of Springfield's first bishop, Bishop Patrick T. O'Reilly.

The date of the establishment of the Diocese was June 14, 1870.

**"IMPOSSIBLE DREAM" FESTIVAL  
ST. CLAIR, MICH.**

**HON. JAMES HARVEY**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1970

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it will be my pleasure on Saturday, October 10, to participate in a unique celebration in St. Clair, Mich. This community will be celebrating its new look in a program called the "Impossible Dream" Festival.

I believe the fine newspaper story by Dennis Shere, financial editor of the Detroit News, which appeared in that paper's September 27 edition, provides the facts on a magnificent accomplishment of a community that simply would not accept the "death of its downtown business section."

On the contrary, St. Clair's solid citizens launched their "impossible dream" to clear its dilapidated downtown buildings, thanks to a great extent to the Federal Government's urban renewal program, and to start anew.

The new downtown look includes a 31-store shopping center with an open mall; a new park along the St. Clair River; a 62-unit senior citizens apartment complex; and many other new buildings.

Cost of financing the \$5.5 million downtown redevelopment was shared by the Federal Government as well as State, city, and private resources.

Downtown St. Clair stands as the finest example of cooperative effort by all levels of government and, most importantly, by all the people involved.

I am proud to salute the citizens of St. Clair. The newspaper article follows:

**ST. CLAIR'S DOWNTOWN THRIVES: A  
COMMUNITY IS REBORN  
(By Dennis Shere)**

ST. CLAIR, MICH.—Eight years ago, you couldn't buy a pair of shoes in this community of 4,800 because there was no shoe store.

The only grocery store was small, and it was next to impossible to steer a cart down its narrow aisles.

Finding a parking space in downtown St. Clair was a nerve-grating experience. There was no parking lot, just a few spaces on Riverside, the main street.

St. Clair's downtown was dying in 1962, and these were just a few of the signs.

There were eight empty stores, out of about 30, and the city's residents were spending three-quarters of their disposable income outside St. Clair, in nearby communities like Port Huron and Marine City.

Local business leaders like George Thompson, owner of a furniture store, and Franklin Moore, president of the town's only bank,

realized that unless something was done, St. Clair would soon have, figuratively at least, a ghost downtown.

"I felt if we didn't do something about it, shopping centers would spring up around us," Thompson said.

Indeed, a group of investors bought some land on the outskirts of St. Clair and told city officials they had been approached by a large chain store that wanted to use the land for a shopping center.

Thompson, Moore and several other businessmen met with city officials urging them to take action. As a result, a Detroit consulting firm was hired.

The firm's recommendation, put in rough-est terms, was, "rip out the downtown and start over."

That recommendation met opposition from some townspeople who liked the community just as it was.

"Some didn't have high horizons," explained John C. Cobourn, who was mayor of St. Clair when the redevelopment decisions were made.

"We felt we had to go for an all or nothing deal," he said.

Cobourn said that despite the opposition, he felt most townspeople issued a "mandate" by electing to city offices those who supported redevelopment of the downtown.

What St. Clair did was to ask the federal government for urban renewal funds to clear out the dilapidated downtown buildings. At the same time, 56 of the city's residents formed the St. Clair Progress Corp., a non-profit organization that could undertake the redevelopment with federal assistance.

Each of the 56 citizens chipped in \$100 as "seed money" and some local philanthropists donated additional money.

The project area was the entire downtown—46 acres, nine blocks long and two blocks wide.

Demolition began in June, 1967. Now, more than three years later, St. Clair is getting ready to celebrate the reality of its "impossible dream." The city will formally dedicate the new downtown during a one-day festival on October 10.

St. Clair's new look downtown includes: A 31-store shopping center with an open mall.

A park along the St. Clair River.

A 62-unit senior citizen apartment complex.

Several other new stores.

In addition, the city and state have constructed a 102-slip boat harbor. Richard Caruso, St. Clair's urban renewal director, said the harbor is attracting 1,000 boaters into the city on weekends.

Cost of financing the \$5.5 million redevelopment were borne by the federal government, as well as state, city and private resources.

Caruso said St. Clair's redevelopment comprises one of the few urban renewal projects encompassing an entire downtown—though it is obviously on a small scale compared with projects in major cities.

Caruso also pointed out that the shopping center development is unusual because the merchants are purchasing their stores instead of renting space.

Moore, president of the Commercial and Savings Bank of St. Clair County, explained that "we decided we didn't want to have an out-of-town developer come in, build our business district, own it and rent to everybody. We wanted local people to own it."

Because it was an urban renewal project most of the merchants in the shopping center have been able to secure low-interest loans from either Moore's bank or the Small Business Administration.

The downtown redevelopment has made businessmen like Thompson highly competitive even outside St. Clair.

Raymond Gellein, executive director of

the St. Clair Progress Corp., said business in St. Clair has jumped from \$2.5 million in 1965 to \$8 million this year.

"And we're a long way from reaching our peak," he says.

Thompson opened a 40,000-square-foot furniture store in the new shopping center. The store has 121 room displays and has become an attraction for out-of-towners.

**THE ASSAULT ON AMERICAN  
INDUSTRY**

**HON. CRAIG HOSMER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1970

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important speech by Mr. Robert Anderson, president and chief operating officer of North American Rockwell Corp., about the so-called Military-Industrial Complex.

As one who represents a district with a large amount of defense and aerospace industry, I was pleased to read Mr. Anderson's speech, which places these important industries in their true perspective.

The speech was excerpted in the latest issue of the Aerospace Industries Association publication, Aerospace. The story follows:

**THE ASSAULT ON AMERICAN INDUSTRY**

The military-industrial relationship that we hear so much about in this country was not invented in 1968 or 1969.

It existed for nearly two hundred years, but it's only become a significant factor with the advent of sophisticated weapons systems which demand the closest teamwork between industry and the government.

That teamwork has meant much to this nation's security.

Yet, despite the high priority we all place on national survival, the defense industry today is being subjected to incredible denunciation. The attack has a violence unparalleled in American history.

Although some of the provocative headlines would have us believe otherwise, most Americans do not believe that large corporations are inherently evil, or that preparation for defense is of itself immoral.

Yet so vehement have been the attacks, that many sincere people are troubled when they read of excessive profits, cost overruns, lack of government control over expenditures, and so on.

We have a two-fold danger facing us in the continued harassment by those who oppose this relationship. The first is the undermining of public confidence in the integrity of defense procurement. The other is the destruction of morale of the dedicated men and women who are part of the defense establishment—whether in government or industry.

I can't be entirely objective in my approach, for North American Rockwell is one of the nation's major aerospace contractors and was recently awarded the very large Air Force B-1 weapons system contract.

However, I do believe there are two factors that enable me to take a broad view of the entire controversy. First, North American Rockwell is one of the major aerospace companies that is substantially engaged in both commercial and government activities. Also, in my own case, because I came from the automotive industry less than three years ago, I believe I can view the matter with a new perspective.

## LARGEST MANUFACTURING EMPLOYER

Aerospace represents a great portion of American industry. There are one million, two hundred thousand people employed in building this country's military and commercial aircraft, its defense missiles, its space vehicles, its advanced guidance systems and its rocket engines. It's the largest manufacturing employer in the nation.

Aerospace in 1969 had sales of more than \$28 billion. Its export sales of more than \$3.1 billion made it the biggest industrial contributor to our balance of payments.

The opponents of this business, which has contributed so much to the military security and the economic growth of the country, have rallied around the phrase, "The military industrial complex," giving the words an accusatory ring.

It was General Eisenhower, as you know, who originated the phrase when he urged the nation to guard against "the acquisition of unwarranted influence by this complex," and he has been quoted out of context ever since. Completely lost in the sound and fury created by those who picked up only the partial statement is the full meaning of his remarks. "A vital element in keeping the peace," General Eisenhower continued, "is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction. . . . We can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions."

It is essential to keep in mind that the role of the military/industrial complex is not in making public policy, but in carrying it out. Viewed in that respect, industry and government must work together toward common goals. It would be a national disgrace if they did not.

## THE CHARGES

One of these pertains to the size of the defense and aerospace industry. "Most of the big military contractors," they say, "could not survive without weapons business,"—with the implication that corporations are influencing defense expenditures.

True, there are a handful of major aerospace companies almost entirely devoted to government work. However, according to *Moody's Industrials*, the defense portion of the 25 largest prime defense producers in 1969 accounted for less than one-seventh of their total business. Most aerospace companies are becoming increasingly diversified, with a wide range of commercial and industrial endeavors. Typically, they subcontract half of their prime contracts.

Let me assure you that American industry can survive without the so-called "crutch" of defense spending. Nevertheless, the defense industry is being hurt badly by the ceaseless attack on the integrity of its highly skilled employees who see years of dedicated effort being dismissed as of no importance or as of outright moral harm.

Another belief propagated is that spending for aerospace and defense needs has grown during the past five or six years at the expense of providing for health, income security, aid to the poor, education, and other social programs.

First, let me emphasize that it is the elected representatives of the people, and not industry, who rightfully set national priorities.

The significance of Congressional-established national priorities was stated with great clarity last December by Dr. Arthur Burns, now chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, who said, "The explosive increase of federal spending during (the decade of the '60s) is commonly attributed to the defense establishment, or more simply to the war in Viet Nam.

"The fact is, however," Dr. Burns continued, "that civilian programs are the preponderant cause of the growth of the federal budget. When we compare the budget of 1964 with the estimates for this fiscal year, we find that total federal spending shows a rise of \$74 billion, while defense outlays are larger by only \$23 billion. . . . Thus, the basic fiscal fact is that spending for social programs now dominates our public budgets."

Dr. Burns' comments are underscored by the fact that in this current fiscal year, we will spend less on defense as a percentage of our gross national product—7 percent—than in any one year in the past 20 years.

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

This country is in second place behind the Soviet Union in the development of new weapons system. Let me repeat, we are behind the Russians at this moment.

The Soviet Union has invested the equivalent of \$16 billion this year in defense-related research, development and applications. What has the United States allocated?

\$13 billion—\$3 billion less than the Soviet Union.

Those figures, by the way, are taken from statements by Dr. John S. Foeter, Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

What adds to the seriousness of this lagging research and development effort is the certainty that never again will we have the luxury of time to catch up if an enemy attacks. Never again will we have the nearly two years between the invasion of Belgium and the sinking of the Lusitania. Never again will we have a year and more between the battle of Britain and the disaster at Pearl Harbor.

Defense-related research and development is a vital activity.

However, the critics are suspicious of any activity, including research and development, because of what they contend are the "fat profits" in aerospace participation.

## DEFENSE PROFITS

The most penetrating and exhaustive analysis of corporate profits was a study by the Logistics Management Institute, a non-profit organization, which compared the profits of 40 companies substantially engaged in defense production, with 3,500 companies not engaged in defense.

The results of this broad-based analysis showed that profit on sales for the commercial and industrial companies was almost double that for defense-related works, and profit on investment in non-defense efforts, since 1963, was 40 per cent to 74 per cent greater.

At North American Rockwell, we've had a striking demonstration of this disparity in percentage of profits. Our Commercial Products Group, last year, had sales which amounted to only 40 per cent of the \$2.6 billion corporate total—yet that group contributed over 75 per cent of our entire corporate earnings.

What could be more graphic than those percentage figures?

Related to this matter of profits is another popular myth about the supposedly low risk involved in aerospace programs. The critics would have the public believe there is no risk in advancing the frontiers of technology; or to the extent there is risk, that the federal government underwrites all the risk involved in space and defense programs.

Again, the facts just do not support this belief.

## FINANCIAL RISKS

Until recently, when there was a change in the contract ground rules, financial risk had shifted so heavily to the industry side that a company could be betting its corporate existence that it would be able to remain afloat while producing the goods or services required by the government.

As an automotive man, I was amazed by my first encounter with the Total Package Procurement Concept.

The fixed-price total package procurement process embraces the entire span of a program from concept through development, into production. The concept was supposed to eliminate both schedule slips and unpredictable cost increases. Further, it was intended to balance the contractor's commitment along the thin line between appropriate financial risk, on the one hand, and catastrophic corporate loss on the other.

In practice, the concept not only delayed the procurement of many needed systems and equipment, but it also fostered an utterly unrealistic budgeting process.

The *Harvard Business Review* referred to this concept as "being at war with reality." It simply did not recognize the facts of life as known by American industry.

Can you imagine an automobile manufacturer contracting at a fixed price to deliver a model 1977 automobile six years from now? And an automobile, let me add, is infinitely less complicated than a modern weapons system.

That's exactly what was asked of the aerospace industry.

Those much-publicized cost overruns were not synonymous with waste; neither were they a symbol of excess in progress. Rather, they were the surface reflection of the cost uncertainties inherent in developing and manufacturing advance systems.

No business is ever perfect, of course, but what is never captured in the blazing headlines of cost overruns is the reality of endless changes, of inflation, of the costly impact of solving problems which could not be foreseen. These are the realities which accompany the advancement of technological frontiers.

Under Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard we have new, positive, realistic thinking on this contract question. Recently, he issued a milestone directive that talks common sense regarding improvement in the management of programs, the necessity for practical trade-offs between operating requirements and engineering design, risk assessment, and sensible program scheduling.

The Secretary placed his finger on the solution when he said, "When risks have been reduced to the extent that realistic pricing can take place, fixed-price type contracts should be used."

## AEROSPACE EXPERTISE

With the major contracts now being let by the Department of Defense, industry will be able to fulfill its responsibilities more effectively and efficiently than in the past. They allow the latitude necessary in developing these highly complex, highly sophisticated weapons systems, while at the same time giving the government its full dollar's worth.

## AEROSPACE EXPERTISE

In this troubled world beset by man-made problems in population, in transportation, in housing, in communications, and in pollution, there is need for exactly the type of expertise demonstrated by the aerospace industry during this past year in America.

The problems facing us are gigantic, nation-wide, even world-wide in scope. Their solution will require technical skill and management skill of the highest order. The best management, in terms of inventiveness is in the industry that has built the world's foremost supersonic, transonic, and hypersonic aircraft; the industry that has developed "miracle" guidance systems; the industry that has ringed this nation with defensive

ICBMs, and bridged the gap to the moon. But I do not want to leave you with the mistaken impression that we stand now as pillars of strength ready to take on all adversaries. We have been hurt by this endless tirade of abuse, and all of us in business must act vigorously to overcome this constant erosion of American defense capability.



We are determined to resist that erosion. This nation must continue its technological leadership. To default, to let that leadership slip away to Russia without further protest, means the passive acceptance of major risks in our national security.

And without security all else is fruitless. America's defense shield must not be shaped by harangue and denunciation and newspaper headlines.

It must continue to be forged in the councils of the Presidency, within the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and in the Congress of the United States.

The need for a strong industrial base, for a strong, free American industry to help carry out their decisions, is self evident.

In this technological age, let us continue to answer the world-wide technological challenge.

Let the industry that has responded so many times before get on with the job.

### THE PALESTINIAN LINE

#### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Arabs and Jews alike have achieved some extraordinary achievements of late in the critical area of maintaining peace in the Middle East.

Many hundreds of other people the world over have also put their minds and energies to the task of improving Israel's relations with her neighbors.

This atmosphere of reasoned calmness is encouraging and yet there are still those who rattle the war swords, who still deluge us with false propaganda and who, if we are not aware of their deceitfulness, can lead that part of the world back into chaos.

I recommend to all my colleagues who are interested in the truth about Israeli-Arab relations the following editorial by Mr. Charles Dancy which appeared on October 5, 1970, in the Peoria Journal Star:

#### THE PALESTINIAN "LINE"

(By C. L. Dancy)

The recent chorus of the doctrine that "the Mideast situation will never be solved until the parties recognize the Palestinians have a right to a voice and an entity" is a rather new and mysterious fact of 1970.

In the midst of the mass hijackings that "shocked the entire civilized world", not all the "civilized world" was really shocked. The New York Times wasn't. They dismissed the hijacking crisis, the lives of 400 innocent international travelers from many countries, with a line or two and went on to discuss how it demonstrated the necessity to come to grips with the problem of the Palestinians and their rights.

Earlier, network coverage introduced the same claim, the idea that peace in the Mideast must be based on the rights of the Palestinians.

What is curious about the present propaganda pitch for a "Palestinian state" is that there was dead silence on this subject for 20 years—then suddenly, in concert, a chorus that is "basic", "essential", inevitable, and all the rest.

Why, if it was so at the root of things, was there no hint of this burning desire and burning necessity for 20 years? And why did it suddenly surface so abruptly and pervasively?

The idea of a Palestinian state (and a Jewish state) was first proposed by the United Nations in the 1948 study of that part of the world. The idea was promptly, flatly, and abusively rejected out of hand by Egypt, by Jordan, by Syria, by Lebanon, by Iraq, etc., and by the Palestinians, themselves.

Instead, they attacked Israel, in concert, and staked out Egyptian, Jordanian, Syrian, etc. claims to the territories in Palestine. Their armies failed to make those claims good, although Jordan did manage to seize Old Jerusalem (which the UN proposed should become an international city not part of a new Palestinian state much less part of Jordan) and Samaria, etc.

That was in 1948, and it was not until 1968, rather suddenly, that Palestinians abruptly began to chorus the "Palestinian state" line, obviously with the blessing of the Communist powers that began heavily subsidizing their activities then and the blessing of the Arab countries which "hosted" them and their training camps.

It is a brand new political ploy, therefore, of the enemies of Israel—Arab, Soviet and Chinese—freshly invented after non-existence for a 20 year period (and rejection prior to that, by the same folks whipping it up now).

For their "party line" to be grabbed and touted as a "solution" to the Middle East problem by supposed "friends" of Israel and of freedom in the United States is a sucker game.

Yet, it has taken place, with the usual sources acting in chorus, once again, and adopting as the ideal American policy that which was clearly conceived just two years ago by those who wish America no good. For purposes of simplicity, one might truthfully say that the Soviet policy designed to deal with losing the 1967 war, and making Israel vulnerable once again, is being touted as an ideal "American policy" which we are supposed to pressure Israel into adopting!

Another emerging "line" that defeat "only made the Arabs more intransigent, more desperate and more fanatic and the only answer is appeasement" is also pure nonsense.

Israel clobbered Egypt in 1956, after a wave of fedayeen terrorism, and for 11 years thereafter the "guerrilla problem" was insignificant. Indeed, for more than a full year after the 1967 defeat, the problem remained insignificant.

The "fanaticism" and intransigence did not emerge from that defeat. Peace was within reach. Arab-populated areas were safe and peaceful. It was there.

The new wave of terrorism began almost a year and half later when the Arabs were convinced they had a protector and supplier in the Soviet Union, and when guerrillas were being financed, trained, and armed by Communist powers.

And just how "desperate" and determined and willing to give their lives for this dedicated cause were they then? Enough to plant a dynamite truck in Jerusalem with a time clock, while they ran away and hid. Enough to sneak across at night, set up an ambush on a road, and bazooka a school bus full of children—but not an army patrol of three armed men!

Enough to flood Amman and seek political power, but not enough to make a single determined attack with a small earth stockade manned against an outpost deep in Syria by less than a hundred youngsters, men and women, operating as soldiers-farmers.

That is the reality. Soviet support, protection, encouragement, money and arms has managed to promote sneak raids aimed at unarmed civilians by very small groups, and creation of large masses of armed men who engage in loud talk and internal politics, only.

It is an artificial situation. Meanwhile, tens of thousands of Palestinian Arabs very cheerfully volunteer to work in Israeli areas for more money than ever before!

There are a good many more Palestinians at peace than in the entire complex of "guerrilla" organizations.

The politics of terror will not bring true representation nor improvement in the situation of Palestinian Arabs.

And the politics of terror holds no sane promise for peace in the Middle East. To proclaim a policy in the U.S. that relies on an alliance with the politics of terror is rather weird.

To proclaim it as a "peace policy" is worse than weird.

### HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS CARRY ON THE FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM

#### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, too often the pragmatic pressures of political necessity and the everyday reality of co-existence with the Communists make us forget that much of the world barely subsists in a struggle for survival under Red rule. Those who have once experienced Communist domination, however, never forget it, and the fortunate few who have escaped it carry on the fight wherever and however they can.

One group which has made a concerted effort to keep up a kind of resistance movement outside their homeland is the Hungarian freedom fighters. Their primary weapons are their own vivid memories and the power of the printed word. Following is a summary of some of their recent activities:

#### HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS CARRY ON THE FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM

The World Federation of Hungarian Freedom Fighters held its sixth Congress in London, United Kingdom, between August 28 and 31 of this year. The Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation U.S.A. was represented by its president, Dr. Andras Fogany, its co-president, Istvan B. Gereben, Washington, D.C., and two of its Executive Committee members, Gyorgy Lovas, New York City, and Dr. Attila Sooky, Pittsburgh.

The meetings were chaired by General Lajos Veress de Dalnok, president of the World Federation of Hungarian Freedom Fighters, a resident of London and frequent visitor to the United States. President Veress is a much decorated soldier who in 1944 was captured by the Nazis and sentenced to death for his resistance to totalitarian German domination of Hungary. His sentence was later reduced to life imprisonment. By the war's end he escaped in the confusion of the retreat of the defeated German Army and assumed a prominent role in the underground opposition to Russian rule of Hungary. In 1947 General Veress was among the several members of the underground who were sentenced to death for their activities by the Soviet controlled coalition government. This sentence also was altered to life imprisonment. He was freed in 1956 by the freedom fighters during the revolution. He is president of the World Federation of Hungarian Freedom Fighters since 1962. He has been reelected for four terms.

The World Federation of Hungarian Freedom Fighters was organized by the former

participants of the Hungarian Revolution, now living in various countries of the Free World. The organization has approximately 10,000 members.

The Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation U.S.A.—a member organization of the World Federation of Hungarian Freedom Fighters—is a fraternal, educational and charitable organization.

The Federation on behalf of the enslaved Hungarian nation, which is forced to live under the worst regime of terror in its long history, and in the immortal spirit of freedom born anew on the bloody streets of Budapest in 1956, and in accordance with sixteen United Nations Resolutions emphatically works for the implementation of the demands of the Hungarian people as expressed during the revolution:

1. Withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary in accordance with the 1947 peace treaty.
2. Immediate release of all political prisoners, including the countless Hungarians still in far away Russian Siberia.
3. Restoration of the right to self-determination by internationally supervised free elections with the participation of multiple political parties. Hungary is entitled to choose freely which political, economic social and cultural systems should govern her.

In order to achieve these demands the federation considers one of its main purposes to inform the American public about the history, accomplishments and plight for liberty of the Hungarian people. Serving this purpose the Federal sponsors two English language publications: a periodical, The Hungarian Freedom Fighter and a newsletter, The Fight for Freedom. The federation also publishes in Hungarian the Magyar Szabadsagharcos, aimed to the Hungarian speaking members, and Uzenet/Message sent into Hungary through regular mail. The Federation published a book: The Hungarian Revolution in Perspective edited by Francis S. Wagner.

#### VOLUNTEER ARMY

### HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1970

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Dodge City Globe, Mr. Jack Chegwidan, recently wrote a straight-from-the-hip editorial regarding the proposed streamlining of our Armed Forces that I think should be required reading for all those, including myself, who are intent on improving our military service.

Jack Chegwidan's editorials in Dodge's newspaper are always down to earth and full of that commodity so rare in Congress—commonsense. I commend his editorial to the attention of my colleagues, especially the veterans of the "old Army." Mr. Chegwidan's article follows:

#### EDITORIALS—VOLUNTEER ARMY

The U.S. Army isn't what it used to be.

Reveille call is on the way out for the volunteer Army, as are seven-day work weeks and that old sergeant's favorite "make work." The final decision rests with Army Chief of Staff William C. Westmoreland.

Brig. Gen. James Adamson, chief of the group studying ways to make the Army more attractive, and all-volunteers at the same time, is one who advocates dispensing with reveille, midnight inspections and "make

work." In fact, there are some 800 things that need working out to make a volunteer Army a going concern. They call it "streamlining."

Apparently the soldier of tomorrow will be awakened with gentle music, may report for work on his own volition, and possibly have a 40-hour work week, or less.

We, who served under the old Army system, will be watching with interest to see what kind of top fighting man the new "kill 'em with kindness" treatment will produce. Of course the "new" Army man of tomorrow may want to belong to a union, and engage in collective bargaining with the U.S. government. After all, those in a volunteer Army will include many mercenaries. We wonder if strikes will be authorized.

We can just hear the sergeant in the new volunteer Army say: "Would you gentlemen care to fall in?"

Or the boot camp sergeant might say to the recruit private: "Your quarters look a little sloppy today. Your bed isn't made. Maybe you had better change your maid service."

How about the reading of the "Code of Conduct" to the men? (World War II vets remember this as Articles of War.) Wouldn't this be harsh? After all, is this not the volunteer Army and they need to be handled with kid gloves—to keep the service attractive, of course.

And the new volunteer soldier will surely have the option of quitting under fire and resign, or terminate for insufficient wages.

We are, of course, being overly facetious. However, we cringe at the thought of a milk-toast Army as compared to an Army where men are men, able to take anything that comes along and ask for more.

But we must keep in mind—de-escalation of all that is military is popular now. Yet we will become a vulnerable nation without a hardcore of tough fighting men.

#### PROPOSING A MORATORIUM ON PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSIONS

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, for many years there has been a standard formula, politically almost sure-fire, for responding to difficult problems: appoint a committee to study them. After the savage city riots of 1967, we had the Presidential Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence—the Kerner Commission. After the wave of violence and terrorism culminating in the disruption of a third of the Nation's colleges and universities last May, we had the Presidential Commission on Campus Unrest—the Scranton commission. Between them, they seem to have set a pattern for Presidential commissions, which is more than enough reason to declare a moratorium on them.

The pattern is roughly this: to spend large amounts of money—\$680,000 for the Scranton commission in just 3 months—to produce a massive, agonized bleat that the Nation is in very bad shape, that the rioters are right, but that it's a shame they aren't milder and more decent in their righteousness. The real fault lies, so the commissions tell us, with the ordinary American who just can't see why his country should be torn apart.

The reports of both these Presidential commissions are ultimately based on two unstated but clearly evident premises: that truth is irrelevant, and that evil does not exist. Since most Americans would hardly agree with either, it is not surprising that they are found chiefly to blame.

To take the more recent report in particular, the Scranton commission has a great deal to say about student opinion on the Vietnam war. But as Vice President Agnew rightly pointed out in South Dakota, September 29:

The commission tells us that many students believe ours is a corrupt repressive society engaged in an immoral war—but the commission could not muster the moral courage to declare the utter falsehood of that charge.

The Commission repeatedly recommended that we bring the Vietnam war to an end, apparently in deference to student feelings, but had not a word to say about how we might begin convincing them that our defense of South Vietnam against Communist aggression and terrorism was and is right. This undoubtedly would be difficult, perhaps even impossible, but since it is the truth, we ought to try. But the Commission does not appear to be much interested in truth.

It is even less interested in evil, because evidently in the happily pluralistic minds of the commissioners, there is no such thing. Violence is rejected, even condemned. Some acts are called "despicable" which are exactly that. But we are told that virtually all of those who engage in such acts do so for the very highest motives, in an excess of youthful idealism and disillusionment with the hypocrisy of their elders and the imperfections in America.

Clearly, many confused and originally well-meaning young people are drawn into disruptive protests and even into violence without actually willing it in advance. Just as clearly, there are others who intended violence and terrorism all along. The Scranton Commission rises to its one lone paragraph mentioning the role of the "agitator"—its relatively mild term for the professional revolutionary. According to the commission the agitator can only work in "an atmosphere of tension, frustration, and dissent. What, then, created this atmosphere? The 'agitator' theory cannot answer this question."

The answer, of course, is that the agitators did create the atmosphere, by building up minor grievances and taking advantage of the permissiveness of educators who share the commission's views on the irrelevance of truth and the non-existence of evil. The commission could have found out just how that works by studying the published writings and recorded operations of the Communist Party in any country where it has taken over or has established a strong foothold.

The utter superficiality of the Scranton Commission's thinking and "research" is most vividly apparent in its chief recommendation: That President Nixon should give some sort of speech along the lines of ex-President Lyndon

Johnson's "Come, let us reason together" and then everything will be all right.

This is the counsel of a bewildered child. The times call for men.

**UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS MUST STAND FIRM AGAINST LAWLESSNESS, VIOLENCE, AND ANARCHY**

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as colleges and universities open for the fall semester throughout the Nation, it is most important that officials of these institutions of higher learning stand firm against possible acts of renewed violence and lawlessness on campuses.

In this connection and because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place my recent newsletter, Capitol Comments, in the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

**UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS MUST STAND FIRM AGAINST LAWLESSNESS, VIOLENCE, AND ANARCHY**

As our colleges and universities open for the fall sessions, Administrators and other university officials in many areas of our Nation are bracing for possible acts of renewed violence and lawlessness on campuses.

This week I was privileged to hear an address by Chancellor Alexander Heard of Vanderbilt University, appointed by the President to report on campus unrest throughout the country. His address was analytical and thought-provoking.

In many schools new and more stringent rules have been adopted in an effort to prevent outbreaks of violence and to better control incidents should they occur.

The President and other national leaders are urging University Administrators, Presidents and officials to stand firm this year against the small minority of students that threaten to disrupt many of our institutions of higher learning.

Many leaders in government and education have indicated that this could be a crucial year in the history of higher education in America.

These leaders fear that continued and worsening disruptions will destroy many major universities as we know them today. In some areas students have learned to manufacture bombs and university buildings have been bombed and shattered—with resultant deaths.

A small minority of anarchists must not be permitted to rule our campuses and universities through terror, intimidation and destruction.

Educators have said that many of those involved in disturbances in the past are either dropouts or part-time students who take only a few courses to maintain a student status. Certainly these individuals must not be permitted to use our universities and colleges as a vehicle for fomenting violence.

The great majority of students who attend classes want to receive their education, and this must be guaranteed to them—the right to develop their God-given potential and birthright. Education is the key to this Nation's growth, success and progress.

Certainly the right of dissent is guaranteed by the Constitution. The Constitution guarantees the right of peaceful assembly and

petition—but it does not guarantee immunity for those who would destroy, bomb and kill as a form of protest.

We must maintain law and order on our college campuses which traditionally have been the citadels of reason, contemplation, study and development of the intellect.

The rule of reason—and not the rule of terror—must prevail.

**GRAND PRAIRIE SENIOR SPEAKS OUT ON DRUGS**

**HON. JAMES M. COLLINS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1970

Mr. COLLINS, Mr. Speaker, Grand Prairie senior students took a realistic appraisal of the drug problem confronting teenagers. In this progressive high school there is a close interchange between students, faculty, and administration.

The students wrote a theme regarding drugs and their dangers. Students can discuss student problems best when discussing with their classmates. The clearest statement was by Nancy McGlathlin who speaks from a high school senior's heart.

We are all proud of the enlightened leadership where Browning Combs is superintendent of schools and Earl Tom Keel is coordinator of secondary education and music.

Nancy is an excellent student, but behind every good student is an inspiring teacher. In serving on the Education Committee here, in Congress, I am impressed more and more with the importance of strong, teaching leadership. So, I want to thank Mr. Bellas Thrasher, senior English teacher, for his stimulating motivation.

Here is the essay written by Nancy McGlathlin:

**TOO HIGH A PRICE**

Few high school students realize the dangers associated with using drugs. Not only are drugs harmful from the physical and mental standpoints, but also from the social standpoint. Losing the love of family, the respect of friends, and all self-esteem, is a high price to pay for "turning on" with pot or pills.

The relations between members of a family are strained or completely broken when drugs enter the home. Many teens turn to stealing and lying to support their habit, while trying to hide their actions from objecting parents. The family withdraws from the active community in order to shield the wayward youth. As the drugs begin to take effect, the youth becomes irresponsible toward duties as a family member and upsets the entire household.

As the drug user withdraws deeper into this protective shell of drugs, his old friends begin to shun his new image. He lies about his feelings, telling his friends and himself, that he has found something better than friendship. In an effort to be deep and philosophical, he becomes unresponsive, and finally finds himself alone. His "new friends" are merely kids sharing a common problem—not really "friends" at all—for they are unable to help him.

The drug user often finds that he can't be himself anymore. He is expected, by himself and others, to play his new role. He

realizes the mess he's in but is unable to find his way back. Self hate forms as he must admit to himself that he has made the wrong decision about drugs.

The drug user may overcome his social barriers not only through the counseling and therapy of various drug organizations, but also through the aid of concerned friends who are sympathetic to his problem. With this help, he can, in time, make new friends, regain his responsibility and self respect, and return to a normal life.

**YOUTH—DUE PRAISE**

**HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, recently I submitted for the RECORD an article entitled, "Student Activism." The article stressed how the majority of our young Americans are engaged in worthwhile projects across the Nation. Today I would like to spotlight one of these worthy projects. Distributive Education Clubs of America, better known as DECA, are youth-oriented clubs interested in marketing, merchandising, and management.

National president of DECA's high school division this year is David Colburn of South Carolina. This young man gave an outstanding speech at a recent Washington breakfast explaining in detail the purposes and functions of this valuable organization.

The address follows:

**DECA—WHAT IT IS—WHAT IT DOES**

**WHAT IS HE?**

Distributive Education identifies a program of instruction which teaches marketing, merchandising and management.

**WHAT IS DECA?**

DECA identifies the Program of Youth Activity relating to DE—Distributive Education Clubs of America—and is designed to develop future leaders for marketing and distribution.

DECA is the only national youth organization operating in the nation's schools to attract young people to careers in marketing and distribution.

**DECA AND THE STUDENT**

DE students have common objectives and interests in that each is studying for a specific career objective. DECA activities have a tremendous psychological effect upon the attitudes of students and many have no other opportunity to participate in social activities of the school or to develop responsibilities of citizenship.

DECA members learn to serve as leaders and followers, and have opportunity for state and national recognition that they would not have otherwise.

**DECA AND THE SCHOOL**

DECA Chapter activities are always school-centered, thus contributing to the school's purpose of preparing well-adjusted, employable citizens. Chapter activities serve the Teacher-Coordinator as a teaching tool by creating interest in all phases of marketing and distribution study, and serve as an avenue of expression for individual talent.

The Chapter is the "show window" for student achievement and progress, and is the public relations arm of the DE instructional program. It attracts students to the DE pro-

gram who are interested in marketing management and distribution careers and assists in subject matter presentation.

#### DECA AND THE COMMUNITY

DECA members have made numerous studies and surveys to aid the economic development of their own community. Individual and group marketing projects continue to encourage this type of contribution.

Many businesses favor hiring DE students because of their interest in training and their related school study of that particular business. Many leaders in business and government have praised the DECA program for its civic-related activities.

#### DECA AND THE NATION

DE instruction and DECA activity constantly emphasize America's system of competition and private enterprise. Self-help among students is the rule rather than the exception, and DECA leaders give constant encouragement to continued education.

History has proven that whenever a nation's channels of distribution fail to function, that nation is short-lived. As DECA attracts more of our nation's youth to study marketing and distribution, the total DE program becomes a vital necessity to our national security.

#### NATIONAL DECA WEEK

The purposes of National DECA Week are to call attention to the Distributive Education program, to enhance the educational facilities of your school, and to highlight the activities of DECA. The date is set annually by the Board of Directors, and has traditionally been held to coincide with *American Education Week*. Promotional materials are made available to Chapters and State Associations at a nominal cost.

#### THE DECA CREED

I believe in the future which I am planning for myself in the field of distribution, and in the opportunities which my vocation offers.

I believe in fulfilling the highest measure of service to my vocation, my fellow beings, my country and my God—that by so doing, I will be rewarded with personal satisfaction and material wealth.

I believe in the democratic philosophies of private enterprise and competition, and in the freedoms of this nation—that these philosophies allow for the fullest development of my individual abilities.

I believe that by doing my best to live according to these high principles, I will be of greater service both to myself and to mankind.

I have a story which I would like to relate to you. Please listen carefully.

After the takeover, they told me that the words they scrawled above the entrance to the Capitol simply read, "We Hate Your Country." They also told me that there really wasn't much left of what was once the greatest city in the world. It seems that they had managed to reach this city without any difficulty whatsoever.

I came to the conclusion that somewhere along the line, something went wrong somewhere.

At first, I couldn't believe that corruption and wickedness had actually been allowed to breed among the highest levels of a once economically stable government.

They did it all across the nation, so I'm told—everything went to pieces—total confusion.

My history professor told me that it would never had happened if only there had existed some driving force, some motivating concern, of the young people themselves, for their great nation and its philosophies.

After all of the worrying and debating about maintaining that essential balance of power, we ended up destroying our own selves.

This is a nightmare; however, it could realistically happen except for one factor—the youth of today will not allow this nightmare to exist.

So you may ask: What is today's youth doing to show their concern for the direction of this nation?

125,000 young members of the Distributive Education Club of America have a creed in which they believe. It's called the DECA Creed. Listen to what it says along with my own interpretations.

#### VERSE 1

Nowadays you don't hear too many persons saying "I believe in the future." We of DECA believe in the future, not only our future but also our country's as well. We're concerned about our country's economic future and we are planning for futures in the field of distribution. We are also aware that our respective vocations will open the door to unlimited opportunities for us. The fact is that we are the future leaders in marketing and distribution.

#### VERSE 2

How much are we willing to give? We of DECA are going to put everything we have into life for the purpose of attaining our objectives. What we get out of life is the end results of our input. Our input is measured by the services we, in fact, render to our own vocation, our fellow man, our country, and our God. In the same sense, our rewards are measured by the personal satisfaction which we obtain from giving of our selves. Along with this comes material wealth.

#### VERSE 3

We of DECA are acutely aware of the importance of private enterprise and competition to our nation's wellbeing. Not only do we acquire an understanding but also we develop a respect for these philosophies. What can we say about freedom? Freedom was acquired by our forefathers and ever since that time it has persevered because Americans valued it enough as far as to sacrifice their lives for it. DECA believes in the American system because under this system, each of us has the chance to fully develop our own individual talents and abilities. This is what America is all about. America is government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

We of DECA respect the lawmakers of this nation's government for displaying the competence and leadership desperately needed during such critical and trying times.

#### VERSE 4

This speaks for itself. The 125,000 members of the Distributive Education Club of America are, in fact, young crusaders.

We are flag raisers—not burners; patriots—not anarchists; freedom lovers—not draft card burners; and also

We are potential business leaders—not dead weights.

This is our creed. We live by its philosophies and yet, it is basically a guideline in which all mankind should believe.

There is no need for fear of a nightmare because, standing in the path of the present undermining forces, is a brick wall composed of 100,000 dedicated young people. There are other brick walls present also. However, we still need more support; we need support for this nation's lawmakers, by the powers needed in determining the directions this country needs to take.

If you are really concerned about today's youth and this country's future, you will lend a helping hand. We of DECA need your personal and legislative support, and, needless to say, this country needs DECA and thousands more like us.

Yes, we believe in the future.

DAVID COLBURN,  
President, Distributive Education Clubs  
of America, South Carolina.

#### REFLECTIONS ON DISSENT

### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following speech given by the Honorable Graham Martin, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, is one of the very best it has ever been my privilege to read on the much-abused term "dissent." I am happy to commend it to my colleagues:

#### REFLECTIONS ON DISSENT

(By Hon. Graham Martin)

I have just returned from Istanbul where I represented the United States Government at the XXI World Conference of the Red Cross. Our headlines are usually devoted to violence and tension. This Conference, attended by the Representatives of the national Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies of 96 nations and by government delegations representing 84 countries, bears eloquent testimony that there is still overwhelming concern in the great humanitarian objectives which constituted the agenda for this conference.

On the way, I again visited Geneva. It is fascinating to renew contacts with old friends, to discuss what is happening in the world and to speculate on how future events may unfold. Most useful is the deeper perspective one gains from the opportunity to learn how this great nation really looks to experienced, dispassionate and perceptive observers of other nations.

In talking to one old friend, one of Europe's most distinguished scholars, I told him that I had been asked to deliver an address at the Fall Convocation at my old school. I said that I regarded the award of the degree of Doctor of Laws from Wake Forest University as one of the highest honors I had ever received in a career that had given me more honors than I could possibly deserve. I hoped, therefore, I would have something useful to say.

My friend was silent for a moment. He then said that he was very glad that I so regarded it. He believed, he said, along with his British colleague, C. P. Snow, that the church-related liberal arts institutions in the United States were rapidly becoming one of the last bastions for the preservation of that particular sense of responsibility imparted through an acquaintance with and respect for the humanities. If these basic values are not preserved, he thought, it is not likely that our civilization can make the necessary adaptations that will insure its continued dedication to the principle of individual human dignity.

There are many things it would be useful to say, he went on. You could comment on the failure of the communications media to adequately inform our peoples. The virtual revolution in communications technology has so deluged us with unrelated facts that we are in great danger of losing the perspective that is essential to survival in a nuclear world. I said that I agreed with him but that I had already alluded to this dangerous drift in some comments I had made before the Overseas Press Club in New York in 1966.

He asked what I had chosen as a theme. I replied that I wanted to offer a few reflections on dissent. He looked out over the terrace and pointed across the lake to the old city of Geneva. It is good that you stopped by here, he said, you can start by thinking again of our Jean Jacques Rousseau and the influence of his writings on your Thomas Jefferson. This ancient Republic and Canton of Geneva has had a historic connection with the quality of dissent in America, he

went on, and we, as in fact does the entire world, are watching with fascination how you are handling it now because on your success may very well depend our survival.

(So, I am going to speak about dissent. Our system cannot really endure without it. Yet, unbridled, it can destroy all that we cherish.)

If students are going to have any influence on the larger establishment they will soon join, dissent from "conventional wisdom" which has lost its relevance simply must become part of their baggage.

Some of us can testify from experience that it will never be a non-hazardous undertaking. Some of us can also say that if dissent is to be effective, that dissent must be not only vigorous but also informed and intelligent.

Few would contend that dissent on the American scene today is marked by a lack of vigor. Fewer still, I think, would contend that, on the whole, it is an informed dissent, or, very often, that it is an intelligent dissent. Nevertheless, the unparalleled revolution in communications technology now guarantees that certain aspects of current American dissent, particularly those involving dramatic instances of violence, are immediately known throughout the world. Herein, I suggest, lies a very great danger which must give us most serious concern.

Many observers of our free and open society have been confused by the toleration toward violent expression of dissent that has been a consistent part of the American tradition. The man I consider the most distinguished living alumnus of Wake Forest graphically described this phenomenon in a terse, tightly reasoned essay entitled "The Inscrutability of the Yankee".

The universality and pervasiveness of the influence of the values absorbed by those exposed to the great Wake Forest facilities is once again illustrated by the fact that I first encountered this essay in Cairo in 1943 where it had been reprinted in an English language literary journal.

Gerald W. Johnson, as only he could with his uniquely masterful command of the art of lucid and cogent exposition, made an arresting and compelling point. It was that while we ascribe to the Orient a certain talent for obscuring real meaning by an inaccessibility of commencement and circumlocution of expression, it is really we Americans who often totally confuse the rest of the world.

Gerald Johnson was calling attention to such events of the thirties as the Johnson Act, the Neutrality Act, the extension of the draft in the House of Representatives by a one-vote margin, and Roosevelt's 1940 campaign speech in Boston with the assurance given "Again, Again and Again" that our sons would not be involved in a foreign war.

These instances, Johnson pointed out, and others like them could be and were interpreted by Hitler's analysts of the American scene as clear evidence that they could pursue their ambitions without effective American opposition. Yet, as Gerald Johnson correctly concluded, underneath the surface indices provided by these individual instances, there was clearly emerging, apparent to all truly perceptive observers, a consensus that would rapidly insure the full employment of American resources against the aggressors of that historical time-frame.

The intervening quarter-century has re-validated time and again the perceptive observations of Gerald Johnson on "The Inscrutability of the Yankee". In my own mind, there is no doubt that the Korean War and the Cuban Missile Crisis had their origins in the same basic misreading of the American scene. The latter event brought us to the edge of the abyss of nuclear confrontation. Therefore, it seems to me that elementary prudence indicates, now and in the foresee-

able future, a compelling necessity to take into account the effects our dissent may have abroad. Another such serious miscalculation, in an age of growing nuclear stockpiles, may involve, quite literally, the continued existence of mankind.

If, as I have already observed, our system cannot really endure without dissent, we must consider the nature of the duty to dissent and try to locate the appropriate limits on the right to dissent. Another of the truly great American journalists, J. R. Wiggins, has put it very well:

"Let us begin with the duty to dissent from the policy of government when that policy seems to the individual citizen to constitute a departure from national interest or moral rectitude. That there is such a duty, it seems to me, is the very essence of self-government, the very vital spark of a democratic system. A people devoid of this impulse would induct such passivity into an electorate as to make the form of government a matter of indifference. And a people with this impulse will invest even the most unsatisfactory system of government with the vigor and force that may make it adequate to deal with society's problems."

Wiggins went on to point out that "When we quarrel with today's dissenters we may be differing with tomorrow's conformists. Some principles are changeless and immutable, but that politics are transient and perishable." Not only the change from generation to generation but the change from day to day must concern us when we deal with contemporary dissent, he added, calling attention to the plaint of Thomas Decker in 1603: "Upon Thursday it was treason to cry God save King James of England, and upon Friday, high treason not to cry so."

"Americans then", Mr. Wiggins said, "are inclined to tenderness toward dissent by the instruction of their own history, by the exhortation of their philosophers, by the knowledge that truth is changing and by the counsels of their heart—which incline them, if the truth be told, toward the disrespect of authority and the admiration of nonconformity."

But he went on quickly to add that this inherited characteristic was balanced by another in the American makeup "deriving from their respect for order, their belief in representative government, their confidence in the wisdom of the majority and their belief in the integrity of their own government."

My friend in Geneva had referred to the intellectual debt we owed to Jean Jacques Rousseau, the violent anti-monarchist who helped set Europe aflame with revolution and who had a profound influence on Jefferson. But revolution was not all that we absorbed from Rousseau. As Wiggins reminds us, in his elaboration of the theory of the Social Contract, Rousseau called it "an agreement of individuals to subordinate their judgment, rights and powers to the needs and judgement of their community as a whole." He saw all citizens as entering implicitly into this contract to conform to the general will—a combination of the will of the majority, the lessons of the past and the fate of the future. And he thought that if, as often happens, an individual does not agree with that will as expressed in law, the state may justly force him to submit. This was not viewed as a violation of freedom, but as a preservation of it, even for the refractory individual; for in a civil state it is only through law that the individual can enjoy freedom from assault, robbery, persecution, calumny and a hundred other ills. He thought this especially true in Republics for "obedience to a law which we prescribe to ourselves is liberty."

Francis Bacon in his essay "Of Seditions and Troubles" wisely urged rulers to make every effort to ascertain the causes of discontent and to remove them. If this failed he

advocated facing the discontented with overwhelming military force. During Shay's rebellion Washington gave almost exactly the same advice when he wrote to Henry Lee on October 31, 1786: "Know precisely what the insurgents aim at. If they have real grievances, redress them if possible; or acknowledge the justice of them, and your inability to do it in the present moment. If they have not, employ the force of the government against them at once. . . . Let the reins of government then be held as usual with a steady hand, and every violation of the Constitution reprehended."

I have cited these brief references to emphasize that while the essentiality of dissent is as important today as it has always been in our system, our history illustrate that deep in our national fabric are precedents for not permitting dissent to degenerate into anarchy. Our tradition insures that of the two alternatives set out by Bacon and Washington the former is not only more preferable but is also usually perfectly feasible, given the enormous resources and the demonstrated ingenuity this country has available. We should therefore confidently persevere in making rapid progress in diminishing the legitimate discontents.

But for those who are not really interested in the rights and responsibilities of dissent within the framework of a democratic society, for those who are interested in the overturn of that society, for those who dissent from the system of government and not just the policy of government, our tradition insures a simple answer. It is that a government and a society, if it intends to survive, has no recourse against them but the second alternative set out by Bacon and Washington.

For those included in this particular special group, we need not overly concern ourselves with trying to ascertain the appropriate limits on their rights and duties, since they admit of no responsibility and demand unlimited right including the right to use force and violence. Even Dr. William Sloane Coffin has said that "You cannot ask the government to respect your right to be a revolutionary."

I have said that to be constructive and effective, dissent must be informed, intelligent and intellectually honest. But before turning to this type of dissent, may I venture a few comments on some identifiable types of dissent that I find to be distasteful. The first we might term The Chronic Dissenter. We are all familiar with this type, the perennial nay-sayer, the born pessimist, the intellectual hypochondriac.

They are only mildly annoying. One usually feels sorry for them as one does for those who suffer chronic indigestion. It is unfortunate that we have not yet discovered an intellectual Pepto-Bismol, both to alleviate their discomfort and also our own when we have to listen to them or very long. It is hard to keep one's mind accurately focused on the particular issue they are dissenting on at any given moment. The listener's mind tends to wander. One is apt to find oneself speculating on the possible traumas and frustrations of this dissenter's upbringing that have led to imprisonment in a permanent cage of adolescent rebellion, chirping away unendingly like a busy canary complaining about the inferior quality of his birdseed. One reluctantly concludes that only Group Therapy might be useful and that even there the prognosis would likely be for only marginal improvement.

The second category might be termed The Status Dissenter, who is terribly concerned that his intellectual hemlines are adjusted precisely to the prevailing mode. Although they may be aware from automatic empirical observation that mini-skirts may be a delight or a disaster depending on the quality of what is revealed, they seldom seem aware that such automatic adjustment of their in-

lectual hem-lines just possibly might reveal a mini-brain. A sub-category of this species might be termed The Melodramatic Status Dissenter. These may be found in all walks of life. Recently we have noted their emergence from the groves of academe whence, moth-like, they are irresistibly attracted by the glare of TV klieg lights to become "instant" experts on the rather intricate and complex factors dealing with the life and death of nations. Unfortunately, at times, their contributions have seemed to possess an inverse ratio of value to their legitimate expertise in biology or pediatrics.

A third category we might term The Loud Dissenters. My hackles still rise when I think of our former Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, who like you received his basic training in the humanities here in North Carolina at Davidson, who was himself a splendid listener, as well as one who showed unflinching courtesy to others, being shouted down by hoots, bullhorns and stamping feet while trying to deliver a speech. I regret that I am compelled to say that to me this is the eternal howl of the tormented infant, who can bear no more frustrations, who must have his way or tantrums must surely follow. Devoid of manners, contemptuous of the well established rules of fair play which have long characterized discussion of public issues in this country, they fail to realize the offense they give and that they automatically signal that the principles they allegedly advocate quite likely could not win acceptance in the acid test of free and rational discussion.

The tragedy is at times their grievances are real, are legitimate, and in mind of redress, but this fact becomes quickly obscured in the universal revolution against the tactics they have chosen.

A fourth category might be called The Violent Dissenters. Without wishing to minimize in the slightest the major social questions left still unanswered in today's world, it is my opinion that those dissenters who choose violence as their mode of expression raise a question which towers over all others. They raise the question of our very survival as a nation and a society under law.

In commenting on the increasing incidence of violence, J. R. Wiggins observed that "Nothing is more certain than that one side to a public controversy will not long enjoy a monopoly on the use of force to harass those with whom they disagree. This is a technique perfected by the Fascists and the Nazis. Those who are in dissent ought to be the last to encourage a contest in which the side with the most numbers and least scruples is bound ultimately to triumph. Those in dissent, if they are at all frightened, should be the first to demand for those who speak in opposition to them full personal security. The business of breaking heads is not an enterprise involving so much ingenuity that others cannot be instructed in it or learn to profit by it. If it becomes one of the necessities of public life. When it does, however, dissenters and non-conformists will not gain the greatest advantage from it. Ours is not a phlegmatic or passive people and recurrent acts of violence will call forth reprisal. Innocent citizens will be the victims of such disorders, but the greatest casualty will be the political institutions which rest upon freedom of speech."

It is essential, I submit, that we clearly recognize the consequences of failing to insure that the level of violence begins to subside. Wiggins noted "the tendency of dissent and repression to occur in cycles of some kind—to work themselves out through a discernible sequence beginning with disagreement, proceeding to debate and verbal dissent, verging into passive resistance and civil disobedience and culminating in violence. This violent climax has then been followed by a reaction that has tended to reverse the process by starting out to dis-

courage violence alone and that has often proceeded down the scale toward the repression of civil disobedience, passive resistance and even verbal dissent."

Such a process of reaction may well already be underway. All of us, I am certain, devoutly hope that we may be spared future excesses of violence which otherwise, will certainly accelerate the inevitable reaction down the scale elaborated by Mr. Wiggins.

A fifth category might be called The Opportunistic Dissenter. I personally find those I would place in this category almost as dangerous as The Violent Dissenter, and far more distasteful. Whatever excuses may be advanced for the misguided zeal of those in other categories do not seem to me to be applicable here.

Usually well-informed, usually quite aware of the importance of the issues to the national safety and wellbeing, they are, nevertheless, quite capable of attempting to advance their own careers by supporting a particular aspect of a popular topic of dissent. Such an aspect is usually either distorted out of its true context, or quite often is really irrelevant to the basic issue, but its endorsement does give the illusion of participation while providing ample room for rapid disengagement when no longer profitable.

The degree of the confidence of the opportunistic dissenters that they can successfully disengage before the deluge engulfs their sincere followers is only matched by their cynical assumption that the memory of the American people does not extend beyond today's headline. That they are often gambling with the nation's safety is unimportant in comparison with the fleetingly transient advantage they calculate to be theirs.

Fortunately, the American people seem to have an innate ability to detect and finally reject the phony, and I am very grateful that there still remain enough honest, sincere, and dedicated journalists to insure that the American people finally get all the facts.

But there is another kind of dissent. It is rather like a rare flower—it takes a particularly happy accident of circumstance, and environment to bring it about. It is intelligent dissent. It is marked by several characteristics. I would like to allude to two or three of them.

The intelligent dissenter has taken the trouble to become informed. He not only knows there are two sides to an argument, he has taken the trouble to know as much as he can about both of them. And in this process he exercises a certain skepticism about what he reads and, most particularly, about what he sees on television.

He recognizes that our modern revolution in communications has posed certain problems with which we are still struggling; that one such problem is the tendency to emphasize only the dramatic; that the emphasis on the dramatic inevitably underscores the chaos often attendant on rapid change and tends to obscure the slow and steady progress that is surely being made. He seeks for perspective, for he knows that without perspective knowledge cannot be equated with wisdom. He is skeptical about the validity of assumptions which dedicated advocates sometimes distort to support the desired rationale. He would not be impressed, for example, by the working papers produced at the Detroit conference in 1947 of the National Council of Churches. The premise that the government of the United States was wholly wrong was never challenged.

Wiggins notes that "in fact, this was so clearly the first premise of the session that no occasion arose to even formulate this assumption." I think our intelligent dissenter might have remembered that after leaving the Presidency Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1811 to William Duane:

"It is true that dissenters have a right to go over to the minority, and to act with them. But I do not believe your mind has

contemplated that course; that it has deliberately viewed the strange company into which it may be led, step by step, unintended and unperceived by itself. . . . As far as my good will may go (for I can no longer act), I shall adhere to my government, Executive and Legislative, and, as long as they are republican, I shall go with their measures whether I think them right or wrong, because I know they are honest, and are wiser and better informed than I am."

The intelligent dissenter will take time to listen. He listens not simply out of courtesy, although that should always be a basic motivation. He listens not just to gather breath for a new onslaught, or to wait to pounce on the flaws of an opposing argument. He listens, rather, in the hope of learning something he didn't know before. He listens to find out what flaws there might have been in his own argument, and is quick to acknowledge them where they appear, in the hope of closing on some common ground. He listens because his conviction is basically intellectual, not emotional, and can therefore be changed if the weight of the evidence indicates a change or modification.

The intelligent dissenter knows that his dissent must be responsible. He will remember the words of Zechariah Chafee, in his classic work "Free Speech in the United States," when he said: "I want to speak of the responsibilities of the men who wish to talk. They are under a strong moral duty not to abuse the liberty they possess. All that I have written goes to show that the law should lay few restraints upon them, but that makes it all the more important for them to restrain themselves. They are enjoying a great privilege, and the best return they can make is to use that privilege wisely and sincerely for what they genuinely believe to be the best interests of their country."

The intelligent dissenter will also remember Chafee's admonition that it would be extremely dangerous "if speakers and writers use their privilege of free discussion carelessly or maliciously, so as to further their own interests or the interests of a selfish interest of their particular minority. By abusing liberty of speech," he said, "they may easily further its abolition."

That warning, the intelligent dissenter knows, is as valid today as when it was given just before World War II.

The intelligent dissenter will know that restraint must be an integral part of his baggage and that he must force himself to display a degree of tolerance that, at times, will be extremely difficult to attain. The intelligent dissenter will remember St. Paul's injunction that the greatest of virtues is that spirit of Christian charity which we profess but too often honor in the breach.

And, above all, the intelligent dissenter will never forget that in the end, however high the temporary cost may seem to be, he must be true to his own sense of personal integrity. I have had the great good fortune to be sustained all my life by the example of my father who was born a bit to the north of this campus on the banks of the Dan one hundred years ago. He loved this institution, as he did all the Baptist institutions of this State, and it would have given him great pleasure to see me here today. He served his denomination and his State for more than fifty years as a Minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. As I grow older I recognize ever more fully that when I allotted twice the normal life span I just might hope to be half the man he was.

Although he never sought controversy, he seemed to be always involved in dissent. I recognize now that his towering personal integrity would permit no other course. The twenties were turbulent years also and one incident I remember involved one of the great Presidents of this institution, Dr. William Louis Poteat. It seems incredible now that such a gentle man as Dr. Poteat, the

most Christian of Christians, could be subjected to such scathing attacks by both the clergy and the laity of the Baptists of his State for quietly maintaining, as indeed his own integrity demanded, that Darwin was, after all, right.

I remember accompanying my father to an Association meeting in Cabarrus County, Speaker after speaker denounced Dr. Potent until my father could no longer take it. He demanded the floor and I sat spellbound as he lashed them for the ultimate sin of blasphemy in caring to substitute their finite, limited comprehension for the omniscience and omnipotence of God. I still remember the hushed quiet as he closed with the quotation of the exhortation of Oliver Cromwell: "I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible that you may be mistaken".

I do not remember the name of the speaker at my own Commencement 37 years ago, and only a line or two of his deathless words of wisdom. Perhaps, if you remember two of mine 37 years hence, I will have bettered par for the course. Then, we had other things on our minds as we set out to carve a small niche for ourselves in the establishment. We soon found, as you will, that you don't join the establishment—it joins you. While I hope you will be intelligent dissenters from such of its manifestations your conscience dictates you must oppose, I also hope you will handle with equal intelligence the dissent you will encounter against those of its institutions in which you deeply believe.

"Think it possible that you may be mistaken." I never forgot that line. I commend it to you. It will make intelligent dissent a little less difficult if you remember, as you encounter a succession of minds that enjoy the rare certainty of complete conviction, that the presence of a reasonable doubt is not an unmitigated disaster in human society.

Thank you for letting me be with you today.

#### DOUBLE STANDARD OF JUSTICE IN OUR COUNTRY

### HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1970

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, Lloyd Ballhagen, editor of the Hays Daily News, has been raising editorial clouds of dust ever since he settled in Hays to run the News, a newspaper with a reputation for editorials that not only open your eyes, but sting a little, too.

Several weeks ago, Mr. Ballhagen made a very good point regarding the double standard of justice in our country. More important, the article applies to public officials in Washington. I commend the Hays Daily News editorial to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Ballhagen's editorial follows:

#### LOOT IN ROBBERY DOES NOT COUNT

The former mayor of Newark, N.J., Hugh J. Addonizio, a congressman for 14 years, went to jail the other day.

His sentence: 10 years in prison and a \$25,000 fine.

His crime: 63 counts of extortion and one count of conspiracy involving the extortion of \$1.5 million from contractors who do business with Newark.

A teen-age boy in Arkansas, William Radcliff, Little Rock, went to jail last year.

His sentence: three years in prison.

His crime: a robbery in which he netted 10 cents.

Justice is indeed blind.

#### VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER

### HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, one of several projects on which the Congress should act before recess or adjournment is, in my judgment, the discharge petition before the Judiciary Committee with respect to voluntary school prayer.

At a time when the moral fiber of the Nation is in question, there is a clear need to reaffirm the right of students and teachers to voluntary pay obeisance to divine providence. The question of voluntary school prayer is tied up now in a constitutional amendment which is in turn tied up in committee.

I support the discharge petition to bring this matter to a vote and am hopeful that the action can be successful before the business of the House is completed before this Congress.

Law and order ranks as one of the most critical problems facing America. Enough has been said and written about the subject to fill a library. Much of it represents an emotional and overgeneralized treatment of a complex subject. Looking for scapegoats and faultfinding rather than the search for solutions is a popular theme. Ironically, our law enforcement agencies are singled out all too often for the lion's share of the criticism and faultfinding. One is left with the impression that the police are on trial rather than the criminal elements running rampant in this country.

It is time to put teeth back into our laws. It is time to strengthen the court system of America so that the guilty are tried and punished quickly, fairly, and firmly.

It is a refreshing departure from the familiar rhetoric of our time when one reads a positive and thoughtful article offering suggestions to help our overworked and harried law enforcement agencies. This month's FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin contains such an article by Miss Mary Creese, news editor, Rock Springs Daily Rocket-Miner, Rock Springs, Wyo.

Entitled "We Can Help You, If You'll Let Us," Miss Creese offers some thoughtful suggestions on ways in which the police and news media can work together more effectively.

I hope this well-written article receives the careful attention of the law enforcement and news media communities.

In order that the large audience that reads the RECORD has an opportunity to read Miss Creese's article, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

#### WE CAN HELP YOU, IF YOU WILL LET US

(By Miss Mary Creese)

While some law enforcement officers shy away from news reporters, and some are reluctant, with good reason, to trust the news media, we in the newspaper business can be a help to you—if you'll let us.

It took many columns of type and a lot of extra hours to persuade one sheriff that those of us who were aware of the truth knew the search for a missing teenage boy

was done thoroughly and professionally, even though it was unsuccessful.

We knew that, because of his fatigue and disappointment, the sheriff was reluctant to report his day's efforts. I joined in the search, garnered information from many other sources, and wrote sympathetically, but truthfully, of his activities to show that everything possible was being done.

#### BUILT ON CONFIDENCE

Good news stories, of course, are possible because of the confidence of law enforcement officers in the news reporter—a confidence that grows only after years of sustained accuracy, objectivity, and sound ethics.

Most law enforcement officers will agree that there is no deterrent to crime like a wide publicity campaign, that nothing helps prevent traffic accidents and slows the drivers, at least for a time, quite so much as the knowledge that "it can happen to you" or "it did happen to your neighbor."

Most officers will also agree that, if bogus currency is afloat or check artists are at work, newspaper publicity can serve notice to merchants to intensify their lookout for counterfeit bills and forged checks. As a result, the culprits may be more readily apprehended.

The professional, mature newspaper reporter and photographer wants, needs, and deserves your confidence. Between you and him can develop a mutual trust, respect, and understanding. He will guard your secrets and will appreciate your occasional need for silence.

#### LOSS OF CONFIDENCE

The police agency which withholds legitimate news from the press will soon gain a reputation of "managing the news." There will be a breach in relations, and confidence and respect will suffer. On the other hand, a reporter who violates the trust of a police official and reports on a case prematurely in order to scoop the opposition will soon find that a valuable source of information has dried up. It is a matter of dual responsibilities in which the rights of the public rest on the integrity of both the news media and law enforcement.

I, too, have no use for the movie-type reporter, who almost puts a "press" tag in his hand, affects a trench coat, and runs everywhere, coattails flying and eyes wide, searching for a "story."

There are reporters who must be cautioned that they are not investigators—merely observers. They are employed to write about, not probe into, criminal activity.

#### AIR CRASH MAKES HEADLINES

While working as a reporter with the Longmont, Colo., Times-Call in November 1955, I had occasion to cover the crash of a United Airlines DC-6B which went down in flames east of Longmont killing 44 persons. The plane took off from Denver at 8:52 p.m., November 1, bound for Seattle, Wash. Eleven minutes later, when the plane had reached almost 6,000 feet, witnesses reported there was an explosion and a flash and the aircraft plunged to earth.

In a fast-breaking story of this magnitude, excellent liaison and cooperation with law enforcement officials pay off. My associates and I received tremendous assistance from willing law enforcement agencies from the very beginning. Since it was apparent from the information available at the outset that the crash resulted from a midair explosion, the big question was what caused the explosion and was it accidental or—was the aircraft sabotaged?

Six days after the crash, I learned from a reliable source outside law enforcement and official agencies concerned with the incident that a dynamite blast in the number 4 cargo pit caused the crash. Further, I was told that baggage in this particular pit had been loaded only in Denver.

You can imagine the temptation to break this shocking information in a big story nationwide under a Longmont dateline. But, we did not. The FBI had opened a criminal investigation of the case, and we did not want to jeopardize the possibility of a quick solution and arrest. Further, I really had no right to use the information as it had been given to me in confidence.

Soon thereafter an official release was made that a bomb had caused the crash. On November 14, the FBI arrested Jack Gilbert Graham, 23, whose mother had been killed in the crash, on a charge of sabotage. A few days later, the State of Colorado charged him with the murder of his mother. Graham was tried on the murder charge, convicted, and sentenced to death. He was executed on January 11, 1957.

#### SOUND JUDGMENT

I believe that we at the Longmont Times-Call did what any responsible professional news staff would have done in holding off on the tip about the dynamite blast. Even though the source was reliable, and later developments corroborated the fact, we had no official confirmation. Further, we had good reason to believe that public disclosure at the time might jeopardize the possible success of the intensive investigation by the FBI and other agencies assisting. The temptation was great, but, in looking back, I am convinced our judgment was sound and in keeping with the highest traditions of the profession.

I thought at one point several years ago I had the full confidence of a local law enforcement official. However, when I inquired of him one day about a report of vandalism in a nearby school, he said there was nothing to it.

Since my source seemed reliable, I took my camera and drove out to the school. I found there that the enforcement official had indeed investigated extensive damage inside the building. When members of the school board unlocked the building (closed until damage could be repaired), I prepared a good, interesting story, which included the fact that flour, sugar, eggs, and other foods in the school kitchen had been thrown about with abandon. Pictures told the sad story of complete, ruthless vandalism. We did not, however, print the picture of a shoe print with an identifiable heel mark. I held that one out.

It was a vivid official who confronted me the next day with my story folded out on his paper, with which he pounded my desk, demanding to know where I got the story and why I chose to write it, and stating that if he had wanted it in the paper, he would have given it to me.

I told him if he did not want the story in the paper, all he would have had to do was tell me and give me a good reason for withholding it.

#### HELPFUL EVIDENCE

He calmed down and apologized, saying that the case was still under investigation. I asked if he had any prime suspects, to which he replied, "Two, but we can't prove anything." I offered him my picture of the heelprint, which he later confronted one of the suspects, matched the picture with the heel of his shoe, and obtained a confession.

It is true that the professional, mature news reporter wants to do his bit to help law enforcement officers. You can ask any responsible reporter or editor for cooperation in withholding a story pending certain developments and, if your request is valid, he will go along with you. He will, of course, expect you to advise him immediately when the story can be reported. Further, he will also depend on you to help protect his interest should the story become known to other news media which may not respect the

agreement. However, a story with any significant news value cannot, as all officers and reporters know, be suppressed for long.

#### COOPERATION WITH NEWS MEDIA

I have found that the degree of cooperation between the press and law enforcement differs from area to area. The length of the acquaintance between a reporter and an enforcement official will, of course, have some bearing on cooperation. However, some police agencies are not news oriented. By nature or by habit, the officials and officers are close-mouthed and offer little, if any, assistance to newsmen. Some departments apparently have no plans or procedures for making available to the press information from public records, such as police blotters. Consequently, a reporter does not like to deal with agencies of this type, but he welcomes the chance to work with agencies whose personnel recognize the rights of the public as represented by a free press and who furnish what information and help they can without infringing on the rights of others and without making prejudicial statements.

#### REARDON REPORT

Many representatives of news media in this area, as do others in all parts of the country, believe that the highly publicized Reardon Report\* of the American Bar Association is a marked encroachment on freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

The first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, adopted December 15, 1791, 179 years ago, is a stipulation forbidding any law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press.

But today many lawyers and law enforcement agencies claim the Reardon Report—only a report, mind you—is aimed only at lawyers and law enforcement agencies to restrict the release of prejudicial statements about accused persons, and that it does not affect the release of news about crime or criminal investigations.

Most newsmen see it differently. They feel it would black out arrest records and preliminary hearings. It would muzzle police officers and prosecutors and judges. It would forbid mentioning the existence of confessions, prior criminal records, and police laboratory tests.

It would allow a police officer to state that an accused individual denied charges against him, but if he admitted charges, that could not be printed. The lawyers would have a complete record of closed pretrial hearings transcribed, and then after the trial or disposition of the case without trial, the lawyers would have the court reporters write up all those notes and issue copies to the press.

By then, who wants them? No newspaper which has anything to do with news would touch them. Thus the public would be deprived of another bit of public information.

#### TRUTH WILL WIN

Even Justice Paul Reardon, author of the bar report which bears his name, has warned that the proposals should not be used by anyone "as a cover for what should be out in the open."

As pointed out in one newspaper editorial, "The press upholds the traditional democratic ideal that truth will win in a free and open market place."

"The bar tends to believe, on the other hand," the editorial continues, "that truth is best served when filtered through the various technicalities of the court room. . . ."

"If statements by law enforcement and court officials are limited to a short list of specific formalities, the public clearly will have less opportunity to learn how law enforcement is carried out in their society."

Further, some members of the bar claim that the press uses crime news to sell papers—whereas more than 80 percent of the 61 million copies of daily newspapers are pre-

sold by subscription, and the press does not rely on so-called "sensational" stories to survive.

#### NO THREAT TO FAIR TRIALS

In this section of the country, to have the additional curtain, as proposed by the Reardon Report, dropped between us and news sources would constitute a definite threat to the freedom of the press.

To my knowledge, no one has come up with any positive support for charges that the press imperils the concepts of fair trials. The people have a definite right to know what their courts and law enforcement officers are doing. No one denies the dangers of excluding the press from proceedings in any type of trial, from the slightest misdemeanor to first degree murder. If such procedures were condoned, it would follow that the greater part of every criminal trial could be conducted in secrecy behind closed doors.

The public trial, in the words of a Los Angeles writer challenging the exclusion of the press, has a therapeutic function in reducing community tension, in superseding private vengeance, in removing excuses for lynch and vigilante law, in protecting the rights of the public as well as those of the defendant, and in providing values which, perhaps, society has been inclined to take for granted in recent years.

#### CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Properly conducted public trials maintain the confidence of the community in the honesty of its institutions, in the competence of its public officers, in the impartiality of its judges, and in the capacity of its criminal law to do justice.

We have cooperated to the fullest with the judges who insist we withhold the names of juveniles involved in serious crimes—and we do cooperate, if the case goes into juvenile court. However, with the percentage of juvenile "repeaters" growing, even those judges are leaning toward the publication of names, ages, names of parents, and even street addresses of juvenile offenders.

Basically our role, with yours as officers, is protecting constitutional rights while making sure of a keener awareness of responsibility in publishing news—all the news.

That is good reason to say "no" when we are requested to withhold the name of an offender whose case goes through a court of public record. For if we comply with one request, where are we to stop?

A common complaint against newspapers is that we are unduly sensational in our handling of crime news—that such items may be an incentive to crime, that the pander to the cheap surface emotions of the herd mind.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

#### PRESS' DUTY

The truth is that a complete, factual, and mercilessly accurate account of a crime is the duty of responsible newspapers. In the first place, crime news is not solely the concern of low-grade morons. It is also the concern of responsible law-abiding citizens.

If the youth of this country, reading the facts on a race riot or massacre or murder, are tempted to purchase machineguns and start shooting, then there is little hope for American youth and the adults who bore and reared them.

Generally, crime news, complete and even blatant, is necessary before any serious move for reform is ever attempted.

Without publicity which brings out details of crimes, which the private citizen may recognize and therefrom offer his assistance, the tough solutions could be even tougher. With no news story, the person who stumbles over evidence of crime in remote places probably would never get his information to the law enforcement agencies.

We do not want to be told what to print;



we will not surrender the right to public reports of events we consider newsworthy or of public interest; we will continue to publish any statement made in open court, whether or not it is stricken from the record, and we will defend our freedom to publicize wrongdoing wherever it exists, including the actions of law enforcement officers, lawyers, and judges. And we will print our own names in the news if we are the offenders.

Because the public ultimately is responsible for the administration of justice, the public is entitled to know how justice is being administered. No one has the right to keep the press and the public in darkness.

#### FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Freedom to gather news is at the heart of any concept of a free press. When you close out sources of news, you cripple the functioning of the press. It is a combination of the rights to gather, print, and distribute which is the cornerstone of true freedom of the press.

If we have a fault, it is to underpublicize, rather than overpublicize, as staffs and space often are too small to give all areas the attention they demand and deserve.

#### IT IS UP TO YOU

We try to attract to our business persons with an insatiable curiosity and an ability to look and listen and report—without distortion—what they see and hear. True, some reporters follow devious methods in getting there first, regardless of the end result. We have contemptible persons in our business, but you will find them wherever the pressures of competition make it necessary to perform first and explain later.

However, we can be the agency which presents your story, accurately and sympathetically, as we understand that law enforcement is one of the most hard-pressed, underpaid, and senselessly abused groups in the Nation. We can help give you the status you deserve. But what good is the professional, knowledgeable reporter, if a curtain separates him from law enforcement news? That curtain ties our hands so that we are unable to help you. It's up to you.

### SHOULD U.S. TAXPAYERS SUBSIDIZE LARGE CORPORATIONS \$1 BILLION YEARLY?

#### HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Wednesday, October 7, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the trade bill, H.R. 18970, that was recently reported by the House Committee on Ways and Means contains an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code that would allow U.S. corporations to set up separate corporate subsidiaries, called Domestic International Sales Corporations—DISC's—through which they would funnel their export operations. Through these DISC's would flow whatever is now exported, and all income taxes now paid on this portion of a corporation's business would henceforth be deferred. DISC's would remain tax free as long as their profits were kept within the subsidiary and not distributed to shareholders. Ostensibly, DISC's purpose is to spur exports by rewarding the U.S. producing company with a total release from taxes unless distributed. Unfortunately, the provision does not require more exports, merely the formation of a

new corporation to handle export sales and other export-related activities. In fact, exports could decline and the tax bonanza would continue.

The beneficiaries of the \$500 million to \$1 billion yearly tax cut would be corporations that now export to other countries. Hopefully, DISC would provide other corporations with an incentive to export. The U.S. Treasury experts told the Committee on Ways and Means that 93 U.S. firms now account for one-half of U.S. manufactured exports. Because the DISC could provide a tax cut to these firms immediately—without any added exports—the proposal really means that every American citizen who has his income tax withheld from his wage or salary would be required to help pay the cost of a windfall tax benefit to such firms as General Motors, IBM, Ford, and other companies which now account for half of U.S. manufactured exports.

Who will make up this loss in U.S. funds? The U.S. taxpayer will. However, the average taxpayer, already overburdened, has strong reason to question the new subsidy. Experts disagree about how many export gains would be made, but all experts agree that the Treasury could lose at least \$500 million in revenue.

At a time when the Congress seeks ways to pay the higher costs of governing this Nation, it is time to make sure that it understands the potential cost of what might appear on the surface like a way to improve the trade balance.

U.S. tax law now defers income tax payments earned by foreign subsidiaries of U.S. firms; experience shows the deferral is unfair to domestic industry. The answer to this problem should be to end the foreign tax deferral. Instead, the administration proposal would create a new tax deferral—and in many cases an exemption—for U.S. subsidiaries at home.

In considering benefits to U.S. exports, the Congress should ponder these points:

First, is this free trade a subsidy to U.S. exports—or is it retaliation against the countries which subsidize exports to the United States? Second, how can our Nation benefit from this subsidy when experts cannot agree if it will stimulate exports; third, why must the average American taxpayer subsidize the giant corporations?

Should the average taxpayer pay more income tax—and thus have less to improve his living standards—so that huge exporting firms can escape taxation?

#### GOD GIVE US MEN

#### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, October 7, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mary Blanche Leahy of Laguna Hills, Calif., Leisure World, recently called to my attention the poem, "God Give Us Men," by Josiah Gilbert Holland, which she kept always on her desk during her many years of work for the city of Oakland, Calif. As a high

school student I memorized this poem, and believe we could all draw inspiration from it:

GOD GIVE US MEN

(By Josiah Gilbert Holland)

God give us men! A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands;

Men whom the lust of office does not kill; Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy; Men who possess opinions and a will; Men who have honor—men who will not lie; Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog

In public duty and in private thinking.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JERRY L. PETTIS TO THE THIRD ANNUAL ARMED FORCES AUDIO VISUAL COMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCE

#### HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, October 7, 1970

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on the Armed Services, I have long been interested in the concept of audiovisual communications. On Tuesday, October 6, the Honorable JERRY L. PETTIS, Member of Congress, addressed the Third Annual Armed Services Audio Visual Communications Conference. No better man could have been chosen for the task, and no more enlightened critique of the field could have been presented.

To those who are interested in this vital subject, I offer the text of Congressman PETTIS' remarks:

ADDRESS BY HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

I was very pleased to be invited to participate in this conference. Your Air Force hosts are to be congratulated for organizing such an outstanding seminar of experts and presentations.

I have appreciation for the creative thought, the planning, the coordination and the hours of effort that go into producing such a comprehensive, in-depth program.

The dynamic field of audio visual communication interests me greatly. I am aware of the power generated by the modern AV communication media. I respect AVCOM power. I'm particularly interested in how it is directed to make an impact upon the minds and emotions of our own people—as well as the peoples of the world. I'm sure that most of my associates in the political field are aware of it. They should be. Their survival as active politicians may well depend upon the AVCOM media.

Before I was elected to Congress, I had some experience in applying audio communication techniques to airline and other industrial uses—and in the development of new methods for the high speed duplication of ¼ inch magnetic tapes.

I'm sure that many of you know that the Aerospace Audio Visual Service is headquartered in my district. I've had the opportunity to tour that impressive Air Force facility at Norton Air Force Base in San Bernardino and to see the scope of the day-to-day operations in support of a global AV communication capability. I was particularly pleased to learn that some of the top professionals at Hq. AAVS had been conducting regular educational programs, on their own time, to teach local teenagers how to produce motion

pictures. That's an excellent way to serve our nation's future, reduce the generation gaps and train the next generation of AV Communicators.

Prior to my election to the Ways and Means Committee, I had been a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, and of the subcommittee that monitors the NASA programs. I know that many of you helped to develop the techniques of AV Communication—and the photographic, TV and graphic art presentations that contributed so much to the great success of our ballistic missile and space systems—as well as to the lunar exploration.

I don't believe that we could begin to comprehend the meaning of space age sciences and technologies without the spectacular photographs, the film reports and the real-time TV broadcasts that have permitted us all to participate in the making of history by bringing man's first lunar exploration into homes all over the world.

This kind of global AVCOM can make a great contribution toward unifying peoples and creating a true and lasting peace—whenever the major governments of the planet agree to make cooperation a primary objective. Your talents and abilities, when skillfully applied, could make people want to achieve planetary stability.

I doubt that anyone in our Armed Forces would be unhappy to see the military profession become a relic of the past—so we could all progress to more productive and creative applications of our time and talents—like developing planetary resources to serve the legitimate needs of the global population—if everyone would honestly agree to that simple objective.

But today we face a world in a dangerous condition—a very unstable condition. The countries of Eastern Europe have been deprived of their freedom—even the limited kind that Czechoslovakia was trying to achieve. There is trouble in the middle east, so serious that could very directly involve the major world powers. There are repeated threats from Red China against the smaller nations of Asia. Latin America is not immune from revolutionary "exports" imposed upon them from outside forces.

It is obvious that we still need strong, alert and well equipped Armed Forces. It's not yet time to convert your AVCOM "swords" into "plow-share" productions. One day,—we earnestly hope—but not yet.

Why not? What threatens the peace of the "global village"? What forces are destabilizing our traditionally peace-loving America? You are communicators and I'm a Congressman and we all ought to know—so we can communicate and legislate to re-establish and maintain our internal stability.

I'm disturbed to realize that you work under a handicap. While you stand at your stations, minding your own missions, your professional images are being diffused and distorted. Your uniforms are being redesigned and often disgraced—as costumes for carelessness comics. Your rightful place of respect and gratitude in the hearts of your countrymen has been challenged and replaced—to an alarming degree—by ridicule, prejudice or apathy. A strongly uniformed guerrilla band of militant "anti-heroes" is trying to convince our young people that they have the right to the name "revolutionary"—in the honored tradition of "Sons of Liberty" with the dedication and integrity of a Washington, or a Jefferson—a Franklin or an Adams—a Paul Revere, Patrick Henry or a Nathan Hale.

Who wants your swords to rust? Who tarnishes your shields? We have an urgent need to know.

We could learn a lot from the "original revolutionaries" of the 13 little colonies. They were not "aggressors." They certainly

weren't "imperialists"—but neither were they appeasers. They weren't so much against the tyranny of a ruthless monarch—as they were for the dignity of man and the right to live and grow. They were for freedom. But they knew that freedom and responsibility were inseparable. They accepted the responsibility to fight, if necessary. They thought they fought for everyone's freedom. Were they impractical? They dreamed of a world without tyranny. Were they naive?

Ben Franklin summed it up: "Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

We seem to be giving up both these days. We need more real revolutionaries like wise old Ben Franklin. But instead, we seem to be getting "pseudo-revolutionaries."

There is an interesting book available in paperback. It's by Phillip Abbott Luce and Douglas Hyde. It's called "The Intelligent Student's Guide to Survival". It should be of value to people like you who have responsibility for ensuring our survival. I'd like to quote some passages from this book, from time to time. You probably haven't heard of the authors. I hadn't. They had been working diligently in relative obscurity. They were known among their Communist associates. One taught Marxist dogma in England, training young "converts." The other was born an "American." They have both decided to bring a vital message to the American people. They are convinced the message is urgent.

Some of you may remember Whittaker Chambers—who unwittingly propelled a young California Congressman into a very successful career during the Alger Hiss case. "Guide to Survival" says "Chambers is quoted as alluding to a feeling that he left the winning side for the losing side." We think he's wrong. But here is the record:

"When the communists talk of building 'a communist world' they mean the whole world.—In the past 45 years or so they have achieved one third of their aim. They have still two-thirds not achieved. But never in man's history has a small group of people, who set out to win a world, achieved more in less time."

Effective communication has played a decisive part in this success.

David Lawrence wrote an editorial in U.S. News and World Report about a year ago. It's still timely. It was entitled "Communication." He made these points:

"If there is a lack of patriotism, it is not due to a diminished love of country. The cause can be simply explained—a lack of communication between the people and their government." He concluded, "It is time for us to concentrate our attention on better communication, not only between our people and the peoples of the world, but among the citizens of our own country. We have too long overlooked the obvious. Communication is our biggest problem today."

There's nothing more useless than devoting all of our time to identifying and describing a problem instead of defining and applying a solution.

You and your fellow communicators can do a great deal toward providing the solutions we need. It's your opportunity. It's your responsibility.

There is the power of our American Heritage to help you. The traditional concept of an American way of communication should be re-defined as a national political principle.

Thomas Jefferson wanted all Americans to learn to participate in government as independent, educated individuals. The citizen-constituency of a republic had to be well informed—to understand the goal of a better way of life—to communicate their own best interest to elected representatives—and to

evolve and mature together with the new political system. That's why Jefferson wanted universal education and the privileges of free speech and freedom of the press—representing "freedom to communicate."

In a way it's a shame that we still can't debate like Lincoln and Douglas. Of course, there were advantages and disadvantages to that early "AVCOM system."

The audience participated as an essential part of the information system. Their responses were processed in real time. It was hard to "manage the news." Of course, the size of the audience was limited and you had to travel a lot by foot or horse to get even a fair sampling on the "public opinion polls." But what you got was accurate. You knew where you stood—and so did the people. It was an honest-debate environment.

The candidates could directly influence each voter's "decision making process." And the people directly affected the national decision making practice—as far as they could reach—on a person-to-person basis.

Today—a modern decision making information system could go a long way toward establishing an honest-debate environment, on a national scale. We need it. An honest debate environment could eliminate our most serious communication problems—problems caused by misunderstandings—so effectively exploited by those who challenge the viability of our American Way of Life.

You hear the slogan "Power to the People". In a perfect republic, the people have the power. The people represent the individual units of government which constitute the only real "Establishment"—the collective constituent—ideally united in purpose or cause, in mission and dedication.

But that's an ideal. Few human beings are ideal. In our form of government we must really stand united or fall divided. If we are divided, it's largely the fault of communicators who aren't doing their job. We could give some credit to the anti-communicators who are effectively distorting information and confusing our minds—the better to separate us—the better to "bury us".

There was never greater need for the traditional freedoms of speech and press—or the freedom to communicate. But the freedom is needed instead of license to distort, subvert or pervert.

"Guide to Survival" reminds us that "the Communist Party has over 42 million members, of which 6 million are in the free world." That's enough. Not quite enough to get under every bed—but enough to hide a few in closets here and there.

"Yet this small group of people has influenced public opinion profoundly. It is almost impossible to pick up a newspaper or to switch on your radio or TV to the news without hearing some reference to Communists. They make us aware of their presence the whole of the time. This isn't just an accident. There are reasons for it."

Are we helping their cause by giving them more exposure that we give ourselves? That's not profitable. Ben Franklin wouldn't approve.

You are communicators. You should be aware of the reasons for the success of our competitors—and especially the writers among you.

Lenin allegedly instructed his followers to "confuse the vocabulary. Lenin was smart. He knew that thinking can be done only in words and that accurate thinking requires words of precise meaning. Confuse the vocabulary and the unsuspecting majority is at a disadvantage when defending itself against the small but highly disciplined minority, which knows exactly what it wants, and which deliberately promotes word confusion, as the first step, in its efforts to divide and conquer."

The freedoms of speech and press are still essential to the American concept. But now, speech and press are spoken and reproduced—and both of them distributed at the speed of light. Even half-truths travel at the speed of light. Speech can only remain free in an environment of honest debate where all sides of an issue are equally and simultaneously revealed.

We have a national need to know "the whole truth and nothing but . . ."

There are expert communicators at large in our society who are masterful at creating credibility gaps. We must become just as effective at bridging those gaps.

A lot is being said about environmental pollution. It's an important issue. However, the most dangerous form of environmental pollution may well be mental pollution—information pollution. Anything that degrades or stagnates the freely flowing stream of information is communication pollution and is extremely dangerous to national health.

Can't we appeal to the idealism of our youth to help us clean up environmental pollution? Our opponents know how to harness youthful idealism. Recent history has proven that "youthful idealism"—without accurate information—can become a powerful weapon system in ruthless hands.

I don't want to be tagged as "anti" anything. I'm for freedom. I'm also for free exchange of accurate information.

Did you know the Communists are recruiting more people between the ages of 15 and 19 than from any other age group? They plan ahead. Shouldn't we?

Some pseudo-revolutionaries are disclaiming any connection with the more conventional establishment. But then, why do they keep worshipping the same old dogma at the same old shrine?

In 1905, Lenin gave his disciples these orders:

"Go to the youth: Organize, at once and everywhere, fighting brigades among the students and particularly among workers. Let them arm themselves with whatever weapons they can get—knife, revolver, oil-soaked rags for setting fires. Some can undertake to assassinate a spy or blow up a police station. Others can attack a bank to gain funds for uprising. Let every squad learn if only by beating up police."

That's an excellent sampling of environmental pollution. It might be relevant to review Lenin's version of "freedom of speech."

"We must be ready to employ trickery, deceit, law-breaking, withholding and concealing truth . . ."

Or his interpretation of "freedom of the press" . . .

"We can and must write in a language which sows among the masses hate, revulsion, scorn, and the like, toward those who disagree with us."

I think he's talking about me!

I don't want to be unfair to Lenin by quoting him too much—but his words sound strangely familiar still. Some misguided people are passing off his old scenarios as—"entertainment."

Only an honest debate environment can overcome informational pollution and save our national decision-making process. The "Guide to Survival" points out wisely that it is the element of truth that makes communist propaganda get across. It is because they put something true in it—even though most of it is false. Think of the implication. If it is the element of truth which makes propaganda acceptable, our message ought to be even more acceptable! It is the truth that keeps us free.

But "truth" is only a word, setting no one free, unless it is recognized, verified, realized, understood, informed, and communicated to the people—and then understood and implemented by the people. It can then be returned—as a new national resource—"re-

ponse-ability," expressed through the free will choice of the constituency. That's our way of ensuring "power for the people."

I appreciate the need for a well informed—and responsibly informing—Congress. I'm partial to the Congressional side of the legislative body because we most closely represent the people—at the grass roots level—on a national scale—if we're kept informed by well informed constituents. Lenin clearly recognized the people as the ultimate source of power and taught his followers to get close to the people, to understand the people's language and the people's needs. The vital thing is *how you use that power—for the people—gained from the people.*

If we knew what the people truly needed and could communicate the plans and distribute the resources to meet those needs—if we could then hear directly from the people—with accurate and timely feedback—we could always respond to their best interests at the national level. Our problems are caused by our separateness, our differences, our misunderstandings, our distance. All of these diseases can be cured by more effective communication.

We have the scientific and technical capability to develop and implement a real-time referendum system. What does that mean? It means that more effective use of "instant" AVCOM technology could, theoretically, permit every voter to record his viewpoint—based on his individual decision-making process—on any number of vital issues, simultaneously, all over the nation. This might be developed as a modification to presently available TV or telephone systems. Or it could be some form of advanced "visual telephone". The new instrumentation should be available to all registered voters. Computer technology could be used to check coded credentials—like social security numbers—to reject duplication and to record accurate totals. We could have instant responses to "real-time newsletters" and accurate opinion polls on any major issue.

In Washington we'd know exactly how you wanted us to vote on vital issues. And we'd vote that way—if we wanted to be elected. But we'd also be able to present our own views to constituents in a clearer, more efficient and understandable way—based on the best information we could get.

If we truly want democracy to work, to grow, to survive—in the form of a republic—if we really believe in our system of government, we'd better permit the true and able leadership to emerge from the people, through the free expression of their individual wills. Only this way will our nation be governed by those people and for those people. A really new and absolutely reliable system of sensing and serving the will of the American people is essential to our survival.

Perhaps you will help us design, develop and operate this kind of real time information system. It would improve individual "response-ability"—and better define national responsibilities. It would help greatly to re-establish our traditional environment of honest debate in the speed-of-light age. It may be the best way to eliminate communication pollution. Then, instead of permissively permitting anyone else to "bury us"—we could give the rest of the world—a better way of life.

#### NIXON'S FALSE PROMISES TO BLACK BUSINESSMEN

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 7, 1970

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, since the presidential campaign of 1968, Richard Nixon has been dangling the promise of

financial help for minority businesses in front of blacks to encourage their hope that they could fully participate in the bounty of this country. Many members of minority groups across the Nation were led to hope and dream that they themselves could realize the American dream of being self-supporting, of having their hard work result in security for their family, and of providing a better life for their children. This dream of hope has cruelly been founded on Nixon's empty promises.

During the 1968 presidential campaign, Richard Nixon stated that one of the main objectives of his administration would be to eliminate poverty among the minority groups by bringing them into the mainstream of American business. Nixon promised to help the people of the ghettos acquire their own businesses through Federal aid. Since the Nixon administration took office, the President has sent Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans around the country to promise minority groups that money was available to help them become businessmen.

The promised funds have been difficult to find. The Small Business Administration was supposed to have a goal of guaranteed loans of \$144.4 million, but 2 weeks before the end of the fiscal year the SBA had only guaranteed \$81.7 million in loans for minority businessmen.

The Office of Economic Opportunity was supposed to have \$56 million to help minority businessmen. Only about \$37 million of this money was used, but OEO stated even this amount of money might only have "indirect benefits" for minority businessmen.

After sifting through the rhetoric, it has been more difficult to discover evidence of other funds allocated for minority enterprises.

But it is campaign time again, and after 19 months in office President Nixon has realized that he must do something to make these hopeful minority groups think that he is trying to help them become established in business. Any results he might have to point to are so meager that he dare not mention them, for any funds the Nixon administration has made available to minority groups for business are embarrassingly short of the President's promise.

Three weeks before this election, President Nixon announces that \$100 million will be deposited in banks owned or controlled by minority groups to help black businessmen. When the banks are charging the highest interest rate in a hundred years, it is questionable whether it is the banks or the black businessmen who are being helped.

The President's announcement this money will be deposited in minority banks might look good until one realizes that this high interest rate will make meaningful loans cost the borrower a rate of interest that could make the difference between success or failure in his business venture. The Nixon announcement might look good until one remembers it is campaign time again, and Nixon's often repeated intention during the 1968 campaign to make help available for black businesses has never been fulfilled.

Mr. Speaker, the facts speak for themselves. The President has promised help to minorities for business reasons many times, but all we have seen are the promises. Promises are not what black businessmen need to operate their business. Unfortunately, depositing \$100 million in banks offers less hope than Nixon's 1968 promises did, for the banks lending this money will charge such a high interest rate that few blacks will be able to borrow it, even if they can qualify for a bank loan.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL SPEAKS  
ELOQUENTLY TO ALL AMERICANS

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 7, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Attorney General, John Mitchell, addressed a Republican National Committee conference of Republican heritage groups and nationality leaders.

His speech, which received a standing ovation, details the Nixon administration's efforts, successful efforts I might add, to cope with some of the problems most on the minds of nationality groups. I think that the Attorney General's statement speaks eloquently to all Americans as well, and I insert it in the RECORD:

THE U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL SPEAKS

Ladies and Gentlemen: I'm pleased to be asked to join with the Heritage Groups represented here today. I'd like to talk about a situation which I think you can evaluate with perhaps more perspective than other Americans. I want to talk about the use of civil disturbance for political purposes—a phenomenon which I feel has no justification whatever in a society having the machinery for peaceful debate and orderly change.

When President Nixon took office in January 1969, people of both parties were agreed that he faced the most formidable array of problems of any President in recent memory—a seemingly endless entanglement in Southeast Asia; widespread defiance of draft laws that seemed to threaten the nation's very security; civil strife that had boiled over in certain areas; rampant inflation that seemed headed for economic crisis.

You will recall that few could understand why anyone would want to become President in a time like that. A grim joke was making the rounds that President Nixon was demanding a recount.

But Richard Nixon believed in the American system of Government, in the capacity of Americans to use it, and in their wisdom to use it well.

Twenty months later, under his leadership, the American involvement in Vietnam is shrinking. It is shrinking in a way that will not lose Southeast Asia to the Communists and will not give license to every would-be aggressor around the world. While much difficulty lies ahead, a just and honorable end is in sight.

Twenty months later the draft laws have been revised in a fair and practical way, so that every young man knows where he stands and can plan accordingly. The awful time of draft card burnings and flights to Canada has passed.

Twenty months later, minority rights are being protected and expanded in accordance

with the American way of life. Again, much remains to be done, but this Administration has given the lie to those who said it has no interest in minorities. Two long, hot summers have passed without the massive incidents that were predicted.

Twenty months later, the rate of inflation has been reduced. In the process, the economy went through a test period and now appears stronger than ever.

We are not fresh out of problems, nor have some of the formidable ones that we inherited been completely solved. But they are being solved, and through the peaceful Constitutional processes that are as old as the Magna Carta and as new as the proposed Women's Rights Amendment.

Certainly our country has problems, but it also has the capacity to solve them. The ballot, the Bill of Rights, the system of laws framed by elected representatives responsible to the people, the checks and balances that prevent any branch of Government from assuming too much power, these constitute the machinery by which we effect change.

This system may sometimes be slow. I can testify that getting a bill through Congress can be excruciating. And while it is the duty of the President to lead, he cannot move very far without public support.

Now, the overwhelming majority of Americans believe in these Constitutional processes and also recognize that they work.

But these same Americans are shocked and bewildered by the growing resort to violence for political ends. Riots, bombings, burnings, vandalism, building seizures, hostage-holding, hijacking—these crimes are often employed in the name of political causes.

More than this, underground newspapers and spokesmen for extremist organizations call openly for revolution, for the murder of policemen, for the gathering of firearms and the making of bomb clubs.

Our campuses alone, 322 bombings and arson or attempted arson were committed in the past two academic years. In the same period there were 513 sit-ins and building seizures; 11,200 arrests; 12½ million dollars in property damage; 9 deaths; and 587 injuries—all in campus disturbances alone.

The traditional concept of the university as a center of enlightenment and a forum for the free exchange of ideas has been threatened by mobs shouting obscenities and throwing rocks. Listen to this quote from one university official, taken from the recent report of the Commission on Campus Unrest:

"When I look out my window, when I try to carry on my job, I would simply have to break into hysterical laughter if someone came in and told me that what was happening in that school right then was that the students were being repressed. The fact of the matter is they have got me locked in the room; the rocks are coming through the window; nobody has been punished for anything; the whole judicial process has collapsed; whatever standard you think is important in any area of drugs or law or sex or clothes or anything else has been abandoned; and just under my door has been slipped a copy of an openly published newspaper which says things no newspaper has ever dared to say. A howling mob is outside and nobody is going to do anything about it and I am supposed to believe that students are repressed?"

Amazingly, such lawless acts—both on and off the campus—are performed in the name of reform, progress and change. In their infinite wisdom these rioters and vandals know so well that this country needs that they can presume to force it on the rest of us, trampling on our hard-won liberties in the process. As President Nixon said in his speech at Kansas State:

"In a system like ours, which provides the means for peaceful change, no cause justifies violence in the name of change."

Now we are aware from investigation that many of these lawless acts are stimulated by extremist organizations. Their tactics are right out of the revolutionary handbooks.

They only talk about what is wrong with America—never conceding that anything can be good—to establish a feeling that nothing is really worth saving.

They spread the idea that any act—no matter how monstrous—is justifiable if it is in a good cause—this cause. This is the old "end justifies the means" philosophy of the Leninists.

They try to make others believe that progress is futile by Constitutional means, and that the only recourse is force.

They shout down and even attack those who disagree with them—a sure sign that their arguments are bankrupt.

In short, these extremist organizations are well trained and disciplined, frankly ruthless in their approach, and openly dedicated to pulling down Constitutional processes and substituting mob rule.

Some of you, or your parents, came from other lands where repression was more than a slogan. You know at first hand what happens when law is dethroned by raw power, when no Constitution, no Bill of Rights, no election stands guard against terror.

This was the kind of rule which nearly 200 years ago sent European volunteers who loved liberty to help in our War of Independence—Pulaski and Kosciuszko from Poland, de Kalb and von Steuben from Germany, Lafayette from France. It is the kind of rule that has since sent millions to our shore in search of freedom and opportunity.

I am sure you will join with me in saying to the self-styled revolutionaries in our midst today:

"If you want change, use the magnificent system we have for effecting change. Don't rob the rest of us of the rights and liberties we came here to win."

In my opinion, civil disturbance is heading down a one-way street. It is running out of emergency issues by which it can inflame others. As I outlined at the beginning of my remarks, these and other issues are being solved within our system of law.

In addition, a law abiding society will not stand idly by and allow mob rule. The vast majority of Americans are repelled by it, and are demanding an end to it. The Administration has sponsored a measure in Congress to improve the control of explosives and incendiaries, increase the penalties for bombings, and enable the FBI to investigate bombings that occur at institutions receiving Federal funds. This measure is expected to pass Congress and become law very soon.

Through these kinds of measures, those who represent public administration duly elected by the people are serving notice that civil disturbance is wrong, that it will be punished, and that it will give way to the rule of law in this country.

Let me close with the observation that we have heard too much from the extremists about what is wrong with this country. Let us put in a word for what's right with America.

Let's talk about the political system by which the people rule, through elected representatives, and by which change is effected through debate and ballot.

Let's talk about the economic opportunity for the individual to reap a growing reward for his talents in terms of living standards for himself and his family. Such opportunity is far greater here than in any other country in the world.

Let's talk about the educational system—again, the greatest in the world—which gives a person the basic tools he needs for the best use of his abilities.

Let's talk about our country's technical capabilities which, through a unique cooperation between Government, industry and

universities, have enabled us to lead the world in medicine, engineering, transportation, communication, manufacture, and living standards.

Let's talk about the moral precept that still rules most Americans—respect for others, honesty in personal and business affairs, reverence for a higher being and a higher order in the world.

All this, and much more, is what is right with America. There's so much that is right that we don't have to go around apologizing for our country because of what is wrong.

Nor should we, in recognizing what is right, soothe ourselves into the smug idea that nothing is wrong. We do have problems some of them very big. An existence without problems is, so far as I can see, one meant for angels, not human beings.

But we have the peaceful mechanism to examine these problems and meet them. The quality of American life is improving. It is going to continue improving—not through the pillage and riot of extremists, but through the devotion to law that is far more basic to the American mind.

#### A NEW CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS?

### HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 7, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, this country cannot tolerate the construction of a Soviet Submarine Base in Cuba. This is not because of conflicting ideologies or international "imagery" or any other such amorphous concept.

It is because the national security of the United States is directly threatened by the construction of a relatively invulnerable concrete fortress for Communist missile carrying nuclear powered submarines 90 miles off our shores. The military, naval, and tactical consequences of such a development are of near disaster proportions that no amount of "don't talk about it" directives from the Pentagon cannot suppress.

Whatever it takes it is the most solemn responsibility of the Government of the United States to stop any further construction of a Soviet Military and Naval Base in Cuba. The Cuban Government should be told in so many words that this is "no dice" or else. Hopefully, the United Nations would act but this is too much to expect. Once again we'll have to go it alone, in all probability.

But now this is in our own back yard, so-to-speak, where if we must go it alone it is fitting and proper that we do so.

In the meantime it is something approaching ridiculousness to be spending billions to hold the line against Communist advances in Indochina while allowing Communists to build a submarine base less than a hundred miles from the United States. If there ever was a situation in which our President can show his undeniable expertise it is now in this Cuban development to keep the Soviets out of this hemisphere.

It was said that the late President Kennedy stopped the Soviets and made them take their missiles out of Cuba. Maybe they did. Maybe they did not. We actually never took a look, and the so-called confrontation was largely the

appearance of confrontation rather than a literal military and naval power play. In the meantime the military situation has deteriorated in Cuba with the latest report involving the claim that the Communists are now openly building a nuclear submarine missile base there. In a very real sense this is worse than the so-called crisis that faced the Kennedy administration, for Panama and the Caribbean are vital U.S. waters.

It is the urgent responsibility of the Government of this country to act decisively and without delay to keep this Soviet base out of Cuba. In this connection Joseph Alsop's column in today's Washington Post is significant:

THAT SOVIET BASE IN CUBA

(By Joseph Alsop)

When members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee were briefed on the new Soviet submarine base now being built in Cuba, Senator Frank Church of Idaho produced a splendid example of his amiable idiocy about such matters. How could we be sure, he asked, that this was really going to be a Soviet base?

Well, there is a simple answer that even Senator Church may perhaps comprehend. Because of the past influence of the horrible American imperialists, Cubans to this day are mainly baseball players, whereas Russians are passionate soccer players. And the sports facilities with which the new base at Cienfuegos is being provided, very conspicuously center on a fine soccer field.

There are, of course, other, less simplistic reasons why the U.S. government is quite certain that the new submarine base is intended exclusively for Soviet use. Above all, it is being built to handle the largest and most advanced Soviet nuclear submarines, of the "Yankee" class, carrying 16 nuclear missiles apiece.

The real question, in fact, is not whether the base is strictly for Soviet use. The real question is why the Soviet war planners want such a base, when they have always before handled their distant submarines as we do, by ships specially built as submarine-tenders.

The only possible answer is extremely disagreeable. In brief, there are certain kinds of repair and maintenance—particularly on the submarines' vital nuclear missiles—that are extremely difficult to carry out at sea, at least in large volume and continuously.

Hence a base like Cienfuegos is needed, when really large numbers of nuclear submarines are to be continuously at sea and far from home. That is the true explanation of the base. And the explanation means, in turn, that the Soviets are now planning continuous deployment of very large numbers of "Yankee" class and other nuclear submarines in the Caribbean and along the American coast.

They will have plenty of them to deploy, God knows! Norman Polmar, one of the authoritative editors of "Jane's Fighting Ships," forecasts that the Soviet nuclear submarine fleet will be as large as our own by the end of this year. He further forecasts that the Soviets will have 50 more nuclear submarines than we do by the year 1974.

In the circumstances, the construction of the Cienfuegos base is an even more ominous development than the attempted deployment of Soviet nuclear missiles on Cuban bases in 1962. It reveals an undoubted Soviet intention to gain a solid capability to knock out the entire land-based bomber component of the U.S. deterrent, plus the controls of the "Safeguard" ABM system.

The most horrifying single aspect of the story of the Cienfuegos base is the response the bad news has met with in this country. Consider a simple comparison.

In 1962, the U.S. Senate was in flames over

mere rumors of Soviet missiles in Cuba, long before the presence of those missiles was confirmed by U-2 reconnaissance photographs. Contrast this with Senator Church's amiable idiocy, and the senatorial silence that has engulfed the news from Cienfuegos ever since!

Or think of the Kennedy administration's memorable reaction to the undesired and, indeed, the quite unexpected bad news in 1962. And then think of the Nixon administration's response to this news that is even worse!

It is being said, of course, that the administration let the Soviets know we knew about their intended submarine base, "as a signal." The signal, it is claimed, will stop the further construction of the base, with no more fuss. If you can believe that, however, you can believe anything at all, including the theories of world politics held by men like Senator Church and Sen. J. William Fulbright.

Meanwhile, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird has now clamped down an iron lid on any further Defense Department discussion of the Cienfuegos base and its ominous meaning. The obvious intent was, and is, to prevent the public from growing alarmed, when we should be deeply alarmed. And this intent is natural, in view of the progressive American disarmament being shockingly carried on in the face of growing danger!

#### GOOD NEWS ABOUT OUR ECONOMY

### HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 7, 1970

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, back on April 28, President Nixon said that if he had any money he would be buying stocks. I recall that there were Members across the aisle who made it a point to report to this body that the market dipped shortly thereafter.

I do not see those same Members making their financial reports today. Perhaps they do not wish to remind the public that from 724 on April 28 when President Nixon spoke, the market has gone up to 782 as of the close on Tuesday. Those who followed President Nixon's advice on buying stocks last April 28 would today be well ahead of the game, a reflection of the upward movement of our economy.

The stock market has been called a bellwether of our economy. It is on the move—upward, just as our economy is on the move. True, unemployment is threatening to match the Kennedy years—but, while he was winding up a war to end unemployment, President Nixon is winding down a war to turn workers loose for the pursuits of peace.

President Nixon is working for the long pull. Those who rushed to report ill news across the aisle were hoping to reap short-term political benefits.

I cannot blame those on the other side of the aisle for not wanting to spread the good news about our economy, after their tirades about gloom and doom. However, I do hope that they are not suffering personally, that they did not let their political yearning interfere with following the sound business advice of President Nixon.

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON'S  
LATEST NEWSLETTER

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, October 7, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, because of the large number of requests I receive for copies of my newsletters and in order to make the text of the current issue of my newsletter available to Members of this and the other body, I hereby insert the text of the newsletter into the RECORD:

NEWSLETTER

DEAR FRIEND: Staying on the job.—A long session of Congress in an election year presents special problems for many Congressmen, including yours. Though each of us would like to be home full time as elections approach, our first obligation is to serve you in Washington . . . and that obligation will be met. However, as often as time permits during brief recesses of our sessions, your Congressman will be back in the Atlanta area attending as many meetings as my duties in Congress will permit.

A big heart.—While in Israel a month ago during the Labor Day recess, Bernard Abrams and I visited the Hadassah Hospital with Mrs. Fay Schenck, National President of Hadassah. Though this hospital in Jerusalem is supported by contributions from Jews, it warmed my heart while visiting the children's ward to find that the Hadassah women have opened more than half of the children's facilities to Arab children. At left I am pictured with an Arab grandfather, Bernard and three Arab children suffering from leukemia.

(Photo not printed in RECORD.)

To the Israelis, a religious difference makes no difference when children are in need.

National security.—Perhaps no people recognize the need for national security more than the Israelis. They've had to fight for their freedom in three wars in recent years. All Israelis I talked to expressed dismay at Americans who advocate surrender in Vietnam and disarmament at home. They know that freedom is not free and must be protected every day. Therefore, when your Congressman was rated recently by the American Security Council as having voted 100% of the time in the interest of national security, I could not help but think of the Israeli who told me that freedom must be protected every day.

A change is needed.—It is not fair to allow profiteers and land speculators to obtain apartment zoning on the pretense of building regular or luxury-type private apartments and then, after the zoning hearings are over, change the use to low-income, taxpayer-subsidized public housing without further hearings on the change of use. Yet, the Fulton County laws allow this to happen. In DeKalb County, a developer must build the type project he says he will build when the zoning was obtained. Property owners in Fulton County deserve the same protection. You should insist on the local laws being changed to prevent a moral injustice being done to innocent home-owners by denying them a right to be heard on the change of land use from private to public housing.

Realistic housing approach.—While your Congressman has and will continue to vigorously oppose allowing local housing agencies to deny you the right to have a hearing when land use is changed from private to public housing, if due process and equal protection of the law is afforded by allowing the local residents a hearing on what is to be built in their community before the decision to re-

zone is made, then the funding will not be opposed. But I will not support projects where your rights are denied.

POW film.—For the benefit of those who have loved ones they believe to be prisoners of war in North Vietnam, we obtained at our own expense a print of a 16-mm. film made in a North Vietnamese POW camp. Many have already identified loved ones in this film. If you know of someone who would like to view it, call my Atlanta District office at 524-1275 and we will help you.

Your vote's vital.—Are you going to let someone else make your decisions? In a Colorado election this year, 27 votes decided the candidate for Congress. In Maryland, 38 votes decided another Congressional race. In 1966, 360 votes determined the outcome of a Congressional race in Georgia. Though you may not realize it, your one vote can determine the outcome of an election. If you don't vote in November, someone else is going to decide the future of your country for you . . . and you may not like the results.

Watchdog of the Treasury.—Two years ago, your Congressman was honored by being named a "Watchdog of the Treasury" by the National Associated Businessmen, Inc., for protecting your tax dollar from excessive federal spending. For the second time, this award has just been granted me. One of the most effective ways I can serve you in Congress is to guard against too much government spending which causes inflation and makes your dollars buy less at home. I am proud of this award at a time when people are beginning to realize inflation is caused by excessive government spending.

What's your opinion.—To truly represent you in Washington, I want to know how you feel about the vital issues listed below. Please give me your opinions on this questionnaire and send them to me at 514 Cannon Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

It is a high honor for me to serve you in Congress.

Yours very truly,

FLETCHER THOMPSON,

Member of Congress.

(Printing & paper paid for by myself & with donations sent in.)

THE ISSUES

1. Should armed guards be placed on airliners to prevent hijackings?
2. Should the U.S. have a treaty with Cuba to return all hijackers of boats or airplanes to the other?
3. Should the U.S. take diplomatic steps to prevent construction of a Russian submarine base in Cuba?
4. Should a homeowner have a voice on changing land use from private to public housing in his neighborhood?
5. Should the Congress, except in national emergencies, limit federal spending to bring the budget into balance?
6. Would you pay more for a car that needs less repairs after a minor collision?
7. Should the people of America be concerned about growing Russian missile and naval strength?

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES  
COMPENSATION ACT

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, October 7, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to join with the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) and other colleagues in sponsoring the wise legislation that would ex-

tend benefits of the Federal Employees Compensation Act to all policemen and firemen killed or totally disabled in the line of duty.

Our bill provides that a widow who is the sole survivor of a policeman or fireman would be eligible to receive approximately 45 percent of the monthly wage of her deceased husband. The compensation would continue as long as she did not remarry. If there are dependent children, the widow would receive 40 percent and each child 15 percent, up to a total of 75 percent of the monthly wage of the deceased. In cases of total disability, the wife's benefits would equal two-thirds of the monthly wage rate if there are no other dependents, but would be increased to three-fourths of the monthly wage if there are dependents.

During the 90th Congress Federal Employees Compensation Act benefits were made available to police officers who fell while upholding Federal law. This is a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough. Our proposal does not distinguish between officers who fall in defense of Federal, State, or local law; benefits will be granted if they fall in the line of duty. And this legislation brings firemen under the coverage of the act—something that should have been done long ago. Men who lay down their lives to protect their communities give literally everything they have to help their fellow citizens and the least the rest of us can do for them is to guarantee that neither they nor their dependents will suffer undue economic hardship because of physical harm incurred while answering the call to duty.

I am surprised and saddened to learn that the Justice Department opposes taking this step, which seems especially appropriate at a time when police and firemen face increasing risks. The notion espoused by the Justice Department that somehow local government would be adversely affected by extending the coverage of the Federal Employees Compensation Act as proposed in this bill today seems to me strangely misguided.

Neither criminals nor fires respect jurisdictions, and outbreaks of lawlessness or arson affect us all. I hope we can look forward to swift and favorable action on this important matter.

NO EXCUSE TO DELAY WELFARE  
REFORM

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, October 7, 1970

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, as the end of the session draws near, I am hopeful my colleagues in the Senate will have the opportunity to consider President Nixon's family assistance plan and to act favorably upon it as those of us in the House of Representatives did.

To underscore the urgency of this landmark legislation, I include in the RECORD the Los Angeles Time's editorial, "No Excuse To Delay Welfare Reform":

**NO EXCUSE TO DELAY WELFARE REFORM**  
(Issue.—Now that Mr. Nixon has shown a disposition to compromise, is there any excuse for further inaction on welfare reform?)

President Nixon has wisely decided to accept a Democratic-sponsored compromise to get his welfare reform proposal unstuck from the Senate Finance Committee, where it has been languishing for more than four months.

It is now up to Senate liberals to display a corresponding sense of urgency and responsibility so the measure can be enacted before Congress adjourns for the year.

Practically everybody agrees that the existing welfare system is a mess. It is expensive. It contributes to the breaking up of

homes. And it does precious little to encourage recipients to get off welfare and into jobs.

Under the reform program proposed by Mr. Nixon a year ago, every family with children would, in effect, be guaranteed a minimum annual income based on the size of the family—provided the head of the family is willing to work or take job training.

Since the proposed program would include the working poor, the initial cost would be somewhat higher than that of the existing system. But if it succeeded in breaking the welfare dependency cycle, it would save the taxpayers money in the long run.

President Nixon has squelched Democratic charges that he was not serious about the proposal by waging an intensive lobbying

campaign among conservative Republicans on the committee.

Now he has announced that he is willing to accept an amendment proposed by Sen. Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.), providing for a one-year trial in three areas before the new system would go into effect in the country as a whole.

Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield predicts, as a result, that the committee will report out the bill in October and it will be voted upon by the Senate this year.

We hope Long and other obstructionists on the committee feel likewise. This is too important a bill to die because of either conservative opposition—or a seeming reluctance among some Democrats to see a Republican President get credit for a landmark piece of social legislation.

## SENATE—Thursday, October 8, 1970

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

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

Give unto us, O Lord, that quietness of mind in which we can hear Thee speaking to us, illuminating our minds, directing our actions, controlling our emotions, for Thy name's sake.

Gracious Father, who wildest us to cast our care on Thee, who carest for us, preserve us from all faithless fears and selfish anxieties, and grant that no clouds of this mortal life may hide from us the light of the love which is immortal; and which Thou hast manifested to us in Jesus Christ our Lord, but that we may this day walk in the light of Thy countenance, be guided by Thine eye, be sanctified by Thy spirit, and be enabled to live to Thy glory. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication from the President pro tempore of the Senate (Mr. RUSSELL).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., October 8, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. HOLLINGS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 7, 1970, be dispensed with.

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

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

### AMBASSADORS

The assistant legislative clerk read the following nominations:

Artemus E. Weatherbee, of Maine, who was confirmed by the Senate September 1, 1970, as U.S. Director of the Asian Development Bank, to serve on the Bank with the rank indicated, to be an ambassador.

Christopher H. Phillips, of New York, to be the deputy representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

G. Edward Clark, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of The Gambia.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations has favorably reported the nomination of Mr. Artemus E. Weatherbee to be given the rank of Ambassador. Mr. Weatherbee was confirmed by the Senate as U.S. Director of the Asian Development Bank on September 1, 1970. The present action is taken strictly to give him additional status; it has no bearing on his duties or his remuneration.

In recommending that the Senate approve this nomination I would like to make a few points quite clear to the Senate. These have nothing to do with Mr. Weatherbee himself, but relate to the circumstances surrounding this particular administration request. Indeed, since we approved Mr. Weatherbee's nomination to be U.S. Director on the Asian Bank, a vote of confidence has already been given to him as a person.

The case for granting ambassadorial rank to our permanent representative at

the Asian Development Bank rests entirely on the circumstance that the headquarters of the Bank are in Manila in the Philippines. Other comparable international financial institutions, such as the World Bank and the Inter-American Bank, have their headquarters here in Washington, D.C., and it is presumed that the tasks and the living and working conditions of the U.S. executive directors in these institutions are made easier by this fact.

When the Asian Development Bank was established in 1966, Public Law 89-389 provided that the U.S. Director of the Asian Bank could be given the status of a chief of mission, class 2, within the meaning of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended. Although not provided for in the law, our first representative was also given the personal rank of Ambassador on the grounds that it would heighten his prestige and influence in Asian Bank circles in Manila. Leaving the question of justification to one side, the Committee on Foreign Relations has been concerned that the general practice of accord a personal rank in such fashion bypassed the Senate's constitutional right and duty to confirm ambassadorial nominees.

In response to the committee's expression of concern about this and numerous other cases the administration has not unilaterally given Mr. Weatherbee the personal rank of ambassador. Rather, the President has submitted his nomination to be ambassador in the regular way. The committee welcomes this straightforward method of doing business.

However, it should be emphasized that in approving this nomination, the Foreign Relations Committee has made no judgment about the comparative merits of the various international financial institutions. And, most importantly, it does not believe that this action should be regarded in any way as a precedent either in terms of future U.S. Directors of the Asian Bank or in terms of the rank of U.S. representatives to other international organizations and institutions.

With this understanding clearly stated the committee has asked the Senate to approve this nomination.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask