

## Aerographer

Joe E. McKinzie

## Photographer

Kenneth R. Kimball  
Donald F. Sheehan

## Civil Engineer Corps

Jerry G. Havner  
Cecil W. Lovette, Jr.

Warrant Officer Edward G. Torres to be a permanent chief warrant officer W-3 in the Navy in the classification of electrician, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Warrant Officer Charles L. Boland, Jr., to be a permanent chief warrant officer W-4 in the Navy in the classification of supply clerk, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Enlisted Scientific Education Program candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the Line or Staff Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Michael P. Bahnmler Terrel D. Buck  
Orville K. Brown, Jr. Michael W. Dent  
Charles J. Bruerton Alan P. Derry

James R. Dunlap  
Morris E. Elsen  
Clifford A. Froelich  
John W. Gebhart  
William C. Griggs  
Oran L. Houck  
Joseph A. Hughes  
Paul B. Jacovelli  
David H. Kellner  
Marlene Marlitt  
\*Michael T. Marsh  
John A. Mattox  
Joseph E. McClanahan  
James W. McHale  
Charles A. McPherron

John A. Balikowski (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent Lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

George E. Meacham  
Charles G. Morgan  
James D. Palmer  
John W. Pounds, Jr.  
Ronald W. Robillard  
Allen R. Shuff  
Kenneth M. St. Clair, Jr.  
Gerard R. Steiner  
Harold B. St. Peter  
Ronald J. Uzenoff  
Jerry E. Walton  
Ervin B. Whitt, Jr.  
William J. York  
John A. Zetes

## AMBASSADORS

Jerome H. Holland, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sweden.

Robert Strausz-Hupé, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ceylon, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Maldives.

## IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The nominations beginning Keith E. Adamson, to be a Foreign Service information officer of class 1, and ending Harvey M. Wandler, to be a Foreign Service information officer of class 6, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 1970; and

The nominations beginning Harry G. Barnes, Jr., to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, and ending J. Guy Gwynne, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a consular officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 29, 1970.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 16, 1970:

\* Ad Interim appointment issued.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## BLIND STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS IN AUSTIN

## HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is always good to see, in a fast moving society such as ours, that we can still find time to assist those less fortunate than we, and in so doing, help society in general. I was very pleased, therefore, when I read in the January-February 1970 issue of Rehabilitation Record, a publication of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, an article about a real success story at the University of Texas in Austin.

In 1965 there were only six blind students at the university. As a result of a special project, in which the Texas Commission for the Blind and the university are cooperating, there are now 59 visually disabled students in the university. The event that gave impetus to this project was, much to the credit of my State legislature, the enactment of a State law exempting the blind from payment of tuition and fees required at State-supported institutions of higher learning.

Space for project activities was made available by the university administration. Two student groups provide such volunteer services as reading and transportation. And the student government provides funds for the purchase of additional equipment and supplies needed for the project.

The basic premise of the project is to free the blind from continued assistance from social and rehabilitation agencies; that is, to give them the independence and pride that comes from earning one's way in society.

Mr. President, I was so impressed with this project, that I ask unanimous con-

sent that the article entitled "Blind Students," written by Mr. Charles W. Hoehne, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

## BLIND STUDENTS AT TEXAS UNIVERSITY

(By Charles W. Hoehne)

In 1965 there were only six blind students on the campus of the University of Texas at Austin. As of September 1969, there were 59 visually disabled students at UT Austin, thanks to a special project in which the Texas Commission for the Blind and the university are cooperating.

The project includes an office on campus for a full-time rehabilitation counselor and secretary, five special reading rooms for blind students, a braille library of basic reference works, taping and duplicating equipment, braillewriters, and related types of equipment available at a central location on the campus.

"The project at UT Austin represents the drawing together and utilization of a variety of resources," according to Burt L. Risley, executive director of our Commission for the Blind. "There has been tremendous support from the University community. Without this support, I doubt that the project would have succeeded."

The event that really triggered this project was the enactment of a State law exempting the Commission's blind clients from payment of tuition and required fees at Texas State-supported institutions of higher learning.

Space for project activities is made available by the University's administration. Two student groups provide such volunteer services as reading, transportation, and assistance with registration. They are Alpha Phi Omega, the men's service organization at the University, and Gamma Delta Epsilon, the women's service organization. Volunteer services also are provided by a number of individuals who are not associated with either of these two organizations. The student government of the University annually makes an appropriation to the Commission for the purchase of additional equipment and supplies needed for the project.

The clients attending UT Austin are preparing for a variety of vocations. Several are presently candidates for doctoral degrees. A blind law student is serving as a law review editor.

"The curriculum at UT Austin is generally recognized as excellent, but rigorous," Risley points out. "While the attrition rate for the student body in general is rather high, the rate of failure among our clients has become exceptionally low. We do not expect that more than two blind students a year will leave UT Austin for academic reasons."

Except for special equipment and facilities required because of visual loss, blind students at the University receive the same treatment as their sighted classmates. "A very deliberate and calculated effort not to 'baby' these blind students is made," according to Charles Raeke, a rehabilitation counselor from the Commission for the Blind who is serving as coordinator of the project.

"This comes as a shock to clients who have been overly protected and pampered at home because of their blindness, but it's a valuable experience for them. They won't be babied when they get out and compete for jobs."

The success of the UT Austin project has caused us to consider establishing similar projects at other State-supported institutions of higher learning. The Commission estimates that a college or university would have to have an enrollment of at least 50 blind students before full-time staff could be justified for a project of this type. Volunteer groups at Texas Technological College at Lubbock presently are cooperating in the establishment of a program for blind students at that institution, and we hope to provide a similar service to the high concentration of college students in the North Texas area.

"The number of blind students enrolled in institutions of higher education is going to continue to rise," Risley said recently. "This is only one facet of the increased sophistication and relevance which agencies for the blind are attempting to give their vocational rehabilitation programs."

"Our project at UT Austin stems from the conviction that one of the purposes of rehabilitation is to help handicapped individuals to get free of the need for continued assistance from agencies providing social or rehabilitation services. If a handi-

capped individual has the capacity for attaining this type of independence, it is administratively unsound to provide only limited services which may in fact increase the individual's dependence upon the rehabilitation agency."

**FRANCE, AMERICA'S ALLY: PERHAPS THE OLDEST, BUT NOT THE MOST TRIED AND TRUE**

**HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 1970

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, "La Marseillaise," the French national anthem, speaks of the "bloody standard being raised." That was in 1789, and France was fighting for her liberation from tyranny. Today France has again raised a bloody banner, but this time it is not on the side of liberty, equality, and fraternity. Rather, it is on the side of injustice and tyranny.

France has become the most dangerous actor to come center stage in the Middle East conflict. With callous disregard for the chances of achieving peace in that area, France is playing the role of antagonist. Her irresponsible sale of arms to the belligerent Arab nations is in opposition to her original declaration against such sale. Instead she has guaranteed that there will be a still bloodier confrontation in the war that is presently raging.

France has claimed that her present policies of arm sales coincide with her national interest. I regret to say then that our "staunch ally" and "lover of peace and justice" has interests that coincide with increased tensions in the Middle East. Indeed, one wonders whether France has international interests or merely international investments.

Anti-Americanism has been a persistent and unifying theme in the internal politics of France. To cite a case from the 1950's, vociferous popular approval of the French landing in Suez stemmed from the knowledge that the actions had been taken against the expressed wishes of the United States.

Paradoxically, after the French Governments have deliberately raised the bloody banner and stirred up international tensions, they have repeatedly looked to the United States to rescue France from the consequences of her actions. What would the French troops have done if they had been permitted to occupy the area of Suez in 1956? What if the United States had not been willing to sacrifice a substantial amount for the increased protective trade barriers that insulated France from competition from the outside so that her economy could prosper?

I am not saying that the United States should not have taken these actions toward France. What I am saying is that France, in the past, has depended on the United States both for a large part of

her well-being and to rescue her from some of her own actions.

I am afraid that France's present policy in the Middle East will have similar unfortunate consequences and that the United States will then be asked to bail the French out. Even if that were not the case, the security and well-being of the state of Israel hangs in the balance. The French are sacrificing the freedom and liberty of Israel in order to gain transitory influence in the area. And I might add at the expense of the United States.

French sale of Mirage jets to Libya and the proposed sale to Iraq threaten to set off a new and spiraling phase of the conflict in the Middle East. France has assured her opponents that these arms will remain in the hands of the countries to which they are headed—what France terms nonbelligerents. Yet, the dividing line between belligerency and nonbelligerency is often very narrow—if not nonexistent.

Libya's pronouncements have made her one of the most outspoken, anti-Israel nations in the Middle East. The large shipment of French arms may allow her to cross the line and turn belligerent words into belligerent actions. If that became reality, one more armed Arab nation would join the conflict against Israel.

Evidence has shown that French Mirages are in fact finding their way into the hands of those engaged in armed attack in that area. It was reported yesterday that the Mirage jets have found their way into the hands of the Egyptians. Even French imagination cannot manufacture a story that would place Egypt on the side of the nonbelligerents.

France, then, is trading responsible action in international affairs for transitory influence. What France does not seem to realize is that she will be making a bad bargain in the long run; these nations are not going to trade their right to independent action for French bombers.

Why then have I asked the Members of this House to refrain from attending a joint session of this Congress at which Mr. Pompidou was asked to speak? I believe that the French sale of arms to the Arabs threatens to turn any hopes for peace in that area into a still bloodier confrontation.

President Pompidou will be visiting our country in 2 weeks and he has been told that there will be only a minor protest by a few Congressmen. This is not the case. While we well understand the desire and the need of our President to extend a courtesy toward a visiting dignitary, I believe it is up to this Congress to place American opinion toward France's action in a more accurate light. Let this Congress strengthen Mr. Nixon's hand so that he might set forth an unambiguous policy toward French initiatives in the Middle East. Mr. Pompidou must be made aware of the American public's opposition to French actions, and this Congress, as the necessary representative body, must act as its due spokesman. By refraining from attending this joint session that Mr. Pompidou will be attending we will be expressing

our unqualified opposition to France's irresponsibility generally and more particularly lately in the Middle East. This is the one way that Mr. Pompidou will come to know America's views. Otherwise by attending the session and affording Mr. Pompidou this great accolade, we will be condoning his actions when we actually oppose them.

The bloody banner has been waving over the Middle East too long. Too many thousands have shed blood and given their lives. Yet the avowed Arab claim remains the destruction of our one great democratic nation in the Middle East—Israel. France's actions have provided a gathering place for the forces of injustice and tyranny. Let us voice our opposition to such irresponsibility and let us try to bring peace into that area.

In effect, Congress would be bestowing one of the highest honors we can on a visiting dignitary, the first since 1967, since we gave the same honor to the President of Mexico. Yet when President Nixon went to France last year he was not invited to address the French Parliament. He was not invited to be given this great honor of addressing the joint session of the Parliament of France.

I received a letter from one of my colleagues in which he said that France is one of our great trusted and long-time allies. Let us look at the facts. I have made a thorough analysis of the United Nations in the years 1960 to 1969. Let me give you some facts of the United Nations votes from the period 1960 to 1963. France voted less times with the United States in the United Nations than any other country in the Atlantic Alliance with the exception of Portugal.

Let me give you some more startling facts. On those items affecting the security of the United States, France voted less times with the United States in the United Nations than any other country in the Atlantic Alliance, including Portugal. Between 1964 and 1969, the evidence is even more startling and even more revealing. I will make this information available next week.

I only bring to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that we should not accord this great honor. Our President must receive the President of France. This does not mean that this Congress must give him that honor that in turn he did not bestow on the President of the United States when he visited them. I shall not be here. I urge my colleagues not to attend the session at which this man will be honored.

**LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY**

**HON. HUGH SCOTT**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Americans, secure in their own independence, should take a few moments to ponder the plight of the little country of Lithuania, whose 52d anniversary it is today. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial that was



published in the Philadelphia Inquirer be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### LITHUANIANS CONTINUE THE STRUGGLE

For more than a quarter of a century, Lithuanians both at home and abroad have resisted Soviet rule of their nation. Perhaps one unfamiliar with the history of the Lithuanian people may wonder why, after all these years, they refuse to quit. A look into the history of Lithuania will explain why.

This isn't the first time that the Baltic nation has had to suffer under foreign domination. It is by far not the longest period that Lithuanians have had to endure alien oppression. And it is not the first time that the Russians were the antagonists. Russia once controlled Lithuania for 120 years, but the Lithuanians never lost their desire and determination for independence.

After more than a century under Russian rule, the Lithuanians gained their freedom on February 16, 1918. The next 22 years were golden years in the history of Lithuania, surpassed perhaps only by the 38 years when Vytautas the Great ruled Lithuania 500 years earlier and the nation's borders extended from the Baltic Sea all the way to the shores of the Black Sea.

The golden years of this century ended abruptly for Lithuanians in 1940 when Hitler and Stalin divided up the Baltic states, and the Russians once again took over Lithuania. Nazi armies chased the Reds out. Then later the Soviets chased the Nazis out. Lithuanians fought the Russians for the next eight years, and it has been estimated that 30,000 of Lithuanian resistance group lost their lives in the struggle.

But the struggle is not over yet. A nation that would not be subdued in 120 years will not die in a quarter of a century. People with a language and a heritage that is over 700 years old, and who have great pride in that language and heritage, will not let it be crushed by the Communist oppressor so easily. Lithuanians will survive the Soviets just as they survived the Czars. This determination will be evident throughout this nation as Lithuanian-Americans gather to mark their Independence Day on February 16 and as they work and hope for a new day of independence.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION

### HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, the concern over ecology and its relation to the pollution of our air, water, and land is predicted by many to be the issue of the 1970's.

But we realize that it must become more than merely an issue. It must produce action—positive action—and soon. It must not be lost once elections are over.

Lest one attempts to place all the blame for past mistakes on government or industry, I refer you to the following editorial from Mary Ann Barrows' the Calhoun Chronicle.

As Mrs. Barrows correctly explains it:

You're going to hear a lot about it (ecology), and you're going to have to do your share to stop pollution of that environment.

She concludes her editorial with some sound advice:

Too little, and too late, may become a danger of a pinch-penny administration, relying heavily on tax or other incentives to private business to do what is everybody's business. This calls for some bold new steps to be taken before it's too late.

Pollution is not merely a problem of the great urban areas. It has reached into the green mountains of West Virginia, up the Little Kanawha River to Grantsville where Mrs. Barrows lives.

I now refer you to Mrs. Barrows' editorial. I heartily urge you to read this most provocative article:

#### WATER POLLUTION

The decade of the 70's is supposed to be years devoted to improving our environment, before it's too late, before we are ruined by pollution of our water, air and soil. President Nixon has set the tone. Attention of young people is expected to turn from civil rights to ecology, and we are prepared to see a campaign against those who foul the air and contaminate the soil and water. Who in his right mind can oppose such a worthy cause?

Civil rights may not have had much relevancy in Calhoun county but water pollution is going to be right at home. The Little Kanawha river and its tributaries are polluted. There's no doubt about it. One good sniff is enough to confirm that fact. We hope the Town of Grantsville can get along with their sewage system this summer, so that at least one section can stop polluting the river.

But it isn't just the Town of Grantsville that is doing all this pollution. There are lots of homes where raw sewage goes directly into a nearby stream. Even garbage is dumped into streams and no thought given to what this is doing to the river. One thing very noticeable in the latest bit of high water here: lots of floating debris in the river, not a pretty sight, and not very healthy either.

Eventually, we see tighter regulations on pollution involving almost everyone in a campaign to clean up our environment. The world's population is growing much too fast to ignore the problem any longer. Get used to that word "ecology." The dictionary says it is "the science which treats of the relations between organisms and their environment." The "organism" in this sense is most usually man; in other words, the study of man and his environment. You're going to hear a lot about it, and you're going to have to do your share to stop pollution of that environment.

"Too little, and too late," may become a danger of a pinch-penny administration, relying heavily on tax or other incentives to private business to do what is everybody's business. This calls for some bold new steps to be taken before it's too late.

#### FEBRUARY 16—LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, this week Americans of Lithuanian origin mark the anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania, which took place February 16, 1918. Unfortunately, the occasion is a sad one for those who cherished Lithuania's independence, for that land is today occupied by the U.S.S.R.

This country and its brave people had only 22 years of freedom before their

land was dominated by a foreign power, and all cultural and political progress was halted.

Today, friends of Lithuania are hoping that the plight of that country will be brought before the United Nations, and the Congress of the United States has adopted a resolution calling for such action. I support this resolution, which also asks the U.S.S.R. for the freedom of Latvia and Estonia in addition to Lithuania, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this time.

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

#### H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

Passed the House of Representatives June 21, 1965.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,  
Clerk.

#### THE LADY OF THE HOUSE

### HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Carroll W. Parcher, a longtime, close, personal friend of mine, wrote an article entitled "The Lady of the House" which sets forth his opinion regarding his wonderful and beloved wife, Frances, who recently passed away. I would like to bring this to the attention of the Members.

The article follows:

[From the Glendale News-Press, Feb. 6, 1970]

"THE LADY OF THE HOUSE" LEAVES HAPPY MEMORIES

(By Carroll W. Patcher)

The Star that swung low in the early hours just before the Wednesday morning dawn to lift The Lady of the House from a life which pain finally had made intolerable, took on its beams a lovely and a remarkable woman.

Those are words used too often to describe those to whom they apply only in the barest outline. But for Frances they had meaning far beyond the ordinary.

Thomas Brown said: "Life is a pure flame, and we live by an invisible sun within us."

But for Frances the sun within did not remain invisible. It shone through. And those with whom she came in contact, in whatever frame of life, were warmed and comforted by its radiance.

Anna Mae, the colored lady who had been "looking after" the family for a good many years put it this way: "I'd work for Mrs. Patcher iffen she couldn't pay me a cent. It would be wuth it just to be around her."

And Dick Nixon, before he became President, told me one time: "Your wife always makes me feel better. She has something good to say about everyone."

Perhaps that was the reason, or one of the reasons, why the invisible sun glowed so brightly. Frances had that innate goodness about her which let her see whatever good there was to be seen in her fellows (a good which I sometimes could not discern) and to filter out the bad.

When even she couldn't find something good to say about a person, she said nothing. And when I, not so charitable, or perhaps just more obtuse, pointed out what I thought were fairly obvious faults in someone of our mutual acquaintance she almost always countered by pointing out a fairly admirable quality which I hadn't noticed.

I suppose no one goes through life without making some enemies—even inadvertently. But I can think of no one who was her enemy. Or who even disliked her. Except, perhaps, those to whom she was pretty sharp when they criticized something I had written, or said publicly, or some stand the paper had taken.

Not that she always agreed. Her opinions were as strong as her character. But she thought that "for better or for worse" meant standing up for your husband in public.

Sometimes she would say: "I wish you didn't have to be so vehement about freedom of speech. Some of my friends think you like dirty books." But I doubt if any of those friends got anything but an argument when they voiced that opinion to her.

Her greatest joy always was in her family—in the three children she guided, more by example than by duress, toward assuming their adult responsibilities with courage and determination. And in the grandchildren to whom she gave the same love and devotion their parents had enjoyed.

By the greatest possible good fortune all three children were able to be with her during the last days of her illness—a circumstance for which I shall forever be grateful.

Her greatest pleasure was in her friends—not great armies of them (she liked better the small dinner party or the intimate luncheon than the overpowering cocktail party) but the comparatively small circle who shared her interest in music and books and ballet and flowers and the theatre. To those she was devoted, and she received their devotion in full return.

To Frances her home was her comfort and her satisfaction. We had only three during the 45 years of marriage, but she made each one distinctively her own, unmistakably a place in which living was to be enjoyed.

If I piled books and magazines high on the tables around my chair she fretted a

little, I'm sure, but seldom complained until the floor threatened to cave in under the extra weight.

She disclaimed being a "good housekeeper," of which there are perhaps too many, but without doubt was a good home maker, of whom there are far too few.

The house high on the Verdugos with the sweeping view and the aroma of faintly aromatic woods to which we came a dozen years ago, was her favorite. But it was followed closely by the vacation cabin in the high mountains by the big blue lake, where she reveled in the beauty and the clean, fresh air, and the solitude.

Like most people with inner strengths Frances enjoyed being alone. When she came home after the first three-month stay in the hospital I suggested a "live in" housekeeper. "But with somebody in the house all the time, when would I ever be alone?"

I thought of these things, and many more, as I sat at her bedside during the long night, after consciousness as we know it had gone but before "God's finger touched her, and she slept."

Nearly a half century of going to school together, starting a little newspaper together, raising a family together and traveling to far places together provides a broad field for remembrance.

And after the last tortured breath was drawn and the tight features relaxed in that peace which comes only after the gentle touch of death's broad wings I thought of the joy there would be that night in whatever Heaven there is. Because Frances was there.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY—A PIONEER AMONG WOMEN

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Sunday, February 15, marked the 150th anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony, founder of the women's suffrage movement. Miss Anthony's statue stands in this Capitol as a monument to her work for the equality of rights for women.

Believing that the 14th amendment to the Constitution guaranteed women the right to vote, Susan B. Anthony cast her ballot for President on November 5, 1872, in Rochester, N.Y. Seven months later she was convicted in a U.S. court of voting illegally.

Despite this setback, Miss Anthony continued her efforts to enfranchise women. She drafted and, in 1878, succeeded in achieving the introduction in the U.S. Senate of a constitutional amendment guaranteeing women the right to vote. Through her 80th year she continued to travel across the United States lecturing and organizing support for this amendment. At the age of 83, she went to Berlin to help organize the International Woman Suffrage Alliance.

Although she did not attain her goal during her lifetime, Miss Anthony's courage and determination lived on in the suffragists who carried on her work after her death in 1906. These women—founders of the National Woman's Party—waged the battle that Susan B. Anthony had begun.

In 1919 their campaign reached its mark as the Republican-controlled 66th

Congress passed the Susan B. Anthony amendment. I take special pride in the fact that on June 24, 1919—less than a month after congressional approval—the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania became the seventh State to ratify what was to become the 19th amendment to the Constitution. The 36th, and last needed, ratification came on August 20, 1920, establishing the right of American women to vote.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the adoption of the 19th amendment. How fitting it would be for this year to also mark the passage of the equal rights amendment. I am proud to be a sponsor of this proposed amendment to the Constitution which provides a constitutional guarantee of equal rights under the law for men and women. The adoption of this amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 61, would be but a small payment from a Nation whose women citizens have done so much to contribute to its greatness.

FEDERAL AID TO HELP BOOST SUPPLY OF FAMILY DOCTORS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today aimed at helping medical schools and hospitals educate larger numbers of doctors to practice family medicine.

Forty years ago, three-fourths of all practicing physicians were general practitioners.

Today only one in five—20 percent—of practicing physicians are general practitioners. The rest are specialists in surgery, pathology, radiology, internal medicine, psychiatry, pediatrics, and so forth.

In today's sophisticated and rapidly growing field of medicine, it is quite true that we need specialists. But the need is no less for family doctors—physicians who can provide general medical care for the entire family, from childhood to old age.

It is true that some medical schools are finally beginning to recognize the need for training family doctors. But the supply is only a drop in the bucket as compared with the need.

The family doctor needs to be trained in particular in preventive medicine, taking into account the family makeup and surroundings.

A second function is to advise families whom to consult when it is apparent the illness requires the counsel of a specialist—the average family does not understand the medical specialist and needs the advice of a close family friend, the family doctor, to counsel him.

The bill I introduced today would authorize the appropriation of \$50 million for the fiscal year beginning next July 1, another \$75 million for the following fiscal year, and then \$100 million for each of the next 3 fiscal years.

These appropriations would be for the



purpose of making grants to medical schools and hospitals to establish departments and programs in the field of family practice and to encourage the training of medical and paramedical personnel in the field of family medicine.

#### A CRISIS IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

**HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 7, 1970, the All Pennsylvania College Alumni Association of Washington, D.C., at a citation luncheon held in the Marriott Twin Bridges Motel, honored Dr. Eric A. Walker, president of the Pennsylvania State University, by awarding him their 1970 citation in recognition of his outstanding contribution to the advancement and extension of the American ideals of education.

Subsequent to the receipt of the 1970 citation, Dr. Walker, who will retire in June 1970, delivered the following address on the subject of "A Crisis in American Higher Education":

#### A CRISIS IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

If you asked people today if there is a crisis in American higher education, I'm sure you would find that most people would say, "Yes."

And if you asked them what they considered the crisis to be, I believe most people would tell you that the crisis involves student demonstrations, student demands and general unrest.

These are big problems to be sure, and on some campuses they have reached crisis proportions. But there is an even bigger crisis looming on the horizon for every college—big or small. The new crisis is one that has been creeping up for a long time without a lot of fanfare, without coverage from the news media, and without the knowledge of the general public.

The major crisis coming that will affect virtually every school in America is the crisis in financing higher education.

Colleges today are really faced with two types of troubles—the surface crisis and the hidden crisis.

First, let me talk about some of the surface problems colleges have today, and then I'll talk about the financial crisis.

Centuries ago, the main purpose of universities was to teach. In fact, universities then had no buildings, no libraries and no set classrooms. Universities then consisted only of students and teachers.

Gradually, universities acquired land and buildings and then research was introduced as a function of the university. But during World War II the colleges were called upon not only to do research, but to serve as social instruments for accomplishing all sorts of new things—the development of weapons, the training of workmen for defense jobs, the indoctrination of military personnel and so on.

We've never quite gotten over this and now we find that many colleges are trying to serve as instruments for social reform, and on this score, I for one have very grave doubts.

The basic functions of a university are the dissemination of truth and knowledge and the search for new truth and knowledge—in other words, teaching and research. This is

then transmitted to students and to the general public.

Generally, however, the implementation of knowledge is the function of other structures of our society—such as the political structure, the industrial structure, the business structure, the community structure.

There are too many people today who want the university to devote its entire time and resources to following one path or another—to ending poverty, fighting racism, stopping crime in the streets, ending the war in Vietnam. Everyone seems to want the university to do everything—and all at once.

But the question is, should universities stand at the beck and call of every politician or special interest group? Should the universities become action outfits? Should they become forums for various political movements? It seems to me that for universities to go out and attempt to change the world is to make it very difficult for them to serve as repositories of knowledge and as unbiased critics of the passing scene. An actor is not in a position to critically analyze the play in which he is engaged. And no man should be able to serve in the dual capacity as judge and jury.

It is my feeling that many colleges and universities are now devoting so much time to trying to change the world that they have forgotten not only their research functions, but their teaching functions also. And as they fall in their primary function, it is inevitable that eventually a reassessment will come and people will ask why do they exist at all.

Now most of the problems that you have been reading about on college campuses over the past few years, have been student-versus-administration problems. I think this is changing. I think the emphasis now will be student-versus-faculty. Students are gradually coming to realize that if their courses lack relevancy, it is many times because of the faculty member teaching it.

All of these are surface problems and, I believe, are second to the major problem of financing in higher education. As I watch the financial progress of American education, I become more apprehensive that the whole system is heading for a terrible fall. We are in danger of pricing ourselves out of business if the cost of higher education continues to increase.

Public spending on each college student is expected to climb almost 19 per cent to \$1,805 in the next few years. At private institutions the projection is higher. The question is, who is going to pay for this? Already local taxing bodies are beginning to say that they have reached their limit in taxing property and wages. The states find themselves caught in an almost unstoppable treadmill of higher costs with few, if any, new tax sources. And although the Federal Government is considered by many people to be an inexhaustible source of money, it cannot and will not prove to be so.

Tied in with this problem of financing is a general unwillingness among many sectors of our population to support higher education as it has been supported in the past. I believe that there is gradually accruing among the taxpayers the feeling that perhaps we are paying too much for higher education. This rising wave of disaffection for our nation's colleges, results in part, I believe, from the poor image that has been created by a majority of students.

Indeed a Gallup survey last fall showed that the major worry of America's adults as far as their schools are concerned is discipline, or rather the lack of it.

Part of the blame for this is that we have impressed on our youth that college is the thing to do. We have implied that if you don't go to college there are no other avenues open. And so we have many students today who are really not interested in college as such. They are more interested in getting a

degree than they are in getting an education.

And if taxpayers feel that perhaps they are paying too much for higher education, they may have a point. University facilities everywhere have not been as productive as they should be and one cannot expect to go on increasing salaries while productivity decreases. We are still teaching at the ratio of about 15 students for each faculty member and using many methods that have long since been outmoded.

Indeed, in its report last year, the Committee on Economic Development composed of 200 leading businessmen and educators, said that the money expended on education produced less in the way of improvements in the scope and quality of services than was true of other services generally.

Behind this inefficiency, I believe, is the fact that we are still using many methods that have long since been outmoded. We continue to do this because we have failed to question the fundamental validity of many of our basic concepts of teaching.

For example, in spite of our growing recognition of individual differences among human beings, not only in talent, ability and interest, but in rate of learning, we continue to force our students into a pattern designed for a mythical average student.

We take four nine-month years to accomplish our purpose. Is there anything sacrosanct in this? How can we really justify it? In England they use three years, and shorter years at that. Other countries use five years. But students learn at different rates and they come to college in different stages of advancement. Isn't it time we ask ourselves very seriously whether we are right in trying to tie everybody to a standard four-year curriculum?

Another albatross we have around our necks is the credit system. We seem to think that a student should pass 124 credits of work in one curriculum—say Liberal Arts—and 154 credits in engineering to get a degree. The trouble is that the digits we are trying to use for measurement of credits are not the same size—and even if they were, we don't seem to try to equate them anyway. But we think that every course has to be measured in numbers of credit hours or courses, or half-courses or units, or quarter hours. And we slave to change our courses, stretch out the material, contract it, add irrelevant material, or leave out important material in order to fit a calendar which demands a three-credit, four-credit, or two-credit course.

It seems to me that all too often such a system restrains us from doing what we really ought to do.

Then somehow or other we feel that every course ought to consist of fifty minute lectures. Some brave souls have experimented with thirty-minute lectures and some with seventy-five minute lectures. But no one has ever demonstrated that a lecture of some particular length is necessary or the best, or even better than any other length of lecture. With modern teaching aids such as film strips, television, and audiovisual aids, which can be used or not used as a teacher sees fit, should be force ourselves to stick to lectures of one particular length?

And what about the lecture itself?

Too often, it seems to me, lectures are pretty wasteful devices by which symbols are transferred from the notebook of the lecturer to the notebook of the student without leaving much impression in the heads of either one. Since all kinds of copying machines are now generally available, I see no reason why students shouldn't be given copies of the professor's notes and thus avoid the distracting and useless work of writing by longhand a set of symbols which because of their brevity are often meaningless anyway.

As a matter of fact, I have always been

suspicious of lectures, especially if the lecturer has already written a book on the subject. For what can he say that is not already in the book. And if it is worth saying, why is it not in the book?

The answer often is that the student must be offered a chance to ask questions. But if the question is important it should have been answered in the lecture, and if it is not important, then obviously answering it is a waste of the time of both the professor and all the other students in the class. Why should an entire class be held up because one student is not bright enough, or attentive enough, to get the point? We excuse this sort of thing on the basis that it maintains a dialogue, a human relationship, and we insist that human relationships are essential in the learning process. We seek to avoid regimentation. Yet what can regiment students more than forcing them to attend class with 100 or 25 or even 10 other students, listening to lectures in exactly the same detail. Taking exams in unison, and marching on to the final day when each will be given a grade. There is no freedom for the learning process here, and neither freedom nor efficiency can be attained by having the professor devote time enough to the individual students for him to keep his place in rank and column, and march on at the prescribed pace.

Another problem is that we are constrained by schedules. Increasing numbers of students and professors must be fitted into a schedule which will provide each of them with a classroom at the proper place and the proper time. Now many professors like to do their teaching Monday, Wednesday, and Friday between ten and twelve. But many students like to do their learning at odd hours, when they are in the mood, or when they are thinking about the particular topic they would like to discuss. Is our insistence that the student fit his program into someone else's schedule or following the convenience of a professor really necessary or even desirable? Moreover, this scheduling of classes and pacing the rate at which the material is presented is designed for the average or somewhat better-than-average student. But students do not progress at the same rate. And the pace of any individual student varies in different courses. Yet the schedule is there and it must be followed: There can be no deviation from it.

The classroom problem is an onerous one too. Classrooms must be provided of the right size at the right time, and in the right place; and, the result is that very few colleges and universities are utilizing their classroom space more than 30 per cent of the time. Yet many colleges find themselves space-limited and the investment in classroom space, in spite of the fact that it largely stands idle, is horrendous.

And we can look at the economics of teaching. Faculty salaries have approximately doubled over the past decade. In 1958 the National Education Association reported that the average salary for full professors was just over \$8,000. With the beginning of the 1968-69 school year, the American Association of University Professors reported that the average salary for full professors was \$16,312. Yet while faculty salaries have increased tremendously, productivity that is commensurate with what is found in industry, has not increased to any great degree.

And these are some of the reasons why I believe that the big crisis looming on the horizon for every college is the crisis in financing higher education.

The American people expect much from their schools and from the investment they put into them. And American colleges—whether they want to or not—will be forced to find ways to change to meet the student's and the taxpayer's expectations.

I think it's about time we began experimenting on new methods of teaching and learning.

#### UNITED MINE WORKERS UNDER ATTACK

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, over the past several months the officers of the United Mine Workers of America have been subjected to increasing attack in the Nation's press and television. Much of the news carried about the union has been in the nature of charges which have been made to appear as fact, even though supporting evidence was lacking.

Last week, the president of the United Mine Workers of America, W. A. (Tony) Boyle, spoke out against such biased and subjective reporting. I believe that the Members of the Congress should read Mr. Boyle's remarks and that his statement should be given the widest possible distribution. It is time, Mr. Speaker, for objectivity to return to the Nation's news media, and Mr. Boyle's remarks underscore the urgency of the problem.

The remarks follow:

#### W. A. (TONY) BOYLE'S REMARKS

The United Mine Workers of America today charged that it has been the victim of a journalistic lynching bee, aided and abetted by the "totalitarian liberal" establishment.

Speaking for the union, W. A. (Tony) Boyle stated that the media in general has "deliberately" substituted "subjective bias" for objective reporting and investigation.

"I do not like to be critical of the press since this nation desperately needs an unbiased and objective media. But the press has done little in our case except to reiterate in screaming headlines wild charges without foundation. There has been an attempt to build a lynch atmosphere against our union, to utilize that atmosphere for a full-fledged attack upon all labor," Boyle said.

The UMW president added that while the tragic slaughter of Joseph Yablonski and his family has made it extremely difficult for the union to speak out, the UMW can no longer remain silent.

"It is extremely difficult for us to raise questions concerning the character of the dead, but the interests of the UMW's 200,000 active and retired members compel us to speak out," Boyle said.

"There has been no press investigation of significance regarding the background of Joseph Yablonski. Yet, Yablonski had questionable associations and political connections that merit journalistic investigation. We simply are unable to understand why the press headlines unfounded charges, but refuses to undertake investigative reporting into the Yablonski background.

"The press has sought, at least by implication, to associate me and our international union with the three men who now stand indicted. Neither my associate officers nor I know any of these men, nor have we had any association, however remote, with them. I deny categorically that the UMW has ever knowingly had any contact with these individuals.

"The attempt to elevate Silous Huddleston, a local union president in Tennessee, to the status of a top UMW official would be comical, if the implications were not so grim. There are more than 5,000 local union officers in

our union, all elected by the rank-and-file membership. We have checked our records on Mr. Huddleston and we find only that he was an organizer for District 50, which is no longer affiliated with our union, between 1943 and 1946. During that period, I was a UMW district president in Montana," Boyle pointed out.

The UMW president said the time has come to put the record straight, so that the rantings of Yablonski's lawyer and his sons, however understandable as an emotional reaction, will not pass as fact.

Charges that there are 600 allegedly bogus locals in the UMWA were dismissed by the federal district court in Washington, D.C. during the election campaign.

Charges that the union has employed a blacklist to deny jobs to top Yablonski supporters are "hogwash." The UMW has no hiring halls and the employers do the hiring. The law makes blacklists illegal.

Charges of intimidation during the voting are even more absurd. On the eve of the election, Yablonski's lawyer claimed that 2,500 poll watchers, mostly outsiders and including members of the American Civil Liberties Union, had been recruited by the Yablonski slate. The ACLU made no claims of irregularity following the election. The charges filed by the Yablonski lawyer with the Labor Department are largely trivialities and technicalities, although the press has attempted to sensationalize them into grounds for a new election. The election in the UMW was more peaceful than most major union elections and was entirely democratic; there was no violence despite obvious attempts by the Yablonski faction to incite it.

"There is an obvious attempt to induce hysteria, and to force the Labor Department to overturn the election despite a 2-1 verdict by the UMW membership in favor of the incumbent leadership. The UMW will not stand idly by and permit this to transpire," Boyle said.

W. A. (Tony) Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America, today hailed the passage of a strengthened black lung compensation bill in West Virginia.

"This bill greatly improves and strengthens the present compensation statute in West Virginia. It contains many of the amendments requested by our organization in my letter to Governor Arch Moore last summer and which were contained in the legislation introduced at the request of the United Mine Workers of America at the beginning of the session," Boyle said.

Boyle alluded to the key feature of the bill, the so-called "presumption clause" when he stated: "The new presumption clause is a significant improvement over the existing law. It shifts the burden of proof to the coal operator when a man becomes disabled and when such disability logically can be expected to arise out of his occupation."

The UMW president hailed the victory as one for the UMWA saying: "This is a victory for all of the officers and members of the United Mine Workers of America. It was achieved because of the unity of coal miners in West Virginia. When I went to West Virginia, I saw firsthand that the membership of our union was determined to stand together in this battle. More than 600 members of the UMWA Committee for Coal Mine Health and Safety played a major role in our legislative efforts. To these coal miners and to their UMWA brothers in the state go my heartfelt congratulations."

Boyle contrasted the situation now with that of last year. He said: "A year ago coal miners struck for three weeks in West Virginia in an effort to pass a black lung law. That strike cost more than \$20 million in lost wages and almost \$4 million in payments to the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund.



The ranks of coal miners were split asunder during that struggle and the legislation that finally passed reflected the weakness caused by our division. This year our union went to the legislature in Charleston as a united and overwhelming force. This year the coal miners followed the union leadership and worked in close harmony. Our membership did not lose one day's work, nor did our Welfare Fund lose royalties. Most importantly, the bill which passed both houses is strong and we believe an effective piece of legislation."

Boyle thanked the leaders of both the House and Senate for their support of this legislation. "Our legislative efforts would not have been possible without the support we received from the top leadership in both the House and the Senate. On behalf of all miners in West Virginia I want to thank these legislators and express to them the gratitude of coal miners throughout the state for their willingness to support a far-reaching and progressive compensation bill," said Boyle.

"We also must express our appreciation to Governor Arch Moore for his support of the black lung legislation and his efforts to help in its passage," Boyle added and called upon the Governor to sign the bill into law. He said: "We hope that Governor Moore will immediately sign this legislation into law. In doing this he will make possible a fuller protection of the well-being of coal miners in West Virginia, protection which is warranted by the contribution that coal miners have made to that state over the years."

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, 52 years ago today, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania became a free and independent country. She became a member of the international community of sovereign nations in 1921 when Lithuania was received as a bona fide member of the League of Nations. In 1922, the United States granted full diplomatic recognition to this nation, whose peoples have resisted foreign subjugation for so long.

During the Second World War, the Republic of Lithuania was invaded and she lost her independence on June 15, 1940. Nonetheless, the United States has continued to recognize the right of these people to seek a free and independent existence and we continue to maintain diplomatic accreditation with the last legitimately constituted representatives of Lithuania.

I have known many people whose roots are in Lithuania. A good number of them were born there, a larger number had parents or grandparents born there and many of them have relatives there now. We in the United States know national pride, independence, liberty and justice. However, for the many thousands of oppressed people in Lithuania, these are only cherished, hoped for, but unsummed ideals.

I salute these people and recommit myself to supporting their just aspirations for recovery of their liberty, independence, and self-determination.

#### PRIZE-WINNING ESSAYS BY NEW JERSEY YOUTHS

### HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, recently the Greater Keansburg Jaycees of Keansburg, N.J., sponsored an essay writing contest, under the chairmanship of Mr. E. Gary Stover. The winners of the contest were Joseph Westerfield of St. Ann's School and Jan Flood of the Keansburg Public School.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have long been an advocate of lowering the voting age to 18 and for that reason I have sponsored House Joint Resolution 18 for the past two Congresses. The subject of the winning essays was "What I Think the Minimum Voting Age Should Be."

Because I was so impressed with the two winning essays I am placing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to give my colleagues an opportunity to review these essays. I think the young people themselves are the best argument in favor of lowering the voting age and I think a review of the two winning essays will show why.

The essays follow:

#### WHAT I THINK THE MINIMUM VOTING AGE SHOULD BE

(By Jan Flood, Winner—Keansburg Public School)

I think that the minimum voting age should be eighteen. If the voting age was eighteen I believe that the United States of America might have a better government. I say this because maybe if eighteen year olds had their chance to vote, maybe better men would be picked for the different government jobs. Not to say that the men who are in aren't any good, but some could be better.

Some people think that eighteen year olds are not mature enough but, these people don't care if an eighteen year old boy is mature or not to send him to Vietnam to die. I guess they don't think about that. Was it these eighteen year olds that got us into this war? No. It was these people who think eighteen year olds shouldn't have the right to vote.

Don't people realize that nine out of ten eighteen year olds are mature enough to have the right to vote. The main reason these people think that eighteen year olds shouldn't vote is because of hippies. They act as though all eighteen year olds are hippies. This is just not true. Anyway just because you have long hair, wear mod clothes and use such words as groovy, rap, and out-a-site does not mean you're a hippie. Besides why should hippies be deprived of the right to vote at eighteen? Because they wear their hair long, wear mod clothes and say groovy, rap and out-of-site. If that is true why, are they still American citizens. No one ever realized that maybe the reason there are so many hippies is because they are rebelling against not being able to vote at the age of eighteen.

People say that eighteen year olds are not mature enough, they haven't lived long enough. How long do you have to live in this country to realize that this great nation of ours is in great need of better politicians. Maybe if the people who are ruining this country looked around and saw what they are doing, they would give in to the country and let the eighteen year olds get a chance to live. Let them have the rights that everyone else has. I know that if the eighteen

year old had a chance to vote, then he would respect the United States in a tremendous way.

Well all this means that the eighteen year old should have the right to vote.

#### WHAT THE MINIMUM VOTING AGE SHOULD BE (By Joseph Westfield, Winner—St. Ann's School)

In this world of communication, we can not say that the eighteen year old of today and the eighteen year old of seventeen eighty-nine are equally well informed. I direct this statement mainly toward the fact that a newspaper informs the public of the political candidate's position on a certain subject faster and cheaper than in colonial times. This certainly proves and best exemplifies the fact that the Constitution is outdated and is in dire need of reform. It is mandatory that the citizens unite in passing the eighteen year old vote.

In a survey about knowledge of the government, adults were found to know less about this subject than an average group of teen-agers. Facts from this survey prove you are not necessarily smarter nor more well informed than a person if you are older than that person. Indirectly it proves that you need not have the best officials qualified for any particular government office.

Young people are always out to make an impression on older people. Therefore, they would not let an ill-equipped man go into office. In a way it is showing off. Yet, in a more important way, it is doing your job to the best of your ability. That is the most important thing about it.

Another phase is, it is extremely unfair that these boys who fight for us—who die for us—can not freely choose whether they must go and fight. I am simply stating that they can not vote on whether they should be drafted or not. He is trusted with a rifle, a hand grenade, and a knife, but, he is not trusted to pull a small lever in a voting booth. It just does not make sense. He fights a war in which he probably does not believe in, and a war in which the country he is fighting for would rather sell out to the Communists than fight for themselves.

When it comes to voting however it is, "No, he is too inexperienced," or "Him? I doubt it. He would not even know what lever to pull." These ignorant comments incriminate the speaker as prejudiced against younger would-be voters. It is a problem that must be eliminated in the first years of the seventies.

The power of voting would help eliminate another "problem"—demonstrations. To older people these are a disgrace, but, to younger people merely a way of expressing themselves. Voters must realize that aside from writing their congressman a letter, these eighteen year olds have no other way of expressing themselves. "The Moratorium" was said to have been the main reason why the eighteen year old vote did not pass in New Jersey. To the ones who voted "no," I say, "There would have been no need to have a Moratorium had they the right to vote."

These problems are the main ingredients of the "generation gap." The "generation gap" leads us into hippies and yuppies who in turn lead us into crime. With the solution to crime at our fingertips, it is our duty to carry it out. This is a crime of negligence—in a complex way, true—but, it is still negligence. They are the negligent ones—the voters who are too blind to see the solution to the most taxing problem that is facing our nation. It is the duty of every man or woman who can vote to see that this problem is demolished fast. You must extend the power of voting to another group who cares. The "young militants," as they are called, do care what happens to this country.

This is my stand. To most people it is an impudent, brassy, outgoing statement. This is not the way I feel now. It is the way you probably felt after reading it. Though it obviously was not edited, it is believed that added spice to it. I wrote it to get a point across to you. I feel that undertaking was successful. What was done by Upton Sinclair with "The Jungle" it is felt will be done with this. I hope I have opened your eyes to the problems that branch out from the "eighteen year old vote."

## LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

## HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today—February 16, 1970—marks a special day in man's historic struggle for freedom and self-determination, for it was on this day 52 years ago that the Lithuanians established their own Government and proclaimed their independence.

Subsequently, on September 22, 1921, Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations. Then, on July 27, 1922, the United States officially recognized the independent state of Lithuania. A permanent Constitution was adopted, the Lithuanian economy was stabilized, and a renaissance of national culture ensued.

But in 1939, the Soviet Union began an unwarranted assault on this tiny country, and by June 1940, the Soviet Army actually occupied Lithuania. The valiant Lithuanians had no alternative but to concede to Soviet demands.

Despite condemnation by the free world of this unlawful aggression against the sovereign rights of a free people, the Soviet Union to this day still occupies Lithuania and maintains troops within her borders. The national culture is gradually being destroyed, and the Lithuanians are forced to suffer under the yoke of Soviet oppression.

During the 89th Congress, a concurrent resolution was adopted by both the House and Senate recognizing the right of self-determination for Lithuania and the other Baltic States and urging the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples. I cosponsored and supported this legislation, and today on the occasion of this anniversary, I want to reiterate the sense of that resolution which urged the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to Lithuania as well as to the other Baltic States.

America has never recognized the forced incorporation of Lithuania into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and has always condemned this flagrant denial of fundamental human rights. The time is long overdue for Soviet withdrawal from the Baltic States and for the Baltic States question to be resolved before the United Nations.

It is a privilege today to join my colleagues in the Congress in observing this anniversary and in saluting Lithuanian-Americans in my Seventh Illinois Congressional District as well as all over the United States for their outstanding contributions to our cultural traditions and for the credit and honor they have brought our country.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

As a Member of Congress, I want to assure the courageous Lithuanians that our Nation continues to support their just aspiration for freedom, and I want to express the fervent hope that the goal of Lithuanian self-determination shall soon be realized.

## EFFECTIVE CONSUMER PROTECTION

## HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, never before has there been such a widespread concern over the need for effective consumer protection programs and more ethical practices in industry.

Of course, Government has a responsibility to the consumer to make certain that he receives full value in the purchase of goods and services. But it is equally important that the private sector exercise leadership in behalf of the consumer; organizations in every field of endeavor that relates directly to the consumer must play a role in this regard.

It is gratifying to note, therefore, that in the field of live music an organization that is acknowledged leader has displayed commendable initiative by developing several important guidelines to assist those planning to engage live music for a social event.

The organization is Steven Scott Enterprises, Inc., the world's largest provider of live music for all types of social and business functions. The "checklist" developed by Steven Scott is particularly noteworthy when we consider that quality of the music at a social function is vital to its success.

These are some of the guidelines developed by Steven Scott Enterprises for the benefit of consumers planning to engage a band or an orchestra:

First. Consumers should seek references from any group they plan to hire, they should ascertain where and for whom the group has played.

Second. For best results, a reliable, established group should be selected. So-called pickup musicians rarely have played together and often will sound like it.

Third. A reputable orchestra will have a standard rate for similar events, whether the setting is a small, suburban house of worship or large, fashionable hotel. Consumers should be on guard against a group that will attempt to vary prices according to locations.

Fourth. Make sure that special ceremonies are thoroughly understood by the leader and his orchestra well in advance of the event. Guests can be embarrassed or offended by carelessly planned music.

Fifth. Arrangements should be made well in advance of the event. Otherwise, the group you prefer may have a previous commitment.

I believe that in setting up these valuable guidelines, Steven Scott Enterprises is performing an important service to the community.

February 16, 1970

## FEDERALIZATION OF SCHOOLS

## HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial entitled, "And It Came to Pass," which appeared in the Jackson Daily News of Jackson, Miss., on January 14, 1970, was brought to my attention by my constituent, Dr. James C. Pegues of Greenwood, Miss.

In view of the rapid federalization of the schools of this Nation, I believe this editorial should be seen and read by Members of the Congress. It follows:

## AND IT CAME TO PASS

Thirty-seven years ago an unbelieving editor sat down and wrote an editorial for his paper, The Monroe Evening News, of Monroe, Michigan, U.S.A. The date was Wednesday, Sept. 13, 1933.

Under the Lead Line, "Not That!", that incredulous American newspaper editor went on to ask his readers of three decades ago, "Are the schools of America to be used as a propaganda agency to mould public opinion into conformity with the policies of the administration?"

Still in a tone of utter disbelief that editor went on to quote from an interview with one Louis P. Alber, Chief of the Speakers' division of the NRA (National Recovery Act). "Just read these astounding utterances by Mr. Alber," the editor challenged his subscribers.

"The rugged individualism of Americanism must go, because it is contrary to the purpose of the New Deal and the NRA, which is remaking America.

"Russia and Germany are attempting to compel a new order by means typical of their nationalism—compulsion. The United States will do it by moral persuasion. Of course we expect some opposition, but the principles of the New Deal must be carried to the youth of the nation. We expect to accomplish by education what dictators in Europe are seeking to do by compulsion and force."

Mr. Alber went on to explain that a "primer" outlining methods of teaching to be used, along with motion pictures on the subject were being prepared for distribution to all public and parochial schools in the country, and commented: "The NRA is the outstanding part of the President's program, but in fact it is only a fragment. The general public is not informed on the other parts of the program, and the schools are the places to reach the future builders of the nation." . . .

From our vantage point in history we know that the notorious NRA was laid to rest early in its incubation period by the United States Supreme Court. What is important to each and all of us today is what has transpired in the intervening years since 1933. That editor of long ago remarked, "So, according to Mr. Alber, NRA—sweeping and revolutionary as it is—is only a fragment of a greater program of which the public knows nothing, and this unknown program is to be inculcated into the minds of pupils in the schools everywhere, by official efforts and at government expense . . . now our schools are to become—like those of Germany and Russia—an agency for the promotion of whatever political, social, and economic policies the administration may desire to carry out. And the taxpayers, whether they like it or not, are to pay for having their children converted to those policies. The editor closed by stating: "The whole proposition is so amazing, and so alarming in its implications, that we refuse to take it seriously."



Take a look about you today with the Washington-directed school policies. Is the Health, Education and Welfare Department doing exactly what the defunct NRA started out to do?

### POLLUTION AND 1970

## HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, much has been said recently about pollution and conservation. Some may assume that the Republican Party created the concern. Dr. and Mrs. George S. Reuter, Jr., recently spoke at a conference at Sikeston, Mo., on the subject. It is very evident that the issue of pollution and conservation, based on research, is old and that many congressional leaders of the Democratic Party have played key roles in the last 30 years. I thus insert in the RECORD with my remarks on the important issue of pollution and conservation the addresses of Dr. and Mrs. Reuter:

#### POLLUTION AND 1970

(By Mrs. Helen H. Reuter, L.H.D.)

##### INTRODUCTION

We are immersed in the stream of time. As history bears us onward over its cataracts of change, we cannot be certain of all facts in life. One thing is certain, however, the problem of our physical environment is beginning to catch up with modern man. All of us today are charged with the grave responsibility to see to it that our children and grandchildren do not inherit a sunless, smoke-filled world of pollution. The air around us belongs to everyone—to the future as much as to the present—and everyone has a deep obligation to help restore a wholesome atmosphere to the globe we live on. It is too late for apathy, for excuses or recriminations. It is high time to clear the air, high time for all of us to let mankind know what we are doing. Air pollution control is no longer something for health officials only to worry about. Atmospheric conditions over the last couple of years have clearly shown it to be a problem of concern to every citizen.

Physicians have delved into the physical effects of air pollution. Our elderly, our youth, individuals suffering from respiratory and pulmonary diseases have become the helpless victims of our negligence in the area. Repeated exposures to contaminated air have been known to wear down the body's defense mechanisms against respiratory disease. An association between high density living, air pollution and respiratory illness has been found by researchers. Indeed, urban living may impair health!

Evidence indicates that Alaska is on the threshold of economic expansion. The magnitude of the expansion is unknown, but any expansion is certain to increase pollution pressures. Because Alaskan waters are, for the most part, still clean, a unique opportunity exists to apply a preventive program based on ecosystem dynamics, instead of the classical practice of cleanup after deterioration has set in.

When the Mormon pioneers arrived in Salt Lake valley in 1847, it was barren and dry. But the air was clean and the streams from the mountains ran clean and sparkling. Today smoke and smog choke the skies of the magnificent Utah land of Zion, and the sparkling streams empty into the river Jordan and into the Great Salt Lake grimy and laden with refuse. Environmental contamination is growing worse all the

time. Our cities are becoming more smog-filled. Our streams are becoming more ridden with pollutants. Our air carries ever increasing amounts of chemical and industrial waste.

Not long ago oceanographers aboard the research vessel Chain were collecting surface samples from a lonely expanse of the Atlantic south of Bermuda known as the Sargasso Sea. Instead, the scientists made a disturbing discovery. Their nets quickly became fouled with oil and tar—thick sticky globs up to three inches in diameter. Day after day along a 630-mile stretch they cleaned the nets with solvent only to see them gum up again a few hours later.

Dr. E. D. Goldberg, an oceanography chemist, told a meeting of the American Geophysical Union that man is changing his environment almost as much as nature itself. Dr. Goldberg, of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, La Jolla, Calif., said the effects of pollution although they were not known, posed some haunting questions. Also, Dr. J. O. Fletcher, a physical scientist for the Rand Corp. in Santa Monica, Calif., believes man has only a few decades to solve the problem caused by pollution.

##### DEFINITION AND INSIGHT

I define pollution as man's seemingly incessant drive to diminish or even destroy the natural elements which sustain life and make it pleasurable. It is an old problem but it now shrieks with new urgency. The urgency we felt in 1969 will be nothing like what we are going to feel in 1970. Pollution of our environment is the result of the interaction of man and his technologies to the earth and its resources. As long as populations were small in relation to the earth's resources, man could move on to other areas when he had produced conditions that were unbearable, or unsafe, or unproductive. In the past century, his ability to move on to new resource frontiers became increasingly limited. The scientific and industrial revolution, though its productivity was a boon to man, began to exact a terrible toll on the polluting of the environment it affected.

Now we know that air pollution can cause buildings to fall apart or be washed away by rain, according to Dr. Erhard Winkler, a University of Notre Dame geologist. Sulphate, a pollutant released by burning coal and fuel oil can combine with the calcium carbonate of marble, limestone or dolomite to form calcium, or gypsum, which is 32 times more soluble than limestone and is easily dissolved in rain. If the gypsum remains, it absorbs water. Swelling or shrinking depend upon the humidity, and eventually cracks the stone. Pollutants also can form weak acids when the gases become dissolved in rain and fog.

A national publication recently quoted the prophetic words of the 19th century Scottish essayist Thomas Carlyle. Upon viewing a young America with a population of about 25 million, Carlyle predicted: "You won't have any trouble in your country as long as you have a few people and much land, but when you have many people and little land your trials will begin."

##### CURRENT STATUS

The history of our Nation has been one of growing concern. From Gifford Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt to our conservation leaders in the Congress, we have grown in concern. The Congress has passed meaningful legislation. On May 29, 1969, President Richard Nixon set up a new Environmental Quality Council. At the same time, he established a Citizen's Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, headed by Laurance Rockefeller. President Nixon has begun to move the country into a new era of effective action in its fight to maintain a clean environment.

Current issues are still critical, however. Dumping of oil in the sea may also be cre-

ating a new risk of cancer in man. Some crude oils contain compounds that tend to produce cancer in animals. Researchers, for example, have already found a high incidence of cancerous tissues in certain types of fish taken from the oily waters of Los Angeles Harbor. Fish and shellfish that are eaten by man can ingest these oils. The chronic oil pollution may be leading to accumulation of cancer-causing agents in human food.

There are 13,000 tons of air pollutants that descend daily on Los Angeles County. We can take some comfort in the fact that the tonnage of filth in the air is declining as smog devices come into more common use. But the decline remains negligible compared to the problem. This past year some nine billion pounds of smog hovered over Los Angeles. That's about a ton of pollutant for every Los Angeles man, woman and child. Biologists say that thousands may actually choke to death in the Long Beach area by the middle of 1970's if drastic steps are not taken. Smog is rapidly killing trees in a 100,000 acre area of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains.

##### REALIZATION AND NEEDS

The Air Quality Act of 1967 is a far-reaching and critically important measure authorizing major Federal support for a national program of air quality enhancement. Substantial progress is being made toward the implementation of this program. Our capacity, however, to pollute exceeds our capacity to control pollution. For example, in the absence of control, sulfur oxide air pollution levels will continue to increase for the next ten years.

There is a growing realization of dangers to environment. The UNESCO conference in 1969 in San Francisco seriously considered the issues. Prince Phillip's observation on the "Today Show" indicated that the environmental problems were of major concern to the British people. The National Association of Educational Broadcasters, in annual convention, stated that environment and air pollution are number one national priorities, worthy of the greatest attention.

There is also a move afoot to strengthen an existing international convention designed to limit oil pollution on the high seas. Currently, the convention allows ships to discharge oil wastes when more than 100 miles from land. Proposed amendments, which require ratification by member nations, would prohibit dumping of oil anywhere in amounts greater than 16 gallons per nautical mile. It is, however, recognized that enforcing the convention is practically an impossible task.

The Commonwealth Edison Company recently reported to the press what it is doing to help reduce air pollution in the Chicago area. Their plan of action for their company includes the following:

1. To cut in half, within the near future, the amount of coal burned in and around Chicago, and then to reduce it still more.

2. To increase as rapidly as possible the share of nuclear power in their total production.

3. To continue to install and improve electrostatic precipitators at their stations. The goal is to try to have every precipitator prevent 98 percent or more of waste particles from the coal they burn from getting into the air.

4. To use all the natural gas they can get. To introduce new low-sulfur oil. And to continue their efforts to burn low-sulfur coal successfully.

It was Chicago that helped to move Commonwealth Edison Company ahead. The city fathers passed the Chicago Air Pollution Control Ordinance. This ordinance becomes effective in July of 1970. It requires that sulfur emissions be lowered in progressive steps through 1974. The ordinance can be complied with either by burning less coal or lower sulfur coal.

## FUTURE STATUS

We must establish as a goal clean air—air which will not cause disease and suffering, air which will not carry needless dirt and waste and contamination. But we must develop a better understanding of the air we breathe, the air which supports the food we grow, the air which helps to warm the earth and protect us from space-born radiation.

I believe it is better to pay a small amount more for a car today knowing that in so doing a Lake Erie can be saved. Or, it is better to pay a few cents more for a dress or a suit knowing that in so doing a Grand River can be saved.

Finally, I envision an America and a world where mankind and earth are in basic harmony. We have seen enough in our triumphs in space to know that there is great hostility to the existence of life on other planets in our solar system. It is time to give up ideas of escape from this planet which God has created for us. It is time to use our God-given abilities and create a world of harmony.

## POLLUTIONS AND OUR REFLECTIONS

(By George S. Reuter, Jr. (Ed. D))

## INTRODUCTION

The sources of air pollution are essentially two: automobiles and industry. More than half of the contamination in the air over the United States consists of carbon monoxide, most of it issuing from cars, trucks, and buses. More than a tenth of air pollution is hydrocarbons, most of which emanate from auto exhausts as partially burned gaseous compounds. The second most plentiful gas pollutant is composed of oxides of sulfur, produced by home and factory combustion of sulfur-containing coal and oil.

In 1967, these and other sources hurled 133 million tons of contaminants into the atmosphere. In 1969, the annual rate is 142 million tons—more than our annual production of steel. The increase comes from more people, more autos, more industry, more refuse disposal and largely inadequate control activities. This pollution is the direct result of affluence.

Water pollution is serious too. First, municipal sewage: One third of the 19,200 communities with municipal water systems fail to meet existing Public Health Service standards, which generally are not stringent enough and, in some cases, meaningless from the standpoint of pollution-control. Second, industrial pollution is twice as big a problem as municipal sewage. The treated and untreated industrial wastes discharged into our waters are equal to the untreated sewage of 165 million people. Industrial effluents are not now effectively regulated, and industry itself has not responded adequately to the needs of pollution control. A major steel manufacturing complex, supposedly a showcase for control efforts, still contributes 10 percent of the total wastes flowing into Lake Erie. Also, there are septic tanks overflowing into natural watercourses, the discharge of ships and marine terminals, the influence of pesticides, silt washes into waters from land erosion and runoff, detergents and fertilizers often pass through treatment but remain a major source of phosphate pollution, atomic reactors have immensely detrimental environmental effects, etc.

Yes, many water pollution abatement efforts simply transfer pollutants to another location or another media, e.g., from water to the air or the land. If phosphorus is precipitated out into the sludge of a sewage treatment plant and the sludge is then incinerated, it is likely that some of the phosphorus will be discharged into the atmosphere and will be brought back to the land and water with the rain. The concentration of phosphorus in rain is estimated to be from two to seventeen million pounds per year—without the removal of phosphorus. If phosphorus is removed at sewage

treatment plants and the sludge incinerated, the amount of phosphorus in rainfall will greatly increase.

Art Buchwald may be correct, therefore, when he indicates that the big protest movement of the 1970's will concern itself with pollution. He believes that students, teachers, conservation groups and public-spirited citizens are ready to wage war to improve the environment, and if he is correct, we can expect to see some tense scenes between the antipolluters and those forces which are suspected of pollution.

## CONSERVATION STATESMEN OF YESTERDAY

The list is too long to mention those Americans who have helped to guide us by critical problems in the area of conservation so all mankind was aided. It is appropriate, however, to mention a few.

1. James Hamilton Lewis of Illinois. Senator Lewis was born in Danville, Virginia, May 18, 1863. After attending Houghton College in Augusta, Ga. and the University of Virginia, he studied law at Savannah, Ga., and attended Ohio Northern University in 1885 and practiced law in Seattle. While in the West, he served in Congress from Washington in the Fifty-fifth (1897-99) and then served in the Spanish-American War. He moved to Chicago in 1903 and was elected to the U.S. Senate three times—1912, 1930, and 1936. He died in Washington, D.C. on April 9, 1939, and is buried in Abbey Mausoleum, adjoining Arlington National Cemetery, Fort Myer, Va.

2. Thomas James Walsh of Montana. Senator Walsh was born in Two Rivers, Wisc., June 12, 1859. He taught school and was graduated in law from the University of Wisconsin in 1884. He was admitted to the bar the same year and started practice in Redfield, S. D., but he moved to Helena, Montana in 1890. He was Permanent Chairman of the Democratic National Convention in 1908, 1912, 1916, 1920, 1924, and 1932. He was U.S. Senator from Montana from 1913 to 1933. He had just been married and was returning via train to Washington to become Attorney-General. He died March 2, 1933. He is buried at Resurrection Cemetery at Helena.

3. Frank Murphy of Michigan. Mr. Justice Murphy was born in Harbor Beach, Michigan, April 13, 1890, the son of John T. and Mary (Brennan) Murphy. He was educated at the University of Michigan (A. B., 1912 and LL. B., 1914), and he did graduate study at Lincoln's Inn, London and Trinity College, Dublin, and held many honorary degrees: LL.D., University of Santa Tomas, Manila, 1934; Fordham, 1935; University of Philippines and Loyola University 1936; University of Detroit, Duquesne University, 1937; St. John's University, Brooklyn, 1938; New Mexico State College, La. State College, St. Bonaventure College, University of Michigan, John Marshall College, St. Joseph's College, and Tulane, 1941; and Creighton and Wayne University, 1942.

He was admitted to the bar of Michigan in 1914. He served as Mayor of Detroit from 1930 to 1933, Governor General and First U.S. High Commissioner to the Philippines from 1935 to 1936, Governor of Michigan from 1937 to 1939, Attorney-General of the U.S. from 1939 to 1940, and Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court from 1940 to 1949. He died in Washington on July 19, 1949.

4. Joseph Taylor Robinson of Arkansas. Senator Robinson was born on a farm near Lonoke, Arkansas, August 26, 1872. He was educated at the University of Arkansas and studied law at the University of Virginia. He was admitted to the bar in 1895 and commenced the practice of law in Lonoke. He was elected to the Fifty-eighth and the four succeeding congresses (1903-1913). He was Governor from January 16, 1913 to March 8, 1913. He was elected to the U.S. Senate and served from 1913 to 1937. Little Rock was his home from 1913 until his death. He was

Chairman of the Democratic National Convention in 1920, 1928, and 1936. He was Minority Leader of the Senate from 1923 to 1933 and Majority Leader from 1933 to 1937. He was the Democratic nominee for Vice President in 1928. He died in Washington, D.C., July 14, 1937, and is buried at Roselawn Memorial Park, Little Rock. He was scheduled to be President Franklin D. Roosevelt's first nominee to the United States Supreme Court but his death prevented this. Mrs. Robinson later served as Postmaster of Little Rock.

5. Henry Agard Wallace of Iowa. Vice President Wallace was born in Adair County, Iowa, October 7, 1888, the son of Henry C. and May (Brodhead) Wallace. He was educated at Iowa State (B.S., 1910 and M.S. in Agri (hon.), 1920). He married Ilo Browne on May 20, 1914, and their children are: Henry B., Robert B., and Jean B. He was Associate Editor of the *Wallace's Farmer* (1910-24), Editor (1924-29), and Editor, Wallace's *Farmer and Iowa Homestead* (1929-33). He served America as Secretary of Agriculture from 1933 to 1940, Vice President from 1941 to 1945, and Secretary of Commerce from 1945 to 1946. Also, he served as Editor of the *New Republic*. His sixteen books have often been quoted. They go from *Agricultural Prices* (1920) to *The Long Look Ahead* (1960) and include *Statesmanship and Religion* (1936), *The Century of the Common Man* (1943), and *Sixty Million Jobs* (1945). He died in South Salem, New York, November 18, 1965, and was buried in Des Moines, Iowa.

6. Alben William Barkley of Kentucky. Vice President Barkley was born in Graves County, Ky., November 24, 1877, the son of John Wilson and Electra (Smith) Barkley. He was educated at Marvin College, Clinton, Ky. (A. B.) a student at Emory College, and the University of Virginia Law School. At least eleven institutions of higher learning awarded him honorary degrees, including the LL. D. from the University of Kentucky. He married Dorothy Brower on June 23, 1903, and she passed away on March 10, 1947. Their children are well known: David Murrell, Marian Frances (Mrs. Max O'Rell Truitt), and Lauro Louise (Mrs. Douglas MacArthur III). Mrs. Truitt's husband, who was born in Millersburg, Missouri, on January 25, 1904, died on February 2, 1956, and is buried at Oak Hill Cemetery, Washington, D.C. Their children are: Max O'Rell, Jr.; A. W. Barkley; Thomas Hulien; and Stephen McKenzie.

Vice President Barkley married Jane (Mrs. Carleton S. Hadley), November 18, 1949. Mr. Barkley held many important offices, which included: Congressman (1913-27), U.S. Senator (1927-49 and 1955-56) and Vice President (1949-53). He was Majority Leader from 1937-47 and a part of 1949, and Minority Leader of the Senate from 1947-49. He was Temporary Chairman of the Democratic National Convention in 1932, 1936, and 1948 and Permanent Chairman in 1940. He received many awards including the Collier's Award for Distinguished Service in Congress in 1947, the FDR Four Freedoms Award in 1949, and a gold medal by Act of Congress on August 12, 1949. He was author of *That Reminds Me* (1954). He passed away on April 30, 1956, and is buried at Mount Kenton Cemetery in Paducah, Ky. Mrs. Jane Rucker Barkley, who was born in Kettesville, Mo., September 23, 1911, died on September 6, 1964, and is buried in St. Louis. She was the mother of Anne C. and Jane E.

Really, the work of several others must be mentioned by name only because of lack of time today. They are: Frederick (Fred) Moore Vinson of Louisa, Ky. (January 22, 1890-September 8, 1953), Joseph Christopher O'Mahoney of Cheyenne, Wyoming (November 5, 1884-December 1, 1962), Clyde Laverne Herring of Des Moines, Iowa (May 3, 1879-September 15, 1945), Dr. Lester Callaway Hunt of Cheyenne, Wyoming (July 8, 1892-June 19, 1954), Joseph F. Guffey of Pennsylvania (December 29, 1870-March 6,



1959), Key Pittman of Nevada (September 19, 1872–November 10, 1940), Vail Montgomery Pittman of Nevada (September 17, 1883–January 29, 1964), Charles Martin Hay of St. Louis, Mo. (November 10, 1879–January 16, 1945), Dr. Elbert Duncan Thomas of Salt Lake City, Utah (June 17, 1883–February 11, 1953), and Morris Sheppard of Texas (May 28, 1875–April 9, 1941).

#### CURRENT CONSERVATION STATESMEN AT WORK

Pages could be written about each of the statesmen mentioned above and their many contributions in this area, but we are concerned about the future now. Yes, the public—in this case the choking, soot-covered and increasingly sickened public—has finally become aware that thousands of industries have been blatantly polluting the once-pure American air, land and water. Becoming aware, also, are a few legal agencies who are taking seriously their responsibility for the public's interest, if not protection.

In California, Governor Ronald Reagan, a conservative Republican, is grappling with liberal Democrats for primacy in the battle there against pollution. Once again this year, California legislators will consider a bill that would ban the internal-combustion engine from California's busy highways. Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin has proposed far-reaching legislative goals to cure the ailments of the natural environment in the 1970's. For immediate action, Senator Nelson suggests stiff government regulation in five areas of pollution—phase out the automobile's internal combustion engine during 1970 unless manufacturers develop pollution-free exhausts, eliminate by 1972 all use of the "hard" pesticides, restrict the ingredients of household detergents, set a deadline of December, 1972, for the airlines to install smokeless combustors on jet aircraft, and outlaw the "no return" bottle and other disposable containers which have become commonplace in American marketing.

Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch and Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe conducted a meeting with 31 major airlines. Under the threat of corrective legislation, virtually all the nation's airlines agreed to speed up steps to eliminate air pollution caused by jet engines. Mayor Richard J. Daley named H. Wallace Poston to head the Chicago agency to protect the environment. Poston has been regional director of water pollution control for the federal government. He will head the Chicago Department of Environmental Control, budgeted at \$1,927,940 this year and expected to spend another \$1,000,000 in federal funds. Also, a new pollution control facility became operational in Lincoln, N.H. This project is a substantial step in cleaning up the waters of the Pemigewasset River, one of the most scenic and polluted rivers in New Hampshire. The University of North Carolina, Duke University, and North Carolina State University have entered into a pact with the federal government for a joint attack on air pollution. Finally, President Richard M. Nixon has proposed the most comprehensive and costly program in the nation's history, including a \$10-billion clean-waters program.

#### THE FUTURE

The United States is on a suicide course and has only one generation in which to save itself. According to Dr. Barry Commoner, Director of the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems in St. Louis, the weapons of self-destruction are air pollution, insecticides and fertilizers. On the other side of the coin, President Nixon, industrial leaders, housewives and students want to clean up the environment. But it will cost billions of dollars, and thus far no one appears ready to pay for it. And the price will go beyond dollars. Yes, some of America's traditional values will be called to account.

The Environmental Studies Board of the National Academy of Sciences urges the creation of a brigade of researchers who "could function like a fire department" in quickly exploring potential environmental crises such as suspicious rises in water or air pollution. The board asks for the establishment of a "National Laboratory for the Environmental Sciences" similar to such other contractor-operated national laboratories as those of the Atomic Energy Commission.

John L. Gillis has suggested 1980 as a target year to bring water pollution under control. Americans have achieved great progress in the conquest of outer space in ten years, hence a ten-year program to cleanse inner space seems an altogether reasonable proposition. Edward N. Cole believes that General Motors can produce an "essentially pollution-free" auto by 1980 and retain the internal combustion engine.

Leaders like Smith Griswold and Harry Lion Boren are at work seeking answers for mankind. Mr. Griswold, who drives a non-polluting car that runs on natural gas, does not expect much from the Nixon administrations on environmental problems. "Some good minds are working, and solutions aren't hard to find. But in government, the squeakiest wheel gets the grease." Dr. Boren is hard at work for the State of Illinois as Assistant Attorney General in charge of pollution control. Finally, there is the wise statesman from Maine, Senator Edmund S. Muskie, who says that "rhetoric is not enough" to clean up the nation's environment and estimated that the task will cost hundreds of billions of dollars by the year 2000.

Certainly there is no escape. Traces of the toxic gas, for example, have turned up in the Alaskan tundra, off the coast of Hawaii, in the middle of the California desert and at the top of the Colorado Rockies. The best evidence that small doses of monoxide can make trouble comes from a series of recent studies of the effects of carbon monoxide on heart patients and pregnant women.

The answer lies in all mankind joining hands in solving this problem. This is possible.

#### BISHOP PAPKEN

### HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 10, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, Bishop Papken is one of the outstanding churchmen in the Washington, D.C., area who has, since coming here, contributed to the ecumenical movement by his many activities involving churchmen of differing faiths. He has welcomed visiting clergy to his church, the St. Mary's Armenian Church on Fessenden Street, on several occasions in the past year and has himself gone to other churches to represent the Armenian Church and has participated in community activities. Bishop Papken, wherever he has served in the country, has always been in the forefront of the interfaith movement.

Bishop Papken is a worker for the ancient and venerable Armenian Church which, although it traces its origin back to the Apostles of Christ who traveled to Armenia, is one of the most democratic churches of the world.

I wish Bishop Papken success in carrying the message of Christian fellowship and brotherhood from his church to his fellow Americans.

### COMMENDING THE FRANKLIN K. HOWARD COLLEGE BOARDS INSTITUTE

### HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the dimensions of the problems that will confront our Nation in the decade ahead demand that our colleges and universities produce men and women with the skill and the knowledge that will enable them to assume positions of leadership in all fields.

Yet, never before in our history has there been such a tremendous gap between the number of students seeking admission to college and the number of seats that are available to them.

The magnitude of this problem is reflected in the fact that more than 50 percent of all college applications are denied admission to the college of their first choice. Just as alarming are reports that half of all those who do enter college never graduate.

Because of the vast numbers of high school students seeking admission to college, a stricter process of selection has evolved; this takes the form of the college board examinations. Indeed, the scores made by students on these examinations are among the primary criteria for admission to virtually all colleges and universities of our Nation.

The growing emphasis on success in the college board examinations underscores the immense contribution that is being made in the academic field by the Franklin K. Howard College Boards Institute in Garden City, N.Y.

Established in 1959, the institute, a subsidiary of Programmed Proprietary Systems, Inc., a publicly held corporation, spent 5 years in research and development before accepting the first student for its college boards study skills course.

The course, which this year will have an enrollment of nearly 5,000, 10 times the number of only 5 years ago, is an intensive review of the basic verbal and mathematical concepts of 4 years of high school. Students attend a 4-hour session once a week for 8 weeks. All instructors are specialists in the areas of mathematics and English and all are certified and licensed in their specialty field.

I believe that the Franklin K. Howard College Boards Institute is performing an exemplary service to the community for more than one reason.

First, of course, the institute, by helping high school seniors to attain higher scores on their college boards examination, is opening the door to a higher education for qualified young men and women who might otherwise be denied this opportunity.

Second, in emphasizing also the development of the student's study skills the institute is helping to reduce the college dropout rate.

The president of the institute, A. Robert Lieberman, and H. B. Wexler, the

board chairman, both have had considerable experience in education, and their efforts in developing this admirable program merit the highest praise.

In the 1970's we will need more doctors, more engineers, more teachers, more technicians—more professionals in every field of endeavor. I would like to commend the Franklin K. Howard College Boards Institute for its contributions in helping this Nation to achieve this important goal.

IN SUPPORT OF S. 2214

### HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the passage of S. 2214. We have heard here today, from Congressmen who are interested in potato growers, from Congressmen who are interested in potato processors, and I think it is about time that we heard from a Congressman who is interested primarily in potato eaters. Therefore, I want to speak today on behalf of the potato consumer; and I have lots of them in my congressional district.

Let me make myself clear that I am in favor of every producer of an agricultural commodity receiving a return for his commodity, that will enable him to make a good living. I support a program that will return to our farmers a fair price for what they produce. However, I know it to be the goal of certain advocates of potato marketing orders to greatly increase the price that they receive for their potatoes by withholding from the market potatoes that are edible and of good quality for processing or eating. These potatoes would then be diverted into livestock feed or other non-food uses.

It is hoped by the advocates of such a program that they would then be able to sell the remaining portion of their crop for greatly increased prices to the consumers and to the processors. To many, this is wasteful and unfair to the consumer.

I believe that growers should be free to produce as many potatoes as they are able to grow and then to market them in the most effective way possible. I want the grower to have complete freedom to sell his crop on a fresh market, to a potato freezer, to a potato chipper, to a potato canner, to a potato dehydrator, or to any other potential buyer of potatoes. By the same token, I want the processor to be free to buy all good and edible potatoes in a market that is controlled by competition. I am convinced that this will then result in my potato consumers receiving the best possible potatoes and potato products at the lowest possible price.

I know that the passage of S. 2214 is necessary if this condition is to prevail. That is why I am fully in support of this legislation.

### GLIBNESS IN THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST CRIME

### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Anthony Lewis of the London bureau of the New York Times puts the crime problem in perspective in terms of warning against progressively harsher police and Government measures as the solution. In view of the Senate-passed crime legislation, I recommend the editorial to my colleagues in the House who will be considering crime legislation:

[From the New York Times, Monday, Feb. 9, 1970]

#### GLIBNESS IN THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST CRIME (By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON.—One of the attractions of Britain for Americans these days is the simple feeling that it is safe. A person can walk through a park or down the street at night, without giving a thought to the possibility of robbery or assault. By American standards the level of crime in general is low.

Why? Ask anyone who has thought seriously about it, and he will mention that this is a relatively homogeneous country, a tolerant and a contented one, without the extremes of wealth and poverty that breed resentment. One of the strong traditions is community respect and even affection for the police.

In short, the reasons go deep into the character of this society and the economic and political direction given by its leaders since the age of reform began in the nineteenth century. The explanation does not lie in the way suspects are questioned or criminal trials conducted.

Americans might think about that. For the premise of the Nixon Administration and the overwhelming Congressional majority now pushing through harsh crime legislation is that "unshackling" the police and prosecutors will substantially alleviate the appalling American crime problem. That is the justification for cutting so hard into the established rights of defendants, as detailed by Tom Wicker in this space.

#### THE CONFESSION ISSUE

One does not have to admire everything the Supreme Court has done by way of judicializing the criminal law to see that undoing the Court's decisions will not solve the crime problem. Take the restraints on confessions, which are most bitterly attacked by the police and prosecutors. Prof. James Vorenberg of the Harvard Law School, whom some liberals consider a hardliner, has shown how little relevance the confession issue has.

The President's Crime Commission, of which Professor Vorenberg was Director, reported in 1967 that only one-tenth to one-third of all crimes committed are actually reported to the police. There are arrests in only a quarter of those reported, and confessions are essential to resolution of only a small proportion of those. Professor Vorenberg concluded that judicial restrictions on the confession process could affect only a fraction of 1 per cent of crimes.

Or think about some of the methods now described as vital to law enforcement—wiretapping, breaking into homes without knocking, limiting the right of defendants at trial to know the sources of prosecution evidence. What will they do, what can they do, to reduce the volume of street crimes that

rightly disturb Americans most of all? How can wiretapping stop a rapist or mugger?

Within the legal system, we must urgently try to develop a penology with some hope of rehabilitating prisoners. It should surely not be beyond us to try criminal cases and resolve the appeals swiftly enough to make conviction a present threat.

A more fundamental requirement is for the police to regain the confidence of the ghetto. The poor and the black are by far the most frequent victims of violent crimes. So long as they consider the police prejudiced or hostile, so long as they refuse to cooperate with law enforcement or even to report crimes, there can be no effective system of deterrence.

But that raises the whole question of relations between the black and white communities—of welfare reform, of education, of employment, of housing. It is infinitely more difficult for a Senator to face up to these dilemmas and vote with any confidence for a solution than it is to vote for an anticrime bill. But in the long run a bitter divided society is not likely to be lawabiding.

Pretending that there are easy ways to solve the American crime problem is not only foolish but dangerous. When the public is told that all will be well if only the police and the Government get tough and push aside the obstacles made by judges, and then all is not well, what will the reaction be?

It could be to demand ever harsher police measures, in the belief that at some point dealing with the external manifestations of social illness will work. At some point, of course, repression would inhibit crime—with ten of thousands of suspects held in detention without trial, say, and the Supreme Court swept aside if it found preventive detention unconstitutional.

That prospect is not in view, hopefully. John Mitchell and Richard Nixon surely do not want to arrive at that point or anywhere near it. But then it would be wise to tell the American people the truth about the money and time and leadership it will take to make life in their country safe again.

### BEST RADIO PUBLIC SERVICE PROGRAM—WJDA, QUINCY, MASS.—1969

### HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I desire to compliment my able and distinguished friend, Mr. Herb Fontaine of the WJDA radio station, Quincy, Mass., on his being recently awarded the United Press International Tom Phillips Award for 1969's best radio public service program in New England.

I am confident that my colleagues share my acclaim for Herb's winning series, "The Drug Menace—1969" and join me in expressing admiration and gratitude for the service he has performed in bringing to his listeners' attention the critical problem of drug abuse.

Mr. Speaker at this point I would like to submit a news item announcing Mr. Fontaine's achievements:

[From the Patriot Ledger, Feb. 3, 1970]  
RADIO STATION WJDA WINS UPI PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD

QUINCY.—Radio Station WJDA has been awarded United Press International's Tom Phillips Award for the past year's best radio public service program in New England.

The winning entry was a production of "The Drug Menace—1969" a 24-week series,



produced and moderated by news editor-director, Herb Fontaine, assisted by the WJDA news staff.

Panelists taking part during the series included school officials, police chiefs, physicians, former and present drug addicts, psychiatrists, district attorneys and high school students.

Mr. Fontaine worked at Radio Stations WCOU AM-FM in Lewiston, Maine, prior to joining WJDA in 1955. A veteran of World War II, he served with the 1st Cavalry Division in the Pacific theater.

He is a graduate of Medford High School and attended Boston University, and Emerson College. Mr. Fontaine lives at 30 Squanto Road with his wife, the former Barbara Jaspson of Quincy, and three sons.

The award was presented at a dinner last Friday night of some 170 broadcasters at the Marriot Hotel in Newton. James D. Asher, owner of WJDA and WESX in Salem, and Program Director Win Bettinson, were present for award ceremonies.

**BOTH THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964 AND APPROPRIATIONS ACTS OF 1969 AND 1970 CONTAIN PROHIBITIONS AGAINST BUSING STUDENTS**

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the intent of the Congress in laws and statutes is clear with respect to the busing of students to achieve "racial balance." However, the administration of the laws by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is fuzzy.

In this connection I include in the RECORD a column by the noted columnist, David Lawrence, from the Nashville Banner, which will be of interest to my colleagues and the American people.

The column follows:

**"LAW OF THE LAND" PROHIBITS FORCED SCHOOL BUSING**

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The Constitution of the United States specifically says that Congress may by law limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Congress recently has passed such a law, forbidding the courts to issue any order to achieve "racial balance" in the schools by busing. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 says:

"Nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance, or otherwise enlarge the existing power of the courts to insure compliance with constitutional standards."

In another section of the same act is the following provision:

"Desegregation" shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance."

In the 1969 appropriations act of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there were two sections that dealt with the forced busing of students. These provide:

"Section 409. No part of the funds contained in this act may be used to force busing of students, abolishment of any school, or to force any student attending any elementary or secondary school to at-

tend a particular school against the choice of his or her parents or parent in order to overcome racial imbalance.

"Section 410. No part of the funds contained in this act shall be used to force busing of students, the abolishment of any school or the attendance of students at a particular school in order to overcome racial imbalance as a condition precedent to obtaining federal funds otherwise available to any state, school district or school."

In the 1970 appropriations act for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which has been vetoed by President Nixon, these sections were revised to read:

"Section 407. Except as required by the Constitution, no part of the funds contained in this act may be used to force any school district to take any actions involving the busing of students, the abolishment of any school or the assignment of any student attending any elementary or secondary school to a particular school against the choice of his or her parents or parent.

"Section 408. Except as required by the Constitution, no part of the funds contained in this act shall be used to force any school district to take any actions involving the busing of students, the abolishment of any school or the assignment of students to a particular school as a condition precedent to obtaining federal funds otherwise available to any state, school district or school."

After President Nixon's veto of the bill, it went back to a House Appropriations subcommittee. The phrase "except as required by the Constitution" makes the two provisions valueless because there is nothing in the Constitution that directly or indirectly deals with the compulsory busing of school children. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 states broadly the power of Congress to forbid the use of public funds to correct "racial imbalance," of a state law or deliberate discrimination locally.

What the people everywhere are insisting upon is "freedom of choice" insofar as the districts in which they reside are concerned. They want to be able to send their children to any school within a school district, but they cannot, under court orders, object to children or other races attending the same schools. The parents, however, do not feel their own children should be required to go to a distant school to correct "racial imbalance." Congress has specifically ruled against this remedy and has, in effect, prohibited not only the courts from issuing such an order but also the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from carrying out any such instructions of the courts.

The administration has appointed a special Cabinet committee under Vice President Agnew to try to solve the problem. It certainly needs further study, particularly by legal experts, so that some solution in conformity with "the law of the land" may be found.

**MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?**

**HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,400 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

**VIETNAM**

**HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the Vietnam war by individuals who have never visited or served in that country.

For that reason I want to insert in the RECORD a letter from a first lieutenant who is currently serving with the Marine Corps in Vietnam.

The letter was written by 1st Lt. Darrell H. Richards in response to antiwar demonstrations. It was brought to my attention by his mother, Mrs. John R. Richards, who resides in my congressional district in New Orleans.

Mrs. Richards, in her letter to me, says she is very proud of her son, and I can certainly see why. You will, too, after you read his letter.

I was deeply impressed with the thoughts conveyed by this young officer, and I insert them at this point in the RECORD so every Member of Congress may have the opportunity to read them:

JANUARY 15, 1970.

DEAR SIR: I am a 1st Lt. in the United States Marine Corps in Vietnam. I have been here for 7 months and have been on several operations. I had a friend who asked how I felt about the war at this stage. Knowing this person, as I feel I do, and sensing her non-support of the present administrations policy over here, I wrote back the following, hoping to enlighten her as to what is indeed happening.

Just as I hope she may discover the real truth, I hope that you will print the following for those of the public who are in the same classification.

"I don't like war," this war or any other! Yet sometimes they are necessary. If a man strikes at me or actively threatens me, or those of my own I have but two courses of action to take.

Firstly, I can make no overt responsive action, but instead try to settle the dispute in a nonviolent, peaceful manner. The alternative is to strike back as an act of self-defense! Comparatively, the communists threatened me and those of my own.

Russia, Red China, North Vietnam, as well as the other communistic satellite nations are not satisfied with our existence. Their doctrine calls for us to change or be destroyed!

Here in Vietnam, their oppressive doctrine is being forced upon the people. Thousands upon thousands of innocent civilians, who seek freedom in a democratic society, are being killed, tortured, and wounded by the enemy. In many cases their brutal acts are carried out only as a deterrence to the people's goals.

I, as most men over here, see these people fighting for their freedom, just as we did, when we were a striving nation.

The people of South Vietnam extended their desire for us to come to their assistance in their struggle for freedom. We must be realistic. We are not only coming to their aid as an act which is totally and unselfishly for their benefit alone. But entered this war for our own preservation as well. In an indirect way we are fighting now to prevent a future conflict that might even bring the battlefield to our own homeland, if communism's surge was to continue without confrontation.

Yes, there are those fatalists who say com-

munism will conquer all! But there are the multitudes of those Americans, who feel just as John Paul Jones did in the 1770's.

We realize that the war could have been ended earlier with an unlimited military effort. It was not done, and it is too late! The war has now evolved to a political war.

The enemy has been defeated militarily. His strike now is like that of a dying snake. He may still be a threat, but only until the sun goes down. Come nightfall, he is dead. Thus we find the enemy! The dust of his war has come. Infiltration has been down 60% and over, the percentage of the past year. Defections are on the ever rise. Large numbers are dying from malaria, hunger, and lack of medical attention. Their moral, endurance, and hopes have come near their end.

They endure with one remaining hope. That hope is their only chance of victory. They await a large scale withdrawal of American forces.

I detest those people back home who actively protest the war and the policies of this administration. I can speak for most men fighting over here when I say we have great contempt for them.

The only reason the enemy has held on so long, is because he thinks the American people's demand for an immediate large-scale pullout will be met.

The South Vietnamese Government forces are nearing the level of capability needed to maintain the war themselves. They are making great progress in achieving this position. However, at the present stage, the war cannot be won by their effort alone.

The enemy fully realizes the gravity of the situation. He knows a total pullout would be premature at this point. Should this happen, a communist takeover would possibly be inevitable for the people of South Vietnam.

The ability of the North Vietnamese Army and the Viet Cong to sustain themselves against overwhelming odds, has been based on one main hope; that of an immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops.

If the American people were united in cause, this one remaining hope for victory would be destroyed. But instead, the enemy's hope is being nourished by the active protesters and demonstrators. As a result, a greater price is being paid with each passing day. Each day that the enemy has his one last hope to cling to, more American blood is spilled upon the battlefield, and there are more aluminum caskets and amputees. These protesters are killing us. Although their blows are indirect, they are killing us just as much as the bullets made in Russia and Red China. This is why we detest the protesters and their demonstrations.

Yes, many of them may sincerely believe in their cause. But regardless of their ignorance, I have seen the price paid by American fighting men, due to the unawareness of the truth of the protester. If they were over here, then they might see what it is really like, and what it is all about.

I respect a person's right to voice his opinion, but when American men bleed and die as a result, it no longer should be a right, we therefore object.

1ST. LT. DARRELL H. RICHARDS.

#### A DEDICATED CITIZEN

### HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, last month Ocala and the State of Florida lost one of its most dedicated citizens. James Albert Fleming, most properly

referred to as the "Father of the State Fire College" has long served the people of our State in a most needed capacity.

Jim Fleming worked tirelessly to educate and train Florida firemen. He began his association with the Fire College as an instructor and coordinator and rose to become chief of the college through his hard work, devotion, and skill.

His work will live on as a monument to him—for the hundreds of men who attended Florida State Fire College will carry on the great traditions of devotion and duty which Jim so aptly taught them. Those of us who knew him personally were doubly blessed—in having known him as a friend.

The Florida State Fire College, the Ocala community, and all the State of Florida are better places today because of Jim Fleming.

#### ABM, MIRV, AND STICKING TO THE FACTS

### HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak are known for the thoroughness with which they check out information before printing it. However, it was disappointing to read their column of January 21, which was inaccurate on several counts. These inaccuracies were pointed out by former Senator Joseph S. Clark, of Pennsylvania, in a letter of rebuttal published in the Washington Post on February 3, 1970.

Under leave granted, I include the Evans and Novak column entitled "ABM Is Best U.S. Bargaining Card in Arms Talks With the Russians," followed by Senator Clark's letter, at this point in the RECORD:

#### ABM IS BEST U.S. BARGAINING CARD IN ARMS TALKS WITH THE RUSSIANS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

U.S. development of the antiballistic missile (ABM), approved by a one-vote margin in the Senate last year after a convulsive battle, is proving to be the best card in the U.S. hand in strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union.

"Without the ABM, we would have been dead at Helsinki," one top presidential arms-control adviser said privately in assessing the first stage of the arms talks in Finland.

Although U.S. experts learned long ago to be triply cautious in appraising Soviet negotiating objectives—real objectives, as opposed to propaganda objectives—the Helsinki talks, now in recess, left the following impression on the American negotiating team:

U.S. development of the ABM has become almost an obsession with Moscow. However, U.S. development of MIRVs—multiple, independently targeted re-entry vehicles—is almost beneath Soviet attention.

If this genuinely reflects Soviet thinking, it means that the ABM, not the MIRV, is the best U.S. bargaining counter in trying to convince Moscow that the time has come to ease off the dangerous nuclear arms race. The Nixon administration definitely thinks so. Thus, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, who led the 1969 battle for Phase 1 of President Nixon's Safeguard ABM plan, is just as anx-

ious for congressional approval of Phase 2 (the precise extent of which is still secret).

At Helsinki, Soviet negotiators were not openly confessing any apprehension about the U.S. ABM program but, reading between the lines, diplomatic experts detected a deep and underlying concern over the rapidly growing U.S. ABM technology. That Soviet view of the ABM, moreover, is significantly different from two years ago and reflects a basic change in Soviet thinking on strategic weapons.

When Premier Alexei Kosygin came and met President Johnson at Glassboro, N.J., in 1967, he defended the Soviet beginning of an ABM system as a humanitarian insurance policy—a defense measure for civilians against possible nuclear attack.

This appraisal had undergone conceptual transformation at Helsinki. Instead of being a humanitarian Soviet development, it had become a wicked multiplying factor in U.S. escalation of the arms race, in other words, rapid technological advances by the U.S. in ABM development had obliterated the Soviet rationale about ABMs.

Indeed, the Soviets now seem to be duplicating Mr. Johnson's position at Glassboro when he argued that neither nation should start building the ABM. Mr. Johnson's view was that, once either side began development of the ABM, the other side would have to develop a new offensive capability to offset the added protection of the ABM.

This made little or no impression on the Russians. Now, however, as they face a more advanced ABM technology in the U.S. than they themselves possess, they regard the U.S. system as one that carries the gravest long-range threat to the Soviet Union.

There was no similar Soviet concern at Helsinki over U.S. development of MIRVs. Here, the technological advantage is strongly with the Russians, for one major reason: the thrust or "throw-weight" of the standard Soviet long-range missile, the SS-9, is incomparably greater than the thrust of the Minuteman, the standard U.S. long-range missile.

Boiled down, this means that when the SS-9 is "MIRved"—that is, when its up-to-25-megaton warhead is split into three parts and three separate weapons are dropped from a single carrier—each of the three parts could be a death threat to a hardened U.S. Minuteman site not protected by ABM.

But when the Minuteman is "MIRved," the result is three weapons of only fractional megatonnage—useful as a counterforce against Soviet industrial targets and population centers in response to a Soviet first-strike, but not as destroyers of SS-9 missile sites.

Thus President Nixon's one-vote victory margin in the Senate battle over the ABM last year, widely described then as a pyrrhic victory, may prove the seed of eventual success in negotiating a serious defensive and offensive arms-control agreement with the Soviets when the talks resume at Vienna in April. That agreement will not come soon. But without last year's decision to move ahead with the ABM, it might not have come at all.

#### THE ABM, THE MIRV AND THE SALT TALKS

I feel obligated to comment on the recent Washington Post column by my longtime friends Rowland Evans and Robert Novak. Their piece "ABM Is Best U.S. Bargaining Card in Arms Talks With the Russians" relayed (I would be interested in knowing from whom) so many incorrect facts and false assumptions regarding so critical an issue—that could be man's last hopeful chance for peace—that it must be challenged and examined in depth.

We are assured right off that "U.S. experts learned long ago to be triply cautious in appraising Soviet objectives . . ." I would imagine the Soviets also are somewhat



cautious; maybe even more so considering the United States, which proposed the SALT talks some two years ago, entered the negotiations which it had requested with no definite proposals or objectives.

It seems unlikely that the "ABM has become almost an obsession with Moscow." After beginning deployment of the ABMs around Moscow, the Soviets soon discontinued deployment. It would not seem to follow that they would have an "obsessive" fear of a weapons system that they themselves have abandoned. Perhaps the Soviets realized, as I hope the United States soon will, that the ABM can easily be neutralized with increased and less expensive offensive strategies, and that, because we are in the initial phase of ABM research and development, the present state of ABM technology makes today's system already obsolete.

Secretary of Defense Laird is said to be "anxious for congressional approval of Phase 2 (ABM)" so as "to convince Moscow that the time has come to ease off the dangerous nuclear arms race." It is a unique twist of logic that seeks a reduction of arms by proposing an increase. If we were to grant the earlier contention of deep Soviet apprehension of the ABM, it would be even more ridiculous to expect that an expanded ABM would convince the Soviets "to ease off."

MIRV was of no concern to the Soviets, we are told, because "here, the technological advantages is strongly with the Russians," because "the thrust or 'throw-weight' of the standard Soviet long-range missile, the SS-9, is comparably greater than the thrust of the Minuteman, the standard U.S. long-range missile." This conclusion is based on both incomplete analysis and incorrect facts. First, "throw-weight" is only one, and the least significant, fact in measuring the effectiveness of MIRV; the vital element being accuracy, and the United States is way out ahead in this regard. Second, "the standard Soviet long-range missile" is not the SS-9, but rather the smaller "throw-weight" SS-11.

It is correctly stated that a Mirved SS-9 "could be a death threat to a hardened U.S. Minuteman site not protected by ABM." But the claim that a Mirved U.S. Minuteman, yielding three smaller weapons, is not effective against SS-9 missile sites is not correct. Again, only one factor relating to the effectiveness of MIRV—size of the warhead—was given consideration; while accuracy, at which the United States excels, is critical (even indirect or near hits, by silo dislocation and disruption, can knock out a missile site).

The ABM is *not* "the best card in the U.S. hand in strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union." In fact, continued deployment of ABM and development of MIRV jeopardize the SALT talks by adding uncertainty, instability, and probable escalation up the arms ladder at what could be an ideal time for productive arms limitation agreements, with both the Soviet Union and the United States at approximate equality in strategic nuclear weaponry. What is more, should talks continue and an agreement be reached in spite of continued deployment of ABM and MIRV, we may find ourselves with an agreement that exists on paper but that finds us little or no farther away from the brink of nuclear war than before SALT; the means having eaten up the ends.

Finally, I would like to leave a thought with the "top presidential arms control adviser" (I wonder who he was) who said, I would imagine with a deep sigh of relief and inexpressible affection for the man-made monster, "Without the ABM, we would have been dead at Helinski." With the ABM and MIRV, we will be dead in April in Vienna, and we soon could be dead in New York, in Moscow, in Washington, in Leningrad, in San Francisco, in . . .

JOSEPH S. CLARK,  
President, World Federalists, USA.  
WASHINGTON.

TRIBUTE TO DR. THOMAS H.  
HENDERSON

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Virginia recently lost an outstanding citizen, Dr. Thomas Howard Henderson, president of Virginia Union University, who died at the age of 59. Dr. Henderson, a native Virginian, who rose to a position of eminence in the field of education, devoted his entire life to the service of others.

Born in Mecklenburg County, Va., in 1910, he came to Richmond and Virginia Union University where he earned his B.S. degree in 1928. Subsequently he pursued his education at the University of Chicago where he received his master's and Ph. D. degrees.

His career in education began at the age of 18 at Armstrong High School in the city of Richmond where he taught chemistry. Thirteen years later he became the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Virginia Union University, a position which he held until his appointment in 1960 as president of that university.

It was a tribute to his ability that he was selected to be the first layman ever to serve as president of this Baptist-related university. The wisdom of that selection became more than apparent during the next 9 years when his administrative ability succeeded in producing an extensive building program at the university, including the addition of a science building, two dormitories and a student union building, in doubling the size of the faculty; in increasing student enrollment by 28 percent; in initiating a student faculty exchange with Concordia College in Moorhead, Minn., and in effecting a merger with Storer College in the Shenandoah Valley.

In 1940 Dr. Henderson led the fight for equal pay for teachers in Virginia and later during the decade of the fifties served as an expert witness on matters involving school segregation.

He served as a member of Richmond's school board, was a former president of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association, served as chairman of the Richmond Urban League and as vice chairman of the Virginia Council on Human Relations. He also served as a member of the Governor's commission on the problems of children born out of wedlock, worked for the United Givers Fund and served on the Richmond Area Community Council.

Dr. Henderson possessed a keen mind acutely attuned to the times in which he lived. He gave unselfishly of his time and unstintingly of his talents in the service of all of the people of the community in which he lived. His loss through death to Virginia and the Richmond community is well expressed in a recent editorial which appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch which I take pleasure in inserting at this point in the RECORD:

DR. THOMAS H. HENDERSON

The death of Dr. Thomas Howard Henderson, president of Virginia Union University, has ended the remarkable career of the grandson of a slave whose connection with the Baptist-related university spanned more than 40 years.

A decade ago when Dr. Henderson became the president of the 105-year-old institution, he vowed that "the pursuit of academic excellence will be our ceaseless and most engaging challenge." He kept his word. Under his leadership VUU has climbed to new heights of achievement.

Never one to accentuate the negative, Dr. Henderson saw problems as challenges that could lead to greater opportunities. He firmly believed that education was the key to a better future, not only for his race, but for all men.

Dr. Henderson's contributions to education and to society were not limited to VUU. He had served as a member of the Richmond School Board since 1965 and had been active in many education and civic organizations on the local, state and national levels.

His firm commitment to education was exceeded only by his deep faith in God and brotherhood.

He summed up his personal faith in an article written for a Times-Dispatch Lenten season series in 1953, when as VUU dean, he wrote: "The belief in the brotherhood of man challenges me to live by a positive Golden Rule; to go out of my way to do for others what I would like them to do for me; to examine every impulse in dealing with others . . . the idea of brotherhood leads me away from an easy, self-righteous condemnation of errant behavior in others into hard efforts to understand the causes of human mistakes and to work toward their prevention. Under the influence of this idea, self-respect becomes blended with humility in the realization that all brothers are equal in certain rights, especially to the right to be respected and the right to opportunity."

Dr. Henderson's all too-brief career spanned an important era for his race, an era in which he played a leading role.

NAVY CROSS AWARD TO  
MASSACHUSETTS MARINE

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I can think of few circumstances which moved me so profoundly as the occasion I had recently to meet with Mr. Thomas Casey of Milton, Mass.

Mr. Casey and his wife not long ago accepted in behalf of their son, Marine L.Cpl. Thomas M. Casey, Jr., 23, the Navy Cross which was awarded posthumously for extraordinary heroism in Vietnam.

As I read the citation which follows, I am struck by the tragedy of all war. We have lost one of Milton's finest young men in Thomas Casey, Jr. His friends, his family, and his community are diminished by his loss. His valor, and that of his comrades in Southeast Asia have insured for us the preservation of the American democratic ideal.

I know I express the feeling of the entire membership of the U.S. Congress in extending our sympathy to the father and mother and family of this fine young

man who gave his full measure of devotion for his fellow man.

Our prayers are with his family in this period of great sorrow.

I insert the article, as follows:

[From the Milton (Mass.) Record Transcript, Jan. 22, 1970]

POSTHUMOUS PRESENTATION TO VIETNAM HERO: NAVY CROSS AWARD TO MARINE CASEY—NATION'S SECOND HIGHEST MEDAL

The Navy Cross was awarded posthumously to Marine Lance Corporal Thomas M. Casey Jr., 23, for extraordinary heroism in Vietnam. The medal, the nation's second highest award, was presented to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas M. Casey Sr. of 19 Winthrop street, at a ceremony at the Boston Naval Base.

The citation reads as follows:

"For extraordinary heroism while serving as a Fire Team Leader with Company D, First Battalion, Seventh Marines, First Marine Division, in connection with operations against the enemy in the Republic of Vietnam. On the afternoon of February 16, 1969, Company D was assaulting a large North Vietnamese Army force occupying a well-entrenched position in Quang Nam Province. Alertly observing an enemy fortification, Lance Corporal Casey launched a determined assault upon the hostile position, delivering accurate fire as he fearlessly maneuvered across fifty meters of fire-swept terrain. Upon reaching the hostile bunker, he boldly hurled grenades into it, destroying the North Vietnamese emplacements and killing an enemy soldier. Disregarding his own safety, he went to several casualties, and ignoring the hostile rounds impacting near him, skillfully administered first aid to his wounded comrades. Realizing the need for an M-79 grenade launcher, he again rushed across the hazardous area and, obtaining the weapon, returned to the point of heaviest contact. When two additional Marines were wounded, he unhesitatingly commenced maneuvering through a hall of fire to assist the injured men, but as he approached the casualties he was mortally wounded. His heroic actions and aggressive fighting spirit inspired all who observed him and were instrumental in saving the lives of several Marines. By his courage, sincere concern for the welfare of his comrades, and selfless devotion to duty, Lance Corporal Casey upheld the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service. He gallantly gave his life for his country.

"JOHN H. CHAFEE,  
"Secretary of the Navy,  
"(For the President)."

Besides the Navy Cross, which stands for extraordinary heroism in connection with military operations against an opposing armed force, Corporal Casey received the Navy Commendation Medal twice, the Purple Heart and a Medal from the South Vietnam Government.

#### IN DEFENSE OF RESEARCH AND GRADUATE EDUCATION

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, the October-November 1969 issue of the Iowa Alumni Review contains an excellent article by Dr. Duane C. Priestestersbach. Dr. Priestestersbach is dean of the Graduate College at the University of Iowa. Dr. Priestestersbach sets forth an eloquent defense of the need for and value of graduate education and re-

search. I highly recommend the article to my colleagues:

U OF I'S GRADUATE COLLEGE DEAN DEFENDS RESEARCH AND GRADUATE EDUCATION, THEREBY DOING BATTLE WITH THOSE WHO CAST—"A CURSE ON BOTH YOUR HOUSES"

(By Duane Priestestersbach)

What can we do about graduate education and research? The costs of graduate education are too high compared with those of undergraduate education. For example, here at Iowa the per student costs during the 1966-67 academic year (the latest available data) for masters-level training was \$3,172, for doctoral-level training \$5,770, compared with \$873 for the first two undergraduate years and \$1,276 for the last two undergraduate years. (The biennially computed cost analysis which will be available later this year will undoubtedly show an even greater difference.)

Over 50 percent of our graduate student body of 5,000 are nonresidents, many of whom are trouble makers. Not every student with a baccalaureate degree from an Iowa college, including the undergraduate colleges here at the University, is admitted to the Graduate College upon application.

Our professors, when they teach at all, prefer to teach graduate level courses, ignoring their obligations to undergraduate instruction. And, to top it all off, the graduate students who do get degrees are all too often poorly trained for teaching and other professional work. To make matters worse, most of the best graduates leave the State for greener pastures.

And then there's research. The great bulk of the professors do their thing by spending time in their laboratories, or writing books, or consulting at some other institution or business about doing their things. The reward system is all wrong. It really is publish or perish. Good teaching is ignored and most professors do little of any kind, good or bad. Things would be a lot better if the professor would worry less about his list of publications and spend more time teaching students. A curse on both your houses!

Forgive me if I sound bitter, though I'm really not. But I do get more discouraged some days than others when almost every newspaper and many periodicals carry stories about higher education which make some of the assertions which I have just recounted.

It's discouraging because almost all of them reflect so little understanding of the place of graduate education and research in today's programs of higher education, and so little appreciation of the stake that the average citizen has in them. I despair because it's so hard to know where to begin and how to tell the story in a meaningful and convincing fashion. But let me try.

First, some orientation. We have 101 masters-level programs and 56 doctoral level programs in the Graduate College. These programs are superimposed on those of the other nine undergraduate and professional colleges of the University.

In other words, we have a unified Graduate College since none of the other colleges offers graduate programs on its own. We hold steadfast to this arrangement because it capitalizes on a long tradition of real interdisciplinary and intercollegiate interaction of our faculties encouraged by geographical proximity. We are convinced that this interaction has a stimulating and strengthening effect on all of our graduate programs. And Iowa has a record in graduate education of which it can be justly proud. Despite its relatively small size, it has consistently been among the top 25 universities in the production of persons with doctoral degrees, the great majority of whom have gone into college and university teaching, and have held major administrative positions in higher education.

Iowa was one of the first universities to recognize creative work as the equivalent of research in the fine arts. We have developed interdisciplinary programs such as Comparative Literature, American Civilization, Urban and Regional Planning, and Anthropology and Linguistics in recognition of meaningful (and relevant?) combinations of related subject matters. It is increasingly clear that, for the dollars invested, Iowa has been one of the most effective producers of the holders of advanced degrees in the country.

And what about research? I know of no responsible University official who has argued that The University of Iowa should give precedence to research over teaching. Quite the contrary is the case. It's true, however, that some of us have argued for a balance between teaching and research, believing that only through balance will we be providing our students with the attitudes, perspectives, and motivations which will enable them to become disciplined and creative members of a constantly developing society, equipped with the skills which will give them the options for adapting to changing social conditions and, thus, protection from becoming obsolete.

Perhaps the most important statement that I might make concerning research at Iowa is that we have consistently opposed engaging in research which does not have possible benefits to our educational programs, either through the new insights acquired by the professor/researcher or through the involvement of the students in the research itself. We have not spawned research centers filled with skilled manpower who do not teach and who are engaged in research that more logically could be done by industry or by governmental agencies.

There is a distinct, even dramatic, trend in several states to raise increasingly sharp questions about the financing of graduate education in the state universities. There is mounting pressure to establish state curricula around our educational programs by dramatic increases in out-of-state tuition fees for graduate students and through special consideration of resident students even though they may not be scholastically competitive with other applicants.

We will do great damage to the quality of both our undergraduate and graduate programs if we succumb to these pressures. And the State will be the loser. For example, we work assiduously to recruit the finest teachers from wherever we can find them in the United States, and even in foreign countries.

We would have great difficulty in interesting these men and women if we could interest them at all, in coming to the University unless we could assure them that we attract a high caliber of graduate student. Why? Certainly not because the faculties are lazy and looking for cheap substitutes to do their work. On the contrary, they know that they will develop into exciting teachers and will maintain their excellence only through constant study and research. Bright graduate students provide one of the major mechanisms for the stimulation the professors need to keep them on their academic toes.

So far as I know, no one has proposed that we should forego quality faculty when less well qualified persons are available locally. Should we do less in the case of potential graduate students? If we do, (and I repeat myself) our undergraduate programs will suffer just as much as our graduate programs will.

Critics of graduate education forget that the modern world is calling for more and more highly trained persons. In fact, our continued affluence depends on them. We simply can't stand still, joining the mythical ostrich with our heads in the sand by assuming that we have the right to the best of all possible worlds unless we are willing,



as any prosperous businessman knows full well, to anticipate and invest in future growth and development.

For example, I am impressed with the overwhelming need for persons trained at the very highest levels in sizable numbers and in many areas of knowledge if the State of Iowa and the nation are to fulfill the destiny now to be anticipated even during the next 25 years. That destiny includes the redesign and rebuilding of our great cities.

To do this requires men in key places able to handle the complexities of modern planning and design, the subtle and explosive relations between ethnic groups, and the clumsy but essential forms of large-scale government. Where are such leaders to be trained but in the nation's universities?

That destiny includes the development and application of the most complex technologies—such as those required to mount successfully our recent adventure in space. To press forward with these technological developments requires long years of devoted and painstaking training. Where is this training to take place if not in our universities?

The United States has reached a point where its health programs, its national defense, its agriculture, its industry, and its business are dependent on the personnel being trained in the advanced programs of our universities. This kind of training is expensive—very expensive—involving rare machines of measurement and other laboratory equipment, and including the personal supervision of the highest level of faculty. Though the costs are high, would anyone argue that the nation should turn back?

And what about the specific needs of Iowa for specialists? When there is talk about socking it to the out-of-state graduate students with higher tuition charges, I want to remonstrate that the socking is a two-way street. Our State economy, as well as that of the entire country, depends on a wide range of specialists, many of whom we don't train in Iowa because we haven't the training resources required.

If we were really close to the Iowa curtain, preventing students from elsewhere to come to our universities, other states would also draw their curtains. The resulting cost in special fellowships or out-of-state fellowships for training our required specialists or for mounting our own training programs in relatively esoteric fields has never been calculated but the cost would be staggering.

It is of interest to note, furthermore, that over 50 percent of those with doctorates accepting their first position of employment in Iowa have been trained outside of the State. To maintain this important out-of-state resource for creative and highly trained men and women, Iowa must continue to do its part.

And now let me comment on some issues related to research. The popular cry is to get the professors out of the libraries and the laboratories and into the classrooms. In fact, several states are making moves to legislate the number of hours that the professors must appear there. The assumption seems to be that, since the professor has completed his own training, he has been taught all he needs to know and now his function until retirement is to say what he knows at his graduation forevermore. What could be more stultifying to the academic climate of our universities! What could lead to more boring, dull, mundane teaching to say nothing about relevance! Every experienced and successful teacher will testify that he had only begun to know his field of specialization when he had completed his formal academic training.

There is no dichotomy between teaching and research. This is especially clear in graduate education where research is teaching, or at least a form of teaching activity. Consider how difficult it would be for a faculty

member to advise a student on the selection of a problem for investigation if he had not conducted investigations in related areas.

How would he estimate the chances for success? How would he be able to discuss the relation of the problem to others in the area? (And this ability doesn't just apply to the needs of graduate students. As undergraduate students come to us with better basic training, they, too, are being increasingly encouraged to move into programs of independent study requiring the same type of counsel.)

In education some of the most important teaching is the advising and guidance which the faculty member gives the student on the selection and conduct of a research problem. Thus, the professor's research activity must be viewed as a teaching activity just as his preparation for a lecture.

Unfortunately, we have not developed a system of accounting for the effort of our faculty which allows us to give credit for this activity as simply as we can by counting the number of hours that they appear in the lecture hall.

We say that universities are devoted to three functions: teaching, research, and service. (President Boyd has recently said that teaching and research are the services which the University performs.) In any event universities are committed to the creation of new knowledge and its integration with existing knowledge.

This function does not, of course, distinguish them from large corporations and some branches of government which also engage in research. However, the latter engage in a relatively more applied research to improve the quality or effectiveness of a product or to solve some urgent social need. Universities, on the other hand, devote themselves more to basic research and creative work. Well?

We can't put a hold on research and creativity, as state and federal governments presently seem to be proposing, by drying up financial support for research. New products, new processes, new opportunities depend—require—a broad base of basic research. A study recently reported by the Illinois Institute of Technology traces some of today's key innovations from basic research which was originally done with no thought of future utility.

For example, the IIT group notes that the videotape recorder can be traced to Weber's 1852 ferromagnetic theory and Edison's 1883 discovery of current flow in a vacuum tube. The oral contraceptive pill can be traced from Berthold's 1949 discovery of male sex hormone. And the electron microscope can be traced to Plucker's discovery of cathode rays in vacuum discharge tubes and Clausius' theory of the kinetic mixing of gases—both in 1858, Kirchoff's improved mathematical basis for the wave theory of light in 1960, and Lorene's 1880 postulate of the electron's existence.

So we must continually press for understanding of the need to support fundamental research which most likely will one day provide the undergirding for greater things.

We need your understanding and support if we are to remove the curse from these two houses lest it fall also on yours and mine.

#### ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

**HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, 1970, is the 52d anniversary of the independence of the Republic

of Lithuania, which secured its freedom soon after the overthrow of Czarist Russia. Lithuania's history antedated this historic event by almost 700 years, for it was in 1251 that a number of principalities united to form the Lithuanian monarchy.

At its greatest extent this kingdom stretched from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea and almost to Moscow. Over the years its sway gradually declined until it was taken over by Russia in 1795.

The switch from the czars to the commissars brought lasting freedom to neither the Russians nor their neighbors. The restoration of independence to Lithuania on February 16, 1918, ended as a result of the alliance entered into on the eve of World War II by the Communists and their ideological bedfellows the National Socialists. In June 1940 not long after Poland had been divided between Germany and the Soviet Union, the latter occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

National socialism is now dead, but communism is more powerful than ever. Almost 30 years have gone by since the Soviets annexed Lithuania and its two sister republics. Those who rejoiced the loudest whenever a new nation arises from the ashes of former empires in Africa, Asia, South America, and the islands of the sea stand mute whenever the subjugation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia is mentioned. Surely the Lithuanians are as deserving of freedom as the peoples of the more than 60 nations that have emerged from colonialism since the dark days of 1940.

I can testify to the character, the loyalty, and the accomplishments of the Lithuanian people. Our Nation is the richer because more than a million of our fellow Americans are of Lithuanian blood, including over 100,000 in the Chicago area. Many of them live in the district which I am privileged to represent in this great body.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America has been independent for two centuries, but the independence of modern Lithuania was ephemeral by comparison. Even as we thank the Almighty for the numerous blessings that He has showered upon America, let us offer prayers for the restoration of freedom to Lithuania and the other Baltic republics.

#### NEXT YEAR IN ATHENS?

**HON. RAY J. MADDEN**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Prof. George Anastaplo, lecturer in the liberal arts at the University of Chicago and chairman of the Political Science Department at Rosary College in River Forest, Ill., was interviewed by his brother, John Anastaplo, radio commentator, station WJOB, Hammond, Ind., on his recent visit to Greece.

Professor Anastaplo is one of the outstanding authorities on Greek history and government and is chairman of the Political Science Department at Rosary

College. He has been making annual visits to Greece in order to get information and facts concerning the government and economic conditions and other information which will be used in his writings and communications to the American and Greek people on the true facts pertaining to the stability and future welfare of liberty and freedom in the Greek nation.

The radio interview, which was conducted by John Anastaplo, his brother, is set out in the following question-and-answer period:

Commentator JOHN ANASTAPLO. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. We have as our guest this evening my brother, Professor George Anastaplo, Lecturer in the Liberal Arts at the University of Chicago and Chairman of the Political Science Department at Rosary College in River Forest, Illinois. He also holds an appointment as Professor of Politics and Literature at the University of Dallas. Our guest is knowledgeable in contemporary Greek affairs and has published several articles on that subject.

Dr. Anastaplo has recently returned to his home in Chicago from his annual visit to Greece, after which he conferred with interested parties at the Pentagon and the State Department in Washington. While in Greece he was accredited as a foreign correspondent for the *Southwest Review*.

Welcome back to the show. How was Greece?

Prof. GEORGE ANASTAPLO. About the same.

Question. I don't know what that means. Answer. Bad.

Question. Was it any better this time than it was when you last visited Greece, in the summer of 1968?

Answer. Not really, even though there was some hope this time because of a statement issued by a former prime minister, Mr. Karamanlis—some hope that the present government might be replaced. But prior to that statement being issued—a masterful statement issued by him in Paris the 30th of September—, one found in Greece a sense of desperation and depression, a realization that indeed the usurping colonels intend to stay for a long time as the Government of Greece and that they don't have much to offer except repression, torture and false promises. In that sense, things were worse: it's the kind of worsening that comes when you realize that something which is bad simply is not going to go away but is going to stay for a very long time. I suspect that by this time the encouraging effect of Mr. Karamanlis's statement has begun to wear thin.

Question. You don't see any change, then? Answer. I don't see any prospect of change, unless the United States does something to support Mr. Karamanlis in his effort to replace the people now in power by a moderate government which would begin to repair the damage that has been done by these two and a half years of tyranny.

Question. It is reported in the November 10th issue of the Chicago *Sun-Times* that Christopher Janus, a Chicago investment broker who is president of the Greek Heritage Foundation, talked to Mr. Karamanlis, apparently in Paris, and also to King Constantine, the self-exiled—can I say "self-exiled" or did he have to go?

Answer. He virtually had to go—although it may have been better for everyone if he had not gone.

Question.—he talked to exiled King Constantine in Rome. Janus is quoted as saying that Karamanlis let Janus know that he consulted with people in our State Department before he issued his September 30th statement and that it was made with their knowledge. Now what do you see in this report that quotes Karamanlis as saying that he con-

ferred with the State Department before making his statement about the military junta and about what should be done? Do you see in this that the United States is going to give some assistance should Karamanlis attempt to go back?

Answer. No, I don't see that. It still seems to me an open question whether the United States government is going to do anything serious to help friends of the United States in Greece replace the army officers who have seized the government and who are ruining their country. That the United States government is aware of the deterioration in Greece cannot be denied—it is aware of what everyone knows—but that it will do anything to change the situation there remains to be seen. There is no indication that the United States is, at this moment, prepared to take the strong measures necessary to help the Greeks rid themselves of their tyrants.

Question. How long were you there this time?

Answer. I was there only a couple of weeks this time: a very intensive two weeks.

Question. Were you followed?

Answer. I'm told I was. I didn't see anybody following me, but several people I talked with thought I was being followed. Many were afraid I was being followed.

One conducts oneself in such circumstances as if one is being followed. In these situations one simply has to take all kinds of precautions, not to protect oneself so much as to protect one's friends and the people one interviews. You have to be careful whom you talk with, because if you are not careful they will get into trouble. Government officials were very unhappy about my presence; they were unhappy about the people I was talking with; they were unhappy about the things I was asking about and saying to the people I was talking with. It's a very unpleasant situation, in many ways, for the visitor who knows what is going on.

Question. What did Greek officials do to indicate they were unhappy about your presence?

Answer. They let other foreign correspondents there know how unhappy they were about inquiries I had been making and comments I had made to people I had been talking with. They had heard of some of the things I had said and, of course, they knew about the things I had published before I got there.

Question. Did they have your articles?

Answer. Oh, sure, they have them all.

Question. Did they let you know directly, or only through a third party, that they were displeased with you?

Answer. A couple of times officials in the Foreign Press Ministry let me know personally. I was let known both directly and indirectly.

Question. Did they ask you to leave the country?

Answer. No. But I did wonder whether I would get in.

Question. They welcomed you?

Answer. They accepted me.

Question. Reluctantly?

Answer. Reluctantly. They were not sorry to see me go.

Question. How about on the way back. You stopped in Paris?

Answer. I stopped in Rome, I stopped in Paris, and I stopped in London.

Question. Do you want to talk about those stops?

Answer. Well, those are lovely places.

Question. How about Mr. Karamanlis. Is he a lovely man?

Answer. Mr. Karamanlis is a very important man for the prudent liberation of Greece.

Question. Had you met him before?

Answer. Yes, I had met him before. He is a man who is a good friend of the United States and who has great support among the Greek people. He is a man the United

States should be doing something to help get back into power before it is too late. It's hard to know how long we have before time runs out, completely runs out on us, and takes away from us all our opportunities to help our Greek allies. We are still able to influence events there to a considerable extent. Once the Karamanlis effort has run its course, however, there will no longer be much we or our friends in Greece can do to control events.

Question. Do we still have friends in Greece?

Answer. We have people there who are eager to be our friends.

Question. But are they our friends now?

Answer. That is one of the sad things about Greece today, that there should be many influential people—intelligent, educated and even conservative people—who have long been friends of the United States but who are now bitterly anti-American, people who have always been regarded as close to the Americans. They seem to believe that although the United States may not have put in these dictators, it has supported them, has been too glad to go along with them, and has thus abandoned friends of the United States to tyranny. We act as if it does not matter what the Greek people think of us.

Question. What does the King in Rome think? Does he want to go back to Greece?

Answer. Everybody wants to go back to Greece.

Question. Does he think he is going back soon?

Answer. I don't know. I guess he is also waiting on the United States to do something. Everybody is waiting now. The Karamanlis statement has been issued: everybody knows what his position is. Now it's up to the only power that has any ability to change events peacefully, the United States. Only if the United States does something decisive is there going to be a movement in the Greek army to replace the present leaders of Greece by a decent regime.

Question. The *Sun-Times* article I quoted from earlier reports King Constantine in Rome as saying to Mr. Janus, "Well, next year, I'll see you in Athens." He seemed to think the situation in Greece would be changed by next Spring. Do you go along with that?

Answer. For almost two thousand years, the Jews would always close their annual Seder with the hope, "Next year in Jerusalem!" Whether the King's observation to Mr. Janus means much more than that, I don't know.

Question. Do you see substance in the King's observation?

Answer. I see in it a hope, certainly a hope. It is not an unrealistic hope: it could happen. But it will take more than a hope to do it: it depends upon us, on this side of the ocean, to some extent.

Question. You feel then that the King is dreaming quite a bit on this point? You don't feel he will be back in Athens in the Spring?

Answer. In the Spring?

Question. Yes, as it says in the article. Let's say, by Easter?

Answer. I am afraid he will probably celebrate Easter in Rome. I hope I'm wrong, because Greece would be a far more pleasant place to live in and to visit if the King should be back, if Mr. Karamanlis should be back, if Mr. Papandreou should be back, if they should all be back—it would be far more pleasant if the Greeks do get back to the kind of life that doesn't require constant surveillance, constant repression, repeated court martial proceedings, torture and suppression of serious dissent. What there is in Greece today is no life for a civilized people.

Question. Do you gather from your conversations with the King that he is happy living in Rome or is he anxious to return to his throne in Greece?

Answer. There is no responsible Greek who



is happy out of Greece in these circumstances, when he is out of Greece because of a tyranny which is suppressing all men of stature who have any serious influence. This goes for the King, this goes for Mr. Karamanlis, this goes for Mr. Papandreou, this goes for Mrs. Vlachou in London. Everyone who is anyone has been put down. I am sure that when such people are outside of Greece they all long for the day when they can get back and once again help their country return to some kind of steady progress. It is safe to say that they are all hoping to go back home. They are all unhappy with being out of Greece and, depending on their temperament, I guess, they have different notions of how long it will take before they can return home.

Question. Is King Constantine making any efforts on his own to hasten the day of his return home?

Answer. He has, as you can see in the papers, a public position. His position is that he will return when there are free elections internationally supervised, with a free press and with the release of political prisoners. All those conditions mean that the present government would be going or gone.

Question. He's not going to take the initiative?

Answer. Well, I suppose if he had something to take the initiative with, he'd take it. But there is relatively little he can do. You see, there is relatively little anybody can do. There is relatively little that Mr. Papandreou can now do, for instance. There is relatively little that Mr. Karamanlis can do.

Question. Who is going to do the doing, then? The lower echelon officers?

Answer. That is the question, I suppose. The lower echelon officers will be the ones to make the move, eventually, but the problem is: How can they be induced to move? They can be induced to move by public opinion in Greece, insofar as that can be known by them, by the realization on their part that things are not going well and that the honor of the Army is at stake, by becoming aware of Mr. Karamanlis's statement (which has never been published, legally, in Greece), and, perhaps most important, by the direct and indirect influence of the United States. Once most officers know that the United States has serious reservations about the present Greek government and is taking serious measures to help the Greek people get rid of that government, then conscientious officers in the Army will likely move. If that does not happen, then the only other alternative that people can count upon and will resort to, will be terror, sabotage and general deterioration in law and order.

Question. The Greek government relaxed the censorship since you were there in the summer of 1968. Was that evident during your visit last month?

Answer. The Prime Minister announced this relaxation at a press conference that I attended. My own prediction at the time was that it would not mean much, that this is not a regime that can afford to relax censorship very much, that although the requirement that the text be passed on before printing might be suspended—that is, publishers may no longer have to submit their text to a censor—the effect will be virtually the same because of the powers the government retains and will be able to exercise without any judicial restraint. It looked for awhile, however, that I was wrong in my opinion that the relaxation would not make any serious difference. Thus, I got, a couple weeks ago, a letter from a foreign correspondent in Athens who informed me that I had simply guessed wrong about what would happen: publishers, he reported, were being allowed to express some criticisms of the regime. But his letter happened to be delivered here the very day that the Chicago papers reported that two Athenian newspapers had been

closed down altogether for what they had said about the government.

Question. The curtain has been dropped again?

Answer. Yes, but at a different stage. They don't require you to bring your copy in every night to be read and to be approved, but if you don't "behave yourself"—

Question.—they'll close you down. So, it is the same as before?

Answer. It's even worse in some ways, because if you're closed down for two or three days, or have all your run confiscated a few times, you are in serious trouble financially.

Question. Are you closed down two or three days, or permanently?

Answer. I haven't gotten the details yet. Government officials seem to have been closing down newspapers for a few days or they have been confiscating a day's run or they have been going to news vendors and saying, "Don't sell any of the next edition of such-and-such newspaper." The result is that a publisher can take very serious financial losses that way.

Question. But they are not closed permanently?

Answer. Not so far as I know. But you can figure out for yourself what the effect is going to be on publishers of the sanctions that are now being used.

Question. You have been urging, both here in Chicago and in Washington, that the United States take strong measures with respect to Greece. Just what do you mean by that?

Answer. I think there are various measures we can take to show the Greek army, primarily the Greek army but also the Greek people, what our opinion is of this government. That's very important. We should make it very clear that we recognize the serious damage this government is doing both to Greece and to legitimate American interests in Greece. I think we ought to take other measures as well, such as the stopping of all military aid to Greece and the cutting off of all military relations with that country. (I am not talking now about cutting diplomatic relations they should be maintained with every country that has an effective government.) I also think we should cooperate with those allies of ours in Europe who are so unhappy with the Greek government and who are trying to do something about it and about its corrupting influence in the European community of free nations.

Question. What about the argument that since we are trying to get out of Viet Nam, it is not wise to intervene in Greece?

Answer. I'm not talking about getting in there with an army. I'm talking about getting out of there if the present Greek government is not replaced by a government that is responsive to the needs and wishes of the Greek people. If we do our duty on behalf of freedom and constitutional government in Greece, the large majority of conscientious Greek army officers will do theirs; if they see the threatened loss of the American alliance as the price Greece has to pay to retain the tyrants who now rule Greece, those officers will move to set things right. All this can still be done peacefully and sensibly. If, on the other hand, civil war begins in Greece—if it does (I am not saying it is going to begin)—if the present government of incompetent men stays long enough, and if (as is possible) conditions develop which lead to civil war, will we be content to sit back and watch as we are doing now? Will we not be "compelled" to intervene if that should happen? I don't want such a situation to develop. I don't want the destruction of Greece that would come in the process of liberating her again from possible takeover by some of the elements which would be engaged in such a civil war. We will then realize that it does matter to us what happens in Greece. But if then, why not now? This is the time for us to move, when we can still

act without hurting either ourselves or the Greeks.

Question. When you say, "getting out," you mean economically and militarily?

Answer. We have available to us measures, some of which it would serve no useful purpose to describe at this time, which could bring down the present Greek government within a few months, if we would use them intelligently. I know no informed man in Athens or in Washington who doubts this. Such measures, properly employed, would permit our friends in Greece—our long-time friends in Greece—to recover the power that the Greek people want them to have. But I must confess that it does not now appear that we Americans are going to use responsibly and intelligently, and thereby retain, the great influence we have earned in Greece since the Second World War.

#### POINT REYES EARLY DEVELOPMENT ESSENTIAL

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, today this Nation is faced with the challenge of preserving its environment. It is a challenge to clean up the air, water, and land we have despoiled by our thoughtless acts as individuals believing in the American myth of our infinite frontiers.

Slowly we have come to realize that there are indeed finite limits to the accessibility of clean air and water and unspoiled land. We have also come to realize that many of the natural grandeur this country has been blessed with cannot be replaced by man once he has destroyed them.

There are few areas of this country left in which the natural splendor of nature has been left untouched and unruined by man. One of these areas that somehow has remained untouched is the Point Reyes area of California.

However, if this Congress does not act today, this area may also be lost to this generation and future generations of Americans. This Congress must decide whether it is more important to have a properly developed natural seashore to be enjoyed by all Americans, or 30,940 acres of subdivided real estate for a few Americans.

Whatever decision is made at Point Reyes will affect the opportunity of future generations to enjoy the sea, sand, scenery, wildlife, forests, and a feeling of tranquility that now exists there.

In 1962 President John F. Kennedy set aside Point Reyes as a national seashore. At that time a portion of the land was purchased for \$20 million. It was estimated that an additional \$14 million would be needed to complete the necessary land acquisition. However, no further action was taken.

The lack of action by Congress and the Department of the Interior has been costly. It will now cost the American public \$38 million to purchase the remaining land. But if we wait longer, the price tag will be even more costly. It will be a cost measured by the realization that the land needed for the completion

of this national seashore has been subdivided for commercial development and is no longer filled with acres of trees and streams but with acres of homes and shopping centers.

The slow action by the Federal Government has caused land valuation to rise sharply with a proportionate increase in property taxes. This has created a situation where present land owners must either sell to the land developer to build houses or to the Federal Government to preserve the area intact. The choice is up to us who will vote today on this issue.

This vote is the key indicator of how this Congress will respond to the urgent need to deal with our rapidly deteriorating environment. I urge the immediate and overwhelming passage of this legislation.

DANBURY'S PAUL E. WARD WINS  
JAMES V. BENNETT AWARD

### HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a signal honor has come to the Federal Correctional Institution in Danbury, Conn., which is in my district and which has come through the efforts and accomplishments of Mr. Paul E. Ward, superintendent of industries at that institution.

I take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Ward as I call to the attention of my colleagues the announcement by Attorney General John N. Mitchell that Mr. Ward has received the James V. Bennett Award named for the second Director of the Bureau of Prisons and awarded annually to an outstanding supervisory employee. The announcement came through present Director of the Bureau, Myrl E. Alexander, just prior to his retirement. In addition to the Bennett award and the honor it represents, Mr. Ward will also receive \$500 in cash.

It was for his creative management, expert knowledge of the electronics field, and exceptional ability to train and encourage inmates to reach peak goals of performance that Mr. Ward was honored by the Federal Bureau of Prisons. He was one of nine employees selected to receive the Bureau's top incentive award for 1969 and it was gratifying to note that Mr. Ward's name was at the top of the list. He began his Bureau of Prisons service as an electronics instructor at the U.S. Penitentiary, McNeil Island, Wash. Named supervisor of a new electronics production shop, under his leadership, the operation grew to a \$4 million industry. Transferring to the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury, Conn., Mr. Ward repeated his McNeil performance, establishing and expanding the institution's electronics and electrical cable industry, increasing the industrial employment and sales of the organization and establishing a successful vocational training program for inmate workers.

I am pleased to note that dedicated

men are continuing to improve the Federal prison service and particularly that strong emphasis is being given to the rehabilitation of prisoners. I am also gratified to observe that these dedicated personnel and their achievements are being given proper recognition to inspire and encourage others in the same fields.

### A BRITISH JUDGE ASKS: WHAT GOOD IS FREEDOM WITHOUT LAW AND ORDER?

#### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Mother Country of the Common Law a distinguished jurist brings us some cogent thoughts on this great problem of law and order which is facing us today. Lord Denning, master of the rolls of London's Royal Court of Justice, in a speech before the California Bar Association, candidly discussed the British versus the American point of view on these legal problems. Unfortunately, I do not have the entire address, but I insert in the RECORD a brief summary of his talk which appeared in this year's February edition of Nation's Business. I urge my colleagues to read this intelligent appraisal of how two related legal systems handle identical problems. Here is the article:

#### A BRITISH JUDGE ASKS: WHAT GOOD IS FREEDOM WITHOUT LAW AND ORDER?

The United States and Great Britain are vastly different but also greatly alike.

So when an astute Englishman, the most important civil judge in a judicial system which has common roots with ours, talks about how best to administer the law, he's worth listening to.

Lord Denning, master of the rolls of London's Royal Court of Justice, spoke a while back to the California Bar Association in San Francisco about such things as delays in American courts in bringing cases to trial, about striving for perfection in protecting defendants, and about striking a balance between the rights of individuals and of civilized society.

He touched a nerve end of America when he asked: "Have the rules for the protection of the innocent been extended so far that the door is opened to many guilty men? . . . And freedom, what good is freedom if we do not have law and order?"

Here are other excerpts from Lord Denning's speech:

"Freedom, we have stressed through the centuries. But we are coming to think that equally important is the security of decent, right-thinking people.

"Freedom, we know, means the freedom of every man to think what he will, to say what he will, to go where he will, on all his lawful occasions without . . . hindrance (from anyone, save as prevented by law.

"Yes, but what good is any man's freedom to him if his home is invaded by thieves and robbers who are not caught; if his womenfolk are to be assaulted; if his security is in jeopardy?

"What good is freedom to us unless . . . our state . . . is secure?

"We must maintain the freedom—or rather, the right—of society to arrest those who commit crimes, to search them, to detain them, for the protection of the community

at large. . . . If conspirators are conspiring against our state or our security, there should, under proper safeguards, be a right in society even to tap wires.

"But here is a problem. The power to arrest can be abused. The power to detain can be violated. The power to wiretap can lead to tyranny and oppression. All these safeguards of society, once abused, can lead to the police state in a tyranny worse than we've ever known.

"The problem is to find the balance, the balance between the freedom of the individual on the one hand, and the security of a civilized society on the other."

Lord Denning then turned to comparing the speed of trials in England with those in the United States.

In England, he said, everyone arrested is tried within eight weeks—"the greatest length between arrest and trial."

Some American defendants are not tried for two or three years—or even longer.

British courts do not necessarily grant a defendant bail. Lord Denning defended this controversial practice.

"When a man is arrested for a serious offense—let it be murder, rape, bank raid or the like—in England we do not allow this man out on bail," he said. "We keep him in prison pending his trial. It isn't necessary to show that he may abscond. If there's reason to think that he may commit another offense, we do not let him out so that he may do it pending trial."

On the matter of leaning over backward to achieve the perfect trial, Lord Denning said, "I often think that whilst we've been busy clearing the innocent, our rules have let the neck get too wide, and the guilty are only too often not convicted and punished, but they escape through the door which the law has opened.

"Just think of the next step. In the United States you have a fundamental principle that if evidence is unlawfully obtained, nothing which results from it can be given in evidence in the courts. In England we don't go as far as that.

"Supposing a man makes a confession, in the course of which he says where he hid the stolen goods, and a police officer goes and finds those stolen goods. That evidence as to those stolen goods is admissible before the jury, even though there may be something wrong in the way the confession was taken."

Lord Denning advocated the hard line in sentencing the guilty, sometimes, as a means of teaching a lesson. He cited the case several years ago of white hooligans who had beaten up Negroes in London's Notting Hill section. It was feared there would be more beatings.

When the whites came to trial they were given not the six months in prison that might have been expected, but five to seven years.

The beatings immediately stopped. Lord Denning told the California lawyers and jurists: "A sentence such as that did a world of good."

### COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH

#### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the public's sudden recognition of the environmental crisis has focused attention on such evils as air and water pollution. Congress has been propelled into action at a time when further delay could play havoc with the human race's chances for survival.

Yet with all this newfound awareness,



we have tended to skirt the crux of the problem: expanding population dependent upon limited resources.

Modern technology may perfect devices which eliminate air and water pollution. The prospects exist that extensive, new sources of food will be developed. Sensitivity toward man's interdependency with nature is growing sufficiently to justify hope that he will learn to enhance rather than desolate his environment.

But all these developments are for naught if man reproduces himself to the point where the earth's resources, no matter how shrewdly maximized, cannot support the planet's population.

To help assure a decent, fulfilling life for the generations to come, we must face up to the question of population control and the danger of the human race disappearing in a malthusian apocalypse.

This Commission on Population Growth should provide the vital information on how to perpetuate a healthy, viable society in the midst of formidable challenges created by modern technology, waning natural resources, and the advent of the nuclear age.

I urge the passage of this bill.

#### THE 52D ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

### HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues in the Congress in commemorating today, February 16, 1970, the 52d anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence.

It is with sadness that we observe this occasion while the valiant people of this great nation are still oppressed by the yoke of Russian imperialism. However, no nation can be denied its sovereignty and freedom forever, and no people will long tolerate the rejection of their right to self-determination. The events of the past year in Czechoslovakia demonstrate that the Soviets continue to employ authoritarian repression whenever the spirit of freedom arises.

Fifty-two years ago today, the people of Lithuania proclaimed the restoration of their independence after centuries of Russian rule. A free, and democratic way of life was enjoyed by these people until June 15, 1940, when again a ruthless and aggressive Communist Russian Army conquered Lithuania and other small Baltic nations and incorporated them as provinces. Nevertheless, the United States continues to recognize her sovereignty and her sister Baltic states and looks forward to the day when these nations will again be free from Russian oppression and domination.

Freedom-loving Americans everywhere admire the spirit of these great people and it is the hope and prayer of all of us that Lithuania may soon again take its place among the free nations of the world.

#### THE BEST WAY TO ELIMINATE WASTE

### HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to bring to the attention of the House the address made by Dan E. Reed, secretary-manager, Michigan Farm Bureau at the Governor's Conference on Solid Waste Management held in Lansing, Mich.

His address follows as it was reported in the Michigan Farm News of February 1, 1970:

#### GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

"The best way to eliminate waste is to find something it's good for, and that means research—a crying need for agriculture!" Dan E. Reed, Secretary-Manager, Michigan Farm Bureau, told those attending the Governor's Conference on Solid Waste Management held recently in Lansing.

Mr. Reed continued, "We have always had wastes. We used to call many of them 'riches'—the manure pile; ashes used for fertilizer and also soap making; old bottles (not antique collectors' items) provided a major source of income for small boys some years ago; old paper; old iron.

"Much of the material in the loads of urban wastes now going to the dumps—before we became an affluent society—would have been worked over for many kinds of salvage.

"On the farm, with a small, diversified farm operation, we sometimes had a crop failure or a crop for which there was no local market. The pain of the valueless crop was often lessened by the fact that while we hadn't made any money, at least we had the manure left.

"Agricultural solid wastes include sediment flowing into our streams and airborne field dust. Tremendous improvements have been made in limiting agriculture's contribution of both of these wastes. Sediment in our streams is now often found to be more the results of runoff from subdivisions, construction work and road building than from farm fields.

"A respected spokesman for the Department of Natural Resources has said that the Red Cedar River carried more sediment from the building of I-96 Expressway than resulted from all of the farm operations in its watershed since the Indians roamed Michigan.

"Much has been done through the work of Soil Conservation Districts and by individual farm operators in controlling soil run-off and blow-off. Since this represents lost plant food, agriculture's attention to this problem is understandable.

"As is true in both consideration of urban problems and industrial problems of solid wastes, agriculture suffers from the results of the affluent society and from concentration of activities. Labor costs have become so high that animal manure (formerly one of the backbone ingredients of a successful farmer's operation) now becomes so costly to handle that it is cheaper to buy and apply chemical nutrients.

"Assembly-line cattle and hog feeding operations and egg factories have developed concentrations of animals above the capacity of nearby land to accept and purify the wastes even if the labor were available to handle the tremendous job. A cow generates as much waste as about 16½ Humans; one hog produces as much waste as two people; and seven chickens are equal to the disposal problem created by one person. The result

is that, in total, farm animals in the United States produce ten times as much waste as the human population.

"This means that a feedlot with 1,000 head of cattle has approximately the same disposal problem that a city of 16,500 people might have. We have egg factories in Michigan with 30,000-40,000, or 50,000 bird capacity.

"When the village blacksmith was a major industrial producer in our nation, he posed little in the way of pollution problems that were of concern to his neighbors. Henry Ford's production line and \$5 per day provided a magnet which drew people into a concentrated area and helped to speed the development of urban problems. He also provided something we all wanted—transportation at prices within reach of many people—not just the wealthy.

"Even though smoke hung heavy over the cities, the pictures that really struck fear into the hearts of people were those run by the newspapers in the early thirties, showing rows of stacks with no smoke coming out of them.

"The production-line development in agriculture has reduced the status of chicken from 'only on Sunday' or 'when the preacher called' to the condition where it now receives only half the consideration, money-wise, as does the lowly hot dog.

"Chicken and egg production in my mother's time consisted of farm flocks of 50-100 chickens, with the eggs being gathered regularly—most every day, except when the nest of some sly hen might be found and perhaps ten or a dozen eggs added all in one day (not quite 'strictly fresh'). The chicken manure really posed no solid waste problem on our farm. It was a byproduct of considerable value and somebody always had a pet idea as to what particular garden spot might receive the current production.

"The changes from the one-sow/hog farm to today's scientifically managed operation producing 1,000-5,000 market hogs per year; the broiler factory, the egg factory; the beef feeding operations—have all worked together to provide the American consumer with better, more uniform products of high quality and at prices lower than any other spot in the world . . . in many cases lower than they were 25-50 years ago. It has also created many of the problems which are causing producers of these agricultural products serious difficulties, to the point where waste management is now the largest single problem in assembly-line animal production.

"We have spent most of our scientific efforts on one end of the animals—worrying about the best and most efficient feeds, and have neglected the other end product.

"In these days of specialization, the livestock specialist depends upon the crop specialist for his feed. The livestock producer reduces his investment in land, perhaps to small acreage and sheds only, and thus has a waste disposal problem instead of having a valuable byproduct in the manure from his operation.

"There is an effect from taxation on waste problems. The desire to minimize the necessary capitalization of a feeding operation sometimes encourages higher concentrations of animal pollution.

"Not all the solid waste problems of agriculture result from livestock operations. Up to 70% of the agricultural products delivered to canners and freezers ends up as waste. In the days of coal-fired boilers, canning plants in the areas where pit fruits are processed piled their cherry, peach and plum pits and used them as fuel. Today, with gas or oil-fired boilers, used to reduce labor needs, the pits become a problem waste.

"When mother canned her tomatoes, apples, peaches, pears, cherries, etc., at home, the waste was really no problem. It went to the pig pen, or the compost pile.

"While, of course, we have other problems of solid waste in agriculture, let's look for a

moment at progress in the solution of some of these problems. Animal and vegetable wastes have value as potential heat producers. One of the early efforts along this line was the use of the buffalo chip as a source of fuel in the West. In India and other countries where fuels are scarce, patties are made of the animal manure which then are used as domestic fuel. Hundreds of years ago, the Chinese developed procedures for additional utilization of agricultural wastes. The peasants diligently collected all wastes—human, animal and plant—and made them into cakes and allowed them to dry in the sun. These were then stacked and later distributed to the fields and used as organic fertilizers.

"Currently, there is a great deal of interest in the recycling of nutrients. Processed poultry wastes are being successfully used as part of the feed formula for livestock. Other possibilities include—digesters, to use the potential of wastes for gas manufacture; the direct incineration of wastes, either to provide heat for their own destruction or to provide usable heat for other purposes.

"Gerber Products at Fremont has for years used that great purifier, the soil, as a disposal method. Wastes from the processing of baby foods are piped distances from the plant and spread on fields where the soil filters the water and the solids are disposed of naturally.

"In summary, contributing to agriculture's problems have been the limited supply of labor available, the high cost of such labor, the recognition of economies of concentration, improved transportation, and the tremendous need for efficiency to compete in the world markets of today.

"Few farm operations today have the balance of farms of 50 years ago, where the crops were rotated and the plant and animal wastes were reincorporated to improve the soil. Perhaps we should go back to such an agricultural pattern but, if so, we would also go back to a pattern of spending increased proportions of our income for food. Today food is the American housewife's best buy. The average American family spends about 16½% of its spendable income on food. A generation or two ago this figure would have been more than 30-40%.

"In our affluent society, we really can't afford to do many of the things that we know we should do—at least we think we can't afford to.

"Perhaps we should look at our monuments to waste . . . our junk piles, our dumps. Destruction of usable and repairable facilities . . . Is it really cheaper to throw it away than it is to repair it? Or are we simply drawing checks that will have to be made good by succeeding generations?"

#### THE 52D ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

**HON. CHARLES A. VANIK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian National Council at Vilnius declared Lithuania a free and independent nation and provided for free elections for the first time in centuries. This day, therefore, has been a day of celebration and remembrance for Lithuanians and American-Lithuanians in this country.

The history of the independent and free Republic of Lithuania was a glorious one—but tragically short. Twenty-two years after its creation, the Soviet Union entered this brave Baltic state and

extinguished the forms of liberty, but they can never extinguish the spirit of liberty which dwells in the hearts and souls of Lithuanians everywhere.

Lithuanian-Americans have contributed much to the progress and freedom of the land to which they and their forefathers came to. In the Cleveland area community, which I represent, they have long been community and civic leaders who have added immeasurably to the cultural, economic, and political life of northeast Ohio.

As the recent spectacular photographs of the earth from space so dramatically show, we are all riders on one small planet; we are all brothers in the human race on this small globe. The loss of liberty and freedom by any man or nation diminishes us all. Let us pause and remember today the freedom that came to Lithuania 52 years ago today and rededicate ourselves today to the cause of freedom for all men everywhere.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—1970

**HON. HUGH L. CAREY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, today is the 52d anniversary of Lithuanian independence. As has been our custom for more than a half century, we pause at this time to honor the determination of the people of Lithuania to regain the independence and freedom that were declared on this date in 1918.

The Republic of Lithuania was established as a direct result of President Woodrow Wilson's Declaration of 14 Points, which marked the end of 123 years of imperial czarist rule. Lithuania was admitted to membership in the League of Nations in 1921. The following year a provisional constitution was adopted which guaranteed freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and communication. The Republic, however, was destined to enjoy only 22 years of freedom before falling victim to a new form of Russian tyranny—godless communism.

Following its independence in 1918, Lithuania proceeded rapidly to embark on a course of progressive and modern statehood, becoming the first country in Europe to adopt a land reform program. A compulsory education program, started in 1930, reduced illiteracy from 65 to 15 percent. The number of grammar schools doubled from 1930 to 1939. The country's transformation into a modern nation was well underway when it became a battleground for Russian and German forces in 1941.

Although nearly 30 years have now passed since Lithuania was reduced in status to that of a slave state in a Communist empire, we nevertheless look forward at this time to a day when the nation will once again take its place among the free peoples of the earth. There is, of course, a tie between these events—for the spirit which prompted the procla-

mation of freedom a half century ago today chafes under the yoke of the Soviet Union. Sooner or later that spirit will prevail and the Lithuanian people will again know the blessing of freedom.

It is to the credit of the United States that we have never recognized the Soviet seizure of the Baltic States. Let us remind ourselves, and the world today, that this great Nation continues to recognize Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors as independent sovereign nations.

As our late President John F. Kennedy so eloquently stated on the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence in 1958—

The vital spark of freedom has not been extinguished among Lithuanians. Their cause remains our cause and their hopes more than ever remain our responsibility.

#### A VOICE FOR THE PEOPLE—THE PEOPLE'S COUNSEL

**HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I, today, have introduced a bill to establish the Public Counsel Corporation, an instrument which would enable the poor effectively to articulate their views, and to exert their influence upon Government agencies whose programs significantly affect their lives. Unlike the more affluent members of our society, the poor—a term which grossly and unfairly obscures the individuality of more than 25 million Americans, white, black, aged, disabled—are not effectively organized so as to be able to make known adequately and persuasively their needs, their criticisms, and their contributions.

This bill adopts the recommendation of the Administrative Conference of the United States that a people's counsel be created. Full explication of the need for the people's counsel is provided by the report of Prof. Arthur Earl Bonfield in support of the Conference's Rulemaking Committee, entitled "Representation for the Poor in Federal Rulemaking: A Report in Support of the Recommendations of the Rulemaking Committee."

The Rulemaking Committee queried some 40 Federal agencies in regard to the agencies' rulemaking procedure. In Professor Bonfield's report, which has been accepted and approved by that committee, it is stated that about one-third of the responding agencies which claimed to administer programs substantially affecting the poor had not previously attempted to ascertain their views with respect to rules and policies. For example, one agency's response was:

We do not now attempt to ascertain the views of the poor and economically underprivileged, as such.

The efforts of the agencies which did attempt to obtain the views of the disadvantaged people affected by the agencies' programs are characterized, in Professor Bonfield's report, as "frequently haphazard, unsystematic, and sporadic." And the report further states:



Furthermore, agencies seem to have frequently sought information with respect to the views of the poor from persons who are neither poor, nor spokesmen for the mass of the poor people affected by the agencies' actions.

Another query addressed to the agencies by the Conference's Rulemaking Committee asked whether they planned any changes to insure that the views of the poor would be adequately ascertained prior to the promulgation of rules implementing or affecting those programs particularly relevant to the poor. Again, the responses indicated the agencies' insensitivity to these views—"most agency respondents," Professor Bonfield's report states, "indicated that they had no such plans, and that they were satisfied with their present efforts in this regard."

The bill creating the people's counsel is based on three premises:

First, large segments of the American public are not adequately represented in the Federal rulemaking process;

Second, the sound administration of the administrative rulemaking process demands that all relevant interests and viewpoints be considered prior to the formulation and promulgation of an administrative rule or regulation; and

Third, to assure that the interests of the public are fully considered, means must be established to provide the unrepresented public with competent, consistent, and aggressive advocates in Federal rulemaking.

In introducing this bill, I am particularly mindful of the opinion expressed in the Administrative Conference's 1969 Annual Report by Malcolm S. Mason, Assistant General Counsel of the Office of Economic Opportunity, who accurately notes that "the poor are many and different and must be able to speak with many voices." My bill provides that these voices will be heard. And I deem it essential that Professor Bonfield's report be heeded in its reference to the establishment of "official advisory committees to the poor people's counsel in each area of major concern, such as welfare programs, housing, employment, education, and so forth." Thereby, numerous interests will be represented. In the same regard, there should be, as Professor Bonfield states, "informal hearings among the poor" by the people's counsel to achieve the end of allowing many views to be heard.

Establishment of a people's counsel is a major step in the right direction. The OEO community action programs have shown the vital role the disadvantaged can—and must—play.

I would call attention to an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star on January 22, 1970, by Robert Walters, entitled "Court Rebuffs HEW, Justice on Role of Poor in Hearings." The article points to the unjustifiable resistance of our governmental institutions to meaningful participation by the poor, as shown by the reluctance of the Justice Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to let poor people participate fully in hearings on State welfare reforms. Mr. Walters reports the Justice Department's being "concerned about a precedent that might substan-

tially expand citizen participation in the Federal policymaking process"—an end eminently to be desired, to my mind. The article follows:

**COURT REBUFFS HEW, JUSTICE ON ROLE OF POOR IN HEARINGS**  
(By Robert Walters)

For the second time this month, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare—and the Justice Department—have been rebuffed by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals here for refusing to let poor people participate fully in hearings on state welfare reform.

The circuit court ruled yesterday that HEW cannot proceed with administrative hearings on state welfare programs unless it gives poor people the status of full participants.

Acting at the request of the National Welfare Rights Organization, the court in a Nevada case had issued an injunction Jan. 2 ordering that welfare recipients be granted "whatever procedural rights are exercised by the other parties thereto."

The Justice Department, concerned about a precedent that might substantially expand citizen participation in the federal policymaking process, had overruled HEW on yesterday's case.

HEW officials were unwilling to postpone an administrative hearing on Connecticut rules compliance until the appeals court could consider the government's ban on full participation in the hearing by welfare recipients.

At the Justice Department's insistence, however, the hearing was convened as scheduled on Tuesday morning. But no testimony was taken because about 40 persons staged a demonstration and a legal complaint was hastily filed.

After two days of legal skirmishing, the court yesterday extended the Nevada order to the hearings on Connecticut welfare revisions, with two minor exceptions, both of which turned out to be impractical to implement.

In an apparent gesture of courtesy to the Connecticut officials already here—and in an apparent slap on the wrist to NWRO for waiting until the last minute to file its legal protest—the court said the welfare recipients' right to full participation would not extend to testimony offered by Connecticut witnesses or their cross-examination by HEW officials.

Signing that order were Judges J. Skelly Wright, Carl McGowan and Spottswood W. Robinson III, the same panel which approved the injunction in the Nevada case and will hear further arguments on the issue next month before rendering a final decision.

The latest court order was handed down shortly after the Connecticut HEW hearing was reconvened yesterday afternoon. When Edward K. Adelsheim, HEW hearing examiner, asked the state officials if they wanted to testify under the conditions outlined by the judges, they declined on grounds it might prejudice their case.

Adelsheim then ordered an "indefinite recess" of the proceeding, and HEW officials later said no further state compliance hearings will be scheduled until the appeals court issues a final ruling.

Under the current court restrictions, HEW has the choice of either holding no hearings, or granting the welfare recipients full participatory status—including the right to call their own witnesses, cross-examine other parties' witnesses and examine all pertinent documents in the cases.

When the Connecticut hearing opened on Tuesday, Adelsheim proposed a compromise—"amicus curiae" or friend-of-the-court status, which would give the poor people the right only to make one oral statement during the hearing and file a written brief for

the record. That suggestion was promptly and noisily rejected.

**SOUGHT DELAY EARLIER**

Officials at both HEW and Justice confirmed yesterday that HEW had sought to postpone the Connecticut hearing long before the NWRO attorneys filed their court complaint.

HEW officials were reported to believe that because the issues in the Nevada and Connecticut hearings were similar, because the court had already issued an injunction in the Nevada cases and because the question of citizen participation is expected to be settled within the next few months by the court, it would be improper to proceed with a new hearing.

But the Justice Department officials were described as believing that any sign of acquiescence to the concept of citizen participation could have government-wide implications.

**HON. ANCHER NELSEN SPEAKS BEFORE LINCOLN REPUBLICAN CLUB, FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY**

**HON. TIM LEE CARTER**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on the 7th of February, the Lincoln Republican Club of the Fifth Congressional District of Kentucky was honored to have as its guest speaker Congressman ANCHER NELSEN.

His remarks were interesting and thought provoking.

I commend to you this résumé for your attention:

**REMARKS BY MR. NELSEN**

DUPONT LODGE, CORBIN, KY., February 7.—"The only thing liberal about many liberals today is their name," Congressman Ancher Nelsen (R-Minn.) told a Lincoln Day Republican crowd here tonight. "Their party seems seized by a faction that has little interest in preserving freedom, and their principles appear cast aside for a psychedelic joy ride to nowhere. In abandoning the national interest to a narrow-minded political spectrum, in tossing aside the people for a political bullhorn, they have harvested political ruin."

The Minnesota Republican said "Their decline into know-nothingism presents our party with great new opportunities to expand our membership among black and white Americans and to build up our country." He urged the Kentuckians to join in welcoming into Republican ranks all the millions of Jeffersonian Democrats who have been driven out of their own party. "Ours is a national party working to correct every injustice, every problem that troubles this nation. Our mission must be to invite everyone to pitch in with us and help," Nelsen declared.

"Among the great ironies," according to the farmer-lawmaker, "is the unreasonable liberal-led attack on Vice President Agnew for daring to disagree in public." As one example, he said, such leading liberals as President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson and Hubert Humphrey all, at one time or another, expressed differences with the press. In a 1941 speech, President Roosevelt accused newspaper owners of printing "pure bunk—B-U-N-K—bunk . . ." In 1942, Stevenson observed that "The failure of the

commercial press, with few exceptions, to honestly report the news and be fair in their editorial columns, has served to retard the war effort . . ." In 1968, Humphrey said "I am convinced that just as the media can tell the facts to the people, they can also exaggerate and inflame the situation."

Party fund-raising is another area which indicates the liberals' abandonment of the people, Neisen asserted. "When liberals controlled the White House, they turned their backs on rank-and-file party members to butter up a small coterie of big money boys. These heavy donors got all the plums—special dinners at the White House, favoritism of many kinds—but the rank-and-file was ignored. As a consequence, while the Republican party wisely has been building its base upon the small donations of millions of ordinary citizens, the other party so disastrously narrowed its base of support, it has wound up \$8 million in debt."

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, communism has been the curse of freedom-loving peoples for more than half a century. Its baleful influence and impact has been felt nearly everywhere. And its enslavement of the human being, of both body and soul, is known to all of us. Millions of people live in fear of Communist aggression but fortunately are still free to enjoy the elemental human rights. That is not true, however, in many countries where peoples have been overpowered by the Soviet steamroller. Lithuania, in northeastern Europe—a land of valiant people—is one of those countries.

Lithuanian independence was born after the untiring and persistent struggle for the liberty-loving Lithuanians against the czarist autocracy. When the dreaded regime collapsed in 1917, Lithuanians were fully prepared to proclaim their national independence, as they did on February 16, 1918. The independence they thus regained was well earned and richly deserved. After suffering for more than 100 years under the oppressive Russian yoke, they felt that they were entitled to freedom and national independence. Thenceforth for two decades they enjoyed freedom and happiness in their rebuilt homeland. And they were perfectly content with their lot. But the course of world events turned against them; and the last war brought tragedy to them. They lost their freedom, most of their worldly possessions, and Lithuanians by the tens of thousands lost their lives.

But wartime suffering did not bring to an end the misery and misfortune of the Lithuanian people. Since the end of the war they have been saddled with a Communist regime, imposed upon them by the Kremlin, and they have been suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny. On the 52d anniversary observance of their independence day, let us all hope that soon these people regain their freedom and live in peace in their homeland.

#### A BLOW AT OUR SCHOOLS

### HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said within these halls about the ramifications in local school systems of President Nixon's veto of the \$19.7 billion Labor-HEW appropriation bill.

With consideration of a new version of this legislation scheduled in just 2 days, this seems an appropriate time to examine how people back home, those most directly affected, regard the consequences of our failure to provide fully for authorized education programs.

The reaction understandably is sharp in my own county, San Diego, where hard-pressed school systems can ill afford the loss of any of their current total impact aid entitlement of \$15 million. San Diego's school administrators and other concerned citizens find little logic in the oft-repeated argument that the impact aid program awards disproportionately high benefits to wealthy school systems; most San Diego school districts begin with a thin tax base, and problems are compounded by the presence of numerous tax-exempt installations.

Editorials summing up community views of the Federal education programs were presented recently in two of San Diego's suburban newspapers, the El Cajon Daily Californian and the Chula Vista Star-News.

Under unanimous consent, I will include the editorials at this point with my own remarks:

#### PRESIDENT'S VETO HURTS EDUCATION

Some school districts in the Inland Empire are going to encounter rough sledding if President Nixon's veto of the \$19 billion appropriation for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is sustained and there is no subsequent compromise enacted.

Grossmont Union High School District will lose \$500,000; La Mesa-Spring Valley Elementary, \$280,000; Cajon Valley Elementary, \$189,000; Santee, \$131,000.

There will in all likelihood be a compromise to ease the effects of this threatened dissolution of the federal impact aid program. This is, after all, an election year and the President would like nothing more than to elect enough Republicans to control the House and the Senate. He can't do it by sabotaging education.

So it may be a bit premature to hoist the distress flags and flash the S.O.S. signal. School districts have weathered more crises than the French government before De Gaulle and doubtless will be able to survive another.

Nevertheless, the President's veto of the HEW measure raises some disturbing questions.

One of the reasons Mr. Nixon vetoed the measure was because he considered it inflationary. Congress added \$1.2 billion more to HEW's budget than the President requested.

If this were the action of a spendthrift Congress which had been trying deliberately to embarrass the President, the case for vetoing the measure might have been more plausible.

The truth of the matter is that Congress trimmed \$7 billion from the budget, mainly in the area of defense spending. If Congress

had not done that, the federal government would have been spending \$7 billion more. Wouldn't that have been inflationary?

Unless it acted from motives other than those that are apparent, Congress appears to have been doing precisely what needs to be done: Giving health and education a higher priority than they have had in the past.

Mr. Nixon singled out the federal impact aid program for special criticism. He described it as "unfair."

This is the program whereby school districts educating children of federal employees get some financial assistance because government property is not subject to property tax levies.

The President exaggerated the alleged "unfairness" by citing the amount received by "the richest county" in the United States and comparing it with what the 100 "poorest counties" get.

We would agree that the allocations for education in the "poorest counties" need to be drastically increased. But the picture is grossly distorted by citing only the extremes. By comparing impacted and unimpacted areas the President is, in effect, comparing apples and oranges.

Federal installations, such as the Navy and Marine Corps facilities in San Diego, add nothing to the local property tax base upon which we rely for a large portion of our education funds.

Many of the people who work at those installations live in Inland Empire communities—El Cajon, La Mesa, Santee, Lakeside. They may own houses and pay property taxes, but the amount of tax collected by a school district on a home is insufficient to pay the cost of educating one child, let alone two or three. The per-pupil cost in Grossmont Union High School District, for example, is estimated for 1969-70 to be \$861, only half of which is paid by local property taxes.

It is an error to judge all impact aid recipients by that "richest county" which the President said receives \$6 million. None of the Inland Empire school districts are wealthy in terms of assessed valuation. Presumably most heavily impacted school districts are in the same category precisely because tax-exempt federal installations take up property which otherwise could be used for *taxpaying* private industry.

Fighting inflation is a good cause but so is quality education. By his veto the President has tipped the scales in favor of one at the expense of the other.

#### MR. NIXON'S VETO

President Nixon's veto of Congress' \$19.7 billion appropriation for Health, Education, and Welfare (and the sustaining of that veto yesterday by a coalition of House Republicans and Dixiecrats) was appalling and shocking.

It was appalling because it hits directly at those Americans who need help most—the school children, the ill, the diseased, the poor.

It was shocking because it is a clear demonstration that the Nixon administration, in choosing its priorities, has decided that guns are more important than human welfare.

The President vetoed the bill on grounds that it would be inflationary. To an extent this is true, but only to a very small extent.

For the fact is that, while the President is quibbling about \$1.26 billion that he feels Congress over-appropriated for Americans' education and health, he is spending \$69.3 billion for the military, almost half of it in Vietnam. Actually, were it up to him alone, he would be spending \$75.2 billion for the military (the amount he asked from Congress), but Congress cut his request.

This gigantic spending for military purposes is the real reason for inflation, and the real reason why, in the first year of Mr. Nixon's administration, prices have risen at



a greater rate than in any year since the end of World War II.

The ineffectual, half-way measures the Nixon administration has taken to try to halt inflation have brought only rising unemployment, reduced profits, a tumbling stock market, and interest rates so stratospheric that millions of Americans no longer can afford to buy a home.

The only real way to end inflation is to end the war. Short-changing of education and health won't do it.

Mr. Nixon, in his glib television address, did not mention this, of course. He would have Americans believe that the cause of inflation is congressional over-spending for human needs, rather than foreign military adventures. The President also told Americans some half-truths and outright falsehoods.

He gave as one reason for the veto, for example, that the bill would require the government to spend all the school-aid money by June 30. This statement, made on television by the President to 100 million Americans, is absolutely untrue.

Nobody knows this better than the superintendents and business managers of our own South Bay school districts. In fact, the school-aid money that Congress appropriated last year was received locally only last month.

Mr. Nixon also claimed that the impact aid program (extra aid to pupils from tax-exempt federal installations) is unfair, and cited an isolated example whereby a rich county received more in impact aid than a poor one.

However, federal installations do not normally locate in Beverly Hills-type communities, and most impact aid recipients are poor school districts.

For example, our own South Bay districts, which stand to lose up to \$3 million because of Mr. Nixon's veto, are all below-average in wealth-per-pupil, and South Bay taxpayers next year face substantial local tax increases to make up for loss of impact aid unless an adequate compromise is reached.

If a few rich school districts are profiting inequitably from the impact aid program, let the program be revised. But you don't throw out the baby with the bathwater.

If, as the President stated, his administration plans to propose "urgent new reforms" in health and education, rather than "the same old programs," why didn't he propose them at the start of the fiscal year, instead of trying to chop down present programs in mid-year? These are programs which school districts and other public agencies undertook last fall in good faith because there was no indication they would not be continued at present levels.

By substituting rhetoric about unspecified "new programs" for money for present programs, Mr. Nixon gets away with a year of underfunding. The vetoed bill, for instance, appropriated \$300 million for compensatory education, school libraries and innovative programs. This is \$50 million less than appropriated last year, but Mr. Nixon wanted that chopped further to \$190 million.

The bill also appropriated \$25 million for bilingual education, much of it to help Mexican-Americans improve their English; Mr. Nixon wanted that chopped to \$10 million.

Probably the most distressing half-truth told by Mr. Nixon was his statement that, "We spend more for health and education than any nation in the world." While this is true in strictly dollar terms (because American doctors charge such outlandish fees and costs in general here are higher), many other nations spend a much higher percentage of their national income in these fields. Americans actually spend more on whiskey than on education.

In health, the United States ranks 14th

in the number of hospital beds per person (88 per 10,000 people, compared to front-ranking Sweden's 148). In infant mortality, the richest nation in the world ranks 17th. In life expectancy, we rank 12th for females and 21st for males.

Yet Richard Nixon cut the funds for health care and research.

His veto, and the sustaining of it, is one more example that the people in control of our nation have mixed-up priorities—that they think it is more important to spend our billions on guns and bombs than health and education.

No amount of slippery television rhetoric can obscure the fact that this is what Richard Nixon has chosen to do.

#### SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SONS OF NORWAY FRATERNAL ORGANIZATION

### HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, many of our loyal Americans of Norwegian ancestry have begun the observance of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the Sons of Norway. This fine fraternal organization, which commenced business in Minneapolis, Minn., January 16, 1895, has long been a vital and dynamic force in the lives of our people who pride themselves on their Norwegian heritage.

Not only has the organization provided its widespread membership with the security of a well-established life insurance program as well as retirement homes for the elderly, but it has promoted significant social and cultural activities.

Junior members and the women's group, known as the Daughters of Norway, are given special attention in the broad civic and educational programs.

It is only natural that this patriotic segment of our population which has distinguished itself in the furtherance of America's farm and dairy industries should emphasize agricultural interests such as the organization's fine farm youth exchange program for providing Norwegian youth a practical farm experience and study at the Minnesota College of Agriculture.

The organization is deserving of commendation also for its program for providing scholarships to American students for study at the University of Oslo, Norway.

But the contribution made by the membership of this organization and their sturdy forebears has not been limited to agriculture. They have done much to enhance our shipping and maritime industry and they have been a significant factor in many fields of U.S. commerce and trade.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud of the lodges of the Sons of Norway located in Brooklyn. I am grateful for the cooperation and help I have received from their leaders and membership in bringing greater benefits to our friends and neighbors in Brooklyn. I have always

enjoyed their colorful celebration of the 17th of May.

To all the members of the Sons of Norway, I extend my congratulations for achieving 75 years of growth and accomplishments. I extend my warmest best wishes for their fullest enjoyment of this important anniversary year.

#### OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

### HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, recent statements concerning the oil import program have been made concluding there is no relationship between the oil import program and domestic natural gas reserves. This statement is in error, I feel, and the following remarks by J. W. Heiney, president of the American Gas Association should help set the record straight:

Senator William Proxmire "has again misinterpreted the facts on gas supply," said J. W. Heiney, President of American Gas Association.

Heiney said that in a statement yesterday in the Senate, the Wisconsin Democrat "was in error in stating that 'there's almost no relationship between the oil import control program and natural gas reserves.' The senator also overlooked information in his possession," Heiney continued "when he stated that 'no one in the Federal government apparently felt the need to check the data from the industry on gas reserves.'"

"On October 20," the A.G.A. president said, "we found it necessary publicly to call attention to misinterpretations by Senator Proxmire on the gas supply situation. Yesterday he again distorted fact in a manner calculated to mislead his colleagues and the public on the important question of natural gas reserves."

"Senator Proxmire, in a letter dated December 31, 1969, posed four specific questions to Chairman John N. Nassikas of the Federal Power Commission. The first was: '(1) the amount of natural gas that comes from high cost and stripper wells?' In responding," Heiney added, "Chairman Nassikas noted that indeed a small proportion of natural gas came from stripper wells—actually less than 2 percent of the total associated dissolved gas which is produced in conjunction with oil. Senator Proxmire seizes on this statistic to support his contention that there is 'no relationship between the oil import control program and natural gas reserves.' The senator," declared Heiney, "ignores the more complete data submitted by Chairman Nassikas in the same letter to the effect that some 25 percent of total proved gas reserves are produced in association with oil—a fact which A.G.A. pointed out in its statement submitted to the President's oil import task force on July 14, 1969, along with other reasons why drastic changes in the import program could have an adverse effect on domestic natural gas reserves at a particularly critical time."

"A second major point made by Senator Proxmire questions the validity of reserve data. The senator says, 'We really do not have any hard information about our natural gas reserves. No one in the Federal government apparently felt the need to check the data from the industry.' Again, the senator ignores a description in the Chairman's

letter of extensive tests conducted by the staff of the Federal Power Commission through comprehensive and long-standing procedures to weigh the validity of reserve information submitted by interstate pipeline companies which account for some 70 percent of the domestic total." Heiney stated, "These are the companies which are subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. For example, the Chairman states 'Our staff does have access to detailed work papers in support of these interstate supply statistics and examines such supporting data frequently . . . Over the years these estimates as submitted by the pipeline companies have generally been considered by our staff to be reasonably accurate.'"

Heiney noted, "One of the senator's conclusions was that he hoped the President will not confuse the natural gas issue with the oil import program. The A.G.A., which represents some 370 gas companies serving 41 million meters amounting to some 140 million consumers is vitally concerned with the ability to render this service. We feel there is indeed a direct relationship between the natural gas supply question and the oil import program and this relationship is borne out by the facts which we have submitted in the record. "We earnestly hope the President will heed these facts," stressed Heiney.

#### CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have frequently called the attention of my colleagues to crime statistics for the District of Columbia to emphasize the immediate need to solve this problem. In addition, I have mentioned personal accounts of crime which are hidden behind impersonal statistical reports.

A friend associated with Thompson Honor Dairy sent me a note regarding the effect that crime in the District of Columbia has had upon their business operation.

I quote verbatim from the letter I received:

To add to your library of crime statistics, our dairy had 49 holdups of routemen in 1969 and our store here at the dairy was held up three times. We spend \$2,000 a month for guards and dogs to try to prevent burglary of our trucks parked here at night and of our buildings. Just last week, four months after police were successful in catching two burglars entering our lots, the judge put them on a year's probation even though two days after these men were arrested here, they were arrested for another attempt elsewhere. I guess our experience is typical. Businessmen and others in Washington are getting pretty fed up with it though and I expect you'll see more activity in the business community this year. The President's program needs all our help I guess.

The letter was signed by Mr. Jack Ferguson, president.

I think that the contents of Mr. Ferguson's letter make the point quite forcefully. I can only add that the plight of businessmen who must finance protection which is supposed to be afforded by public agencies—for which they pay taxes—the police department and the courts—have every right to urge the

Congress to action. When one reads letters such as this, it leaves the impression that runaway crime has created a state of anarchy, now. I urge that my colleagues think very carefully about this problem and move with the rapidity the citizens expect.

#### IMMEDIATE ACTION MUST BE TAKEN TO ASSIST BEEKEEPERS

**HON. JOHN J. RHODES**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the State of Arizona is on the threshold of a severe agricultural crisis due to the loss of large numbers of honey bees from the use of agricultural insecticides.

In 1960, there were 108,000 colonies of bees on record in Arizona. By 1969, it was estimated that there were less than 40,000 colonies. The State bee inspector has recently estimated that less than half of these hives are alive today.

Most people think of beekeeping in terms similar to those of birdwatching or hamster raising. The fact remains that the honey bee is of utmost importance to Arizona agriculture for crop pollination purposes. Without bees and, therefore, beekeepers, the large number of crops that are dependent on pollinating insects—alfalfa, melons, citrus—are in serious jeopardy.

A number of worthy long-range proposals have been put forward to deal with the problem. However, it is clear to me that immediate action must be taken to assist beekeepers and, hence, to insure the continued existence of honey bees essential to the agricultural economy of our State.

Accordingly, I cosponsored a bill, H.R. 10749, with the Honorable CATHERINE MAY, and other Members of this House, on April 30, 1969, which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to certain beekeepers for losses due to bees killed by insecticides which have been registered and approved for use by the Department of Agriculture.

On August 27, 1969, the Department recommended against the enactment of this legislation. However, it soon became apparent that the problem could not be ignored any longer.

As a result, the Department established an Ad Hoc Committee on Bee Losses which was named to study and report on the matter. On January 15, 1970, the committee issued its report which follows at the conclusion of my remarks. Among the numerous recommendations made was the following:

Because losses are sustained by the beekeeper under situations beyond his control, the Committee feels that some financial assistance to maintain this industry is necessary.

In view of the committee's conclusion, based upon a review of the situation with representatives of the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service, the

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and the Office of General Counsel, it would appear that the Department would be prepared to withdraw its previous objections to H.R. 10749.

I am now informed that while the recommendations of the committee are receiving every consideration, the Department reaffirms its opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am strongly critical of the Department's position on this matter and hope that it will see fit to address itself to this serious agriculture crisis in the Southwest.

To be sure, the problem cries out for long-range solutions, but neither can we afford to ignore the short-range implications. Until more favorable pest control practices can be established it is essential that some form of indemnification be made available to beekeepers for the loss of their bees due to the use of insecticides. This will help to insure that beekeepers remain in business and provide a necessary pollination service to the agricultural community until the very complex problems of pest control can be solved.

For the benefit of my colleagues who would like to know more about this matter, I am including an outline of a speech recently given by Dr. George W. Ware of the University of Arizona as well as a letter which I recently received from Dr. George E. Hull of the same faculty.

The material follows:

OUTLINE OF TALK GIVEN TO THE AMERICAN HONEY PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION, JANUARY 26, 1970, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., BY GEORGE W. WARE, HEAD, DEPARTMENT OF ENTOMOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, TUCSON

On November 18, I appeared at the Hearing on Bee Losses in the USDA Administration Bldg., Washington, D.C. I stated that the administration of the College of Agriculture strongly favor a direct form of indemnification to professional beekeepers for income losses due to bee kill by pesticides.

Arizona is in a particularly acute situation regarding honey bees. There were on record in 1960, 108,000 colonies of bees in Arizona, managed by 443 beekeepers. Now, in 1969, there are estimated to be less than 40,000 colonies managed by 228 beekeepers. Mr. Lyman Coe, our State Bee Inspector, has given me the following apiary inspection results:

	September	October	November	December
Apiaries inspected.....	92	66	57	89
Colonies of bees inspected..	6,030	5,841	6,504	6,055
Colonies burned, American foulbrood.....	108	107	47	35
Number colonies found dead.....	3,541	3,390	4,215	4,347
Percent colonies found dead.....	59	58	65	7

Prior to 1967, the number of dead colonies in the fall has been 5%.

Several reasons can be cited for this decline, but the one outstanding factor is the great increase in the use of organophosphate and carbamate insecticides on cotton during this interval, especially in 1969.

Arizona has a mixed form of Agriculture, many crops of which are dependent on pollinating insects. Of greatest importance are alfalfa and onion seed production, all melon and cucumber crops, and tangerines, tangelos and mandarin oranges. Not well known is long-staple cotton's increased production from the pollinating activity by bees.

As an example of recent losses, from 1961 to 1965 the alfalfa seed acreage in Arizona



was 20,000 acres, yielding 190 pounds of seed per acre. In 1967 and 1968 the acreage dropped to 15,000 acres, yielding 110 pounds of seed per acre. In 1969 the yield per acre was down to 100 pounds, when the national average is more than double that. In Yuma this year, our major seed area, seed production was extremely low and in several fields none was harvested.

Arizona is faced with a dilemma. In 1968 DDT was removed from the University insect control recommendations. One year ago, 1969, our pesticide regulating body, the Board of Pesticide Control, placed a one-year moratorium on the agricultural use of DDT. That Board is to be commended for its timely action, particularly in view of the events that have occurred on a Federal level since their decision. The replacement for DDT, because of its low cost, became methyl parathion. The other materials of choice were carbaryl, azinphosmethyl, and Azodrin, all of which are, for general purposes, equitoxic to bees.

Because of Arizona's success in lowering DDT residues in selected agricultural commodities and the present attitude of the Food and Drug Administration as well as the general public, the Board of Pesticide Control continued the moratorium on DDT use for the 1970 growing season and will probably continue it thereafter. Consequently the same general insecticide use pattern on cotton will emerge for 1970, and the continued consequences will be experienced in the honey bee and pollinating bee industries.

Let me read to you a part of a talk entitled, "Unexpected Effects from Substitute Pest Control Methods" presented Aug. 18-20, 1969, by Dr. John E. Swift, Calif. Extension Entomologist, to the symposium on the Biological Impact of Pesticides in the Environment, Oregon State University, Corvallis.

"In areas where DDT could not be used, the farmers had to rely upon either organophosphorous compounds, a carbamate or various combinations including one or both of these types of chemicals. The most frequently used materials were Azodrin, Bidrin, Dylox, malathion, methyl parathion, parathion, Phosdrin, phosphamidon, Sevin, Thiodan, and toxaphene. Except for Dylox, toxaphene and Thiodan, all of these chemicals are classified as highly toxic to bees. Thiodan is moderately toxic to bees, and toxaphene and Dylox are considered relatively nontoxic to bees." (Anderson, 1967).

The impact of these chemicals on the beekeeping industry has been disastrous. In analyzing this, we should look at colony losses from 1963 through 1968, (Foote, 1969). 1963 has been chosen as the starting point, because it was during this year that DDT was placed on the injurious materials list and that permits were first required for its use. This brought about a reduction of DDT use and an increase in the use of phosphate and carbamate insecticides. The colony losses attributed to pesticides for this period are: 1963, 41,000; 1964, 41,000; 1965, 49,000; 1966, 55,000; 1967, 76,000; 1968, 83,000 colonies. These data point up the apparent effect of certain pesticides on honeybees. In 1963, (Foote, 1963) the almond growers experienced, for the first time, difficulty in obtaining and maintaining enough colonies of bees for pollination. This situation has become progressively worse, until in 1968 it was estimated that we were short at least 26,000 colonies for pollination of almonds, (Stanger, 1969). This is not only true for almonds, but we believe it is also one of the factors that has contributed to the decline of alfalfa seed yields, (Stanger, 1969).

Honeybee colony losses are not only due to the direct impact of the pesticides, but also many colonies go into the winter in a weakened condition because of exposure to pesticides, and are not able to recover sufficiently by spring and summer to do an efficient job of pollination, (Stanger, 1969; Foote, 1969).

California crops valued at more than 300

million dollars depend almost completely on honeybees for pollination. Among the major crops in this category are: almonds, alfalfa seed, apples, cherries, cucumbers, clover seed, melons, pears, plums, prunes and vegetable and flower seeds, (Foote, 1969). If the demand for honeybees as pollinators is not met, a number of agricultural enterprises in this state are going to be seriously hurt.

The beekeeping industry is depressed and a number of beekeepers are on the verge of bankruptcy. Decreasing income from honey and beeswax is not being offset by increasing income from rental of colonies for pollination, even though this practice accounted for 50% of the beekeepers' gross return for 1968. Honey production is down; prices are depressed by foreign competition; production costs have increased; and an average loss of colonies to pesticide of 15% is taking its toll, (Foote, 1969). The annual gross income of the beekeeping industry in 1965 was 8.5 million dollars; in 1966 it was 7.5 million; in 1967, 8.2 million; and in 1968, 6.7 million. This industry cannot survive at this level of economic return, (Foote, 1969).

At present Arizona may have reached the threshold ratio for bees to bee-dependent crops. In some areas such as Yuma County and certain areas of Maricopa Co., the third largest in crop value in the nation, the bee population has fallen below the desirable level for pollination efficiency for citrus alone.

The honey bee has a rank of importance in Arizona for crop pollination purposes. We need honey bees, thus we need their keepers. There is no second generation of beekeepers to back up the existing one. When this generation goes, the domestic pollinating bee is gone. Personally, I fear that the situation may have deteriorated more than realized: Carl Benson, President of our Arizona Beekeepers Assn., is working full time for a public utilities company; Jim Smith, the largest beekeeper in the state, and his wife are both working full time for another business concern. These people, and others, have been forced to this action due to losses of colonies.

Cotton, vegetables, melons, citrus, alfalfa, grain and safflower are all vital to agriculture in Arizona. But the pollinating honey bee is also vital to a great portion of this very same and growing agriculture. These pollinating insects are domesticated animals and require the attention and care of their professional keepers. Without beekeepers we will, for all practical purposes, have no pollinating bees.

Now, to complete this three-legged stool, we find that insecticides are also essential in the production of practically every Arizona crop. But because pollinating honeybees are insects, they are killed just as easily and at the same time as the economic pest insects. And this is the cause of our dilemma: Arizona agriculture needs pollinating honeybees and insecticides. Unfortunately, and with no immediate solution on the horizon, the bee and our current selection of insecticides are, for all practical purposes, incompatible.

How do you solve this problem? We don't have the answers. We do know that agricultural practices and insecticide use patterns are not likely to change sufficiently in the immediate future to alleviate the present critical problem. There appears to be no choice but to establish some form of reimbursement to beekeepers when they are caught in today's complexity of agricultural production.

Because pollinating bees are essential to Arizona's agriculture, and as a result of the intersection of these circumstances resulting in a heavy decline of bees, we strongly favor federal indemnity to professional beekeepers for losses sustained from the agricultural use of insecticides.

What is actually being done by the University of Arizona's Department of Entomology to alleviate the bee kill situation on a local basis?

The entomologists are reviewing our four

pollination information folders—citrus, alfalfa, melons and cotton. We are dropping the word "insecticides" from titles, and taking the positive approach of the value of honeybee pollination to all crops. In conjunction with this we plan to make several news releases timed to correspond with insecticide applications.

Meetings of our own department have been held with personnel from the U.S.D.A. Bee Research Laboratory in Tucson for brainstorming the bee problem. Many ideas have generated from these sessions, several of which have strong possibilities of aiding the beekeeper in the future.

The bulk of our cotton insect research is directed at cultural control of the pink bollworm, that is, by carefully timed crop plow-under during the diapausing period of the larvae. Other aspects involve the search for biological agents (bacterial and viral diseases), and parasites to control lepidopterous cotton insects.

We have also begun experimenting with the planting of alfalfa strips in cotton fields to harbor lygus bugs which move in after alfalfa hay cutting from nearby fields. Too, we started endorsing the strip-cutting of alfalfa fields to prevent the entire fields from being cut at one time and forcing lygus into cotton, which by the way, is not the preferred host of lygus. Alfalfa is indeed the preferred host, and we prefer to keep them in the alfalfa, thus avoiding their control with insecticides in cotton.

And finally, we are examining the biological clocks of insects to determine the time of day or night when they are most susceptible to insecticides. For example, we have just learned from carefully controlled laboratory experiments that pink bollworm moths are twice as sensitive to Guthion at sunrise as they are in late evening when they are most active. Actually this is exactly opposite of what we had expected and hoped. We knew that with respect to bee visitation, late afternoon and evening insecticide applications would result in the least loss.

Now let me tell you about the use of integrated control, illustrated by a most successful example conducted in Arizona last summer.

In 1968 the cotton growers of Graham County, Arizona through their pink bollworm committee, decided upon a cotton insect control program which called for scheduled weekly insecticide applications to the entire acreage involved. About 13,000 of the 17,000 acres of cotton in the county were in the program and treated for six consecutive weeks beginning in early August. The entire acreage was treated each week without regard to the insect populations present, and the cost of the six week program was about \$198,000. Some growers put on additional applications after the program ended because of a late build-up of pink bollworms.

Dissatisfaction was expressed on the part of several growers with the 1968 program, and the pink bollworm committee asked the University of Arizona for assistance in improving their program for 1969. The College of Agriculture assisted the committee in organizing and conducting a program in which cotton insect control was based strictly on need.

Thorough and regular field sampling is required in order to treat based on need, and to accomplish this, the growers hired a supervisor and 8 young men as field scouts. Cotton scouts were given 2 days of intensive training on cotton insect identification and techniques of field sampling at the University. A third day of training was given in the field in Graham County by University entomologists and weekly meetings were held there to discuss problems and situations as the season progressed.

Eighty two growers with 12,750 acres and 652 separate cotton fields participated in the 1969 program. The Safford Valley was divided into 4 areas of about 3200 acres in each area,

with a pair of scouts assigned to check all the fields in each area on a weekly basis.

They recorded information on damaging and beneficial insects in each field and made this information available to the grower through the supervisor.

When a field was infested with a pest at or near the economic level the scout supervisor contacted the grower and re-checked the field. The grower then decided whether he wanted to apply chemical control. Extension Service publications containing information on economic levels and suggested insecticides helped him in making his decisions. Resource people such as the county agent were also available for consultation when questions arose.

The pink bollworm committee decided that treatment for the pink bollworm should begin when 15% of the bolls became infested. They also contracted on a bid basis for the chemicals and application to be used when necessary. These committee actions reduced the number of decisions made by individual growers as the season progressed.

Results of the 1969 program were that one field required treatment for stink bugs, 18 fields for lygus bugs and about 65 fields for pink bollworm. Considering multiple applications on most of the pink bollworm fields a total of 5500 acre treatments were made. This compares to 13,000 acres treated 6 times or 78,000 acre treatments in 1968 under the automatic program.

In 1969, 4,700 pounds of technical insecticides were applied, compared to 363,000 pounds in 1968.

Cost of insecticides and applications in 1969 were about \$17,000 while the scouting service cost another \$19,000. This amounted to \$36,000 total cost in 1969, against \$198,000 for 1968, or \$162,000 less. Agricultural officials in the county believe insect infestations and cotton yields were roughly comparable in 1968 and 1969. Thus the program apparently reduced the production costs of the 82 growers involved by \$162,000. This, of course, takes into account only the 1968 and 1969 seasons and it should be considered that the 1968 program was not a common practice for the area. Increased pink bollworm damage in 1967 as compared to previous years was largely responsible for the committee decision to adopt the massive or district control program of 1968.

Benefits from the "control based on need" type of program used in 1969 are far greater than the reduced cost and reduced environmental contamination as related in the figures previously given. This type program permits more effective use of the pest population management concept in cotton insect control which requires consideration of the entire agro-ecosystem. Proper population assessment permits treating when pests reach the established economic threshold or breaking point. In this way beneficial insects are given a chance to maintain a natural pest-beneficial insect balance which often prevents the need for insecticide control. Programs such as the one in 1968 destroy this balance and often result in minor pests becoming major pests. Insecticide resistance is also more likely to develop in the large scale scheduled program. Another major benefit of the 1969 program over the one used in 1968 is the much less harmful effect on honey bees and wildlife. You, of course, are vitally interested in the beneficial effect on the bee industry. Honey bees simply cannot survive in an area where large acreages are repeatedly treated with phosphate and carbamate insecticides as in the 1968 Graham County program. The quantity and quality of colonies in the county were both severely affected during that year, but are now back to original strength. This offers some hope for recovery by beekeepers in the bee disaster areas of central and western Arizona.

The University entomologists intend to pursue the effort to establish the concept of

integrated insect control or pest population management in Arizona. This concept simply puts to use the best combinations of cultural, biological and chemical methods of insect control and proper field sampling is the key to making the approach work. Certain changes in cotton production practices, which we believe will effectively control the pink bollworm, along with insecticide treatment based on need during the growing season should put the Arizona cotton grower in a much more favorable position regarding pest control than he is in today. At the same time it should allow maintenance of an environment in which you beekeepers can survive and provide the vital pollination service for other segments of the agricultural community.

The problems facing agriculture with reference to pest control and the effects of pesticides on the total environment are many. However, we believe that the techniques described here can be applied to other crops and other areas much more intensively than they have in the past, resulting in benefits to all segments of agriculture.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA,  
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,  
Tucson, Ariz., February 3, 1970.

HON. JOHN J. RHODES,  
House of Representatives,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RHODES: I have recently learned of your interest in the Arizona bee losses as they relate to the use of agricultural insecticides. This is a problem that our Department of Entomology and the Extension Entomologists have been working on for some time.

As you know, maintaining effective pest control while at the same time minimizing environmental contamination by pesticides and reducing adverse effects on beneficial insects, including especially the honey bee, is a complex problem facing those involved in Arizona agriculture. Growers simply could not produce certain crops, including cotton and lettuce, without insecticides to control the economic pests of these crops. It must be conceded, however, that loss of honey bee colonies to pesticide poisoning has severely damaged that industry in most of the state's agricultural area.

The problem, as it now exists, has been accentuated in recent years because of an increased pink bollworm problem in cotton. Growers have been uncertain regarding their ability to control this pest. As a result, a general trend has developed toward scheduled insecticide applications which begin at the first sign of pink bollworm in an area and continue until the cotton is ready for harvest. Vast areas are often involved in these scheduled spray programs and the secondary effects on the biota of these areas is sometimes severe. Honey bees, for example, simply cannot survive in an area where large acreages are repeatedly treated with insecticides, especially certain organo-phosphates and carbamates.

Another important factor has been the necessity to substitute highly toxic, broad spectrum insecticides with short residual activity for the more persistent chlorinated insecticides such as DDT. Although these substitute materials prevent a chronic hazard from remaining residues, they cause a much greater adverse effect within the ecosystem to which they are applied. Honey bee losses, for example, were much less of a problem when cotton growers used mostly DDT or the combination of Toxaphene and DDT than they are now as a result of the substitute used. It is ironic that the successful action to restrict the use of DDT to protect forage producers and dairymen has at the same time brought hardship upon another segment of the agricultural community, the beekeeping industry.

The University of Arizona is making every effort to assist in alleviating the problem of pest control and the effects of pesticides upon the total environment. Early termination of the cotton crops, along with certain fall and winter cultural practices, are being demonstrated to growers as preferable means of controlling the pink bollworm. Growers are encouraged to check fields during the growing season and to apply insecticides only when infestations reach an economic level in each field.

The practice of strip-cutting or strip-planting alfalfa in conjunction with cotton is being demonstrated as a means of avoiding the necessity of early and mid-season lygus bug treatment. Lygus bugs can be trapped in the alfalfa since they prefer this host to cotton and thus treatments which might accentuate other pest problems can be avoided.

Research Entomologists are looking for biological agents which can be used to control specific pests. A new strain of *Bacillus thuringiensis*, for example, shows promise for control of bollworms with little or no effect on other organisms in the treated area.

All of these methods can be classed as part of the concept of integrated insect control. This concept simply puts to use the best combinations of biological, cultural, and chemical methods of control. Minimum use of chemicals is assured when this type of pest control program is adopted.

The University assisted Graham County cotton growers, at their request, in establishing and conducting an insect control program in 1969 by which pests were controlled on an individual field basis as field sampling showed a definite necessity. In 1968 these growers had treated the entire area each week during a six week period without regard to the insects present. Results showed the 1969 program reduced the growers production costs and required only 5500 acre treatments with insecticides as compared to 78,000 acre treatments in 1968. Honey bee colonies were severely affected in both quantity and quality in 1968, but were back to original strength at the end of 1969, with the exception of some lingering 1968 damage. Although dramatic results such as this cannot be expected under other circumstances, it does offer hope for recovery by beekeepers in other areas of Arizona.

Until more favorable pest control practices can be established in Arizona, it has been suggested by University Entomologists that some form of direct indemnification be made available to professional beekeepers for income loss due to bee kill by pesticides. This would encourage beekeepers to stay in their profession and provide the vitally needed pollination service to the agricultural community until the complex problems of pest control can be more satisfactorily solved.

If members of our Extension faculty can be of assistance to you, please let us know.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. HULL,  
Director.

#### REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON BEE LOSSES

(Committee members: Leo G. K. Iverson, Chairman; Stan Cath, NASDA; H. C. Cox, Entomology Research Div., ARS; Marshall Levin, Entomology Research Div., ARS; Paul W. Bergman, Federal Extension Service.)

The Ad Hoc Committee on Bee Losses has considered the information and views presented at the November 19, 1969, meeting in Room 218-A, Administration Building, USDA, and the information submitted in writing from those invited but who would not attend the conference. Several general conclusions have been drawn from the information presented. They are:

1. The beekeepers and their associations are not a closely-knit, well-organized group.



As such, they are in no position to bargain from strength, but they do need assistance to protect their bees from certain pesticides.

2. Consistent and heavy losses in recent years have put the individual beekeeper in serious financial straits.

3. The supply of pollinating bees has reached a critical level and continued losses would seriously threaten the capability of producers of specialty crops such as melons, alfalfa seed, etc., to continue those operations. Furthermore, the fruit industry will in a short time be faced with a critical shortage of domestic and wild pollinators.

4. The beekeepers themselves have a responsibility to avoid hazardous areas when this information is available.

The task force has considered the suggested solutions extracted from those recorded at the conference on November 18 and submitted in written statements. Particular note was made of the beekeepers' concern about further restrictions on the uses of DDT. As a result of this review, the task force is recommending the following course of action to be pursued by the several agencies within USDA and the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture. It is recognized that the following recommendations will not fully resolve the plight of the beekeeper, but are measures the Committee feels will provide some relief and protection to the beekeeping industry.

#### NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE

1. Take the lead and develop a uniform model State law designed to protect the beekeeping industry against excessive losses from pesticides. An amendment to the model State pesticide law may be possible. This law, among other things, would prohibit the use of hazardous materials on crops where bees are working during the pollinating season, set certain restrictions with respect to time of application, wind conditions, selection of control materials, etc., in areas of highly diversified agriculture. The Department of Agriculture should provide the technical assistance in drafting suggested uniform State legislation.

2. Assume a lead role in exploring the possibilities of establishing bee sanctuaries on State and Federal land. Further efforts should be made to reduce, or eliminate, the present fee system. USDA is to lend assistance in this effort.

3. Explore the possibility at the local level of establishing bee dependent specialty crop zones apart from those crops requiring the use of insecticides known to be hazardous to bees.

#### FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

1. To take the lead role in developing a comprehensive information program aimed at the fruit industry and producers of specialty crops to create an awareness of the critical shortage of domestic pollinating bees and the need to protect the bee industry. To accomplish, the Federal Extension Service should:

a. Encourage the State Cooperative Extension Service to sponsor meetings and programs between crop producers and beekeepers which will stress the importance of bees, the critical situation and the need to protect the bee industry. Efforts should be directed toward solution at local levels.

b. Disseminate available information with respect to insect populations throughout the country which may require control that would be pertinent as potential hazards to beekeepers.

c. Reemphasize the importance of bees and their protection in 4-H and other youth organizations.

2. Develop a staffing pattern at the national level of the Federal Extension Service necessary to implement a national bee safety program and the ongoing pesticides safety program with special emphasis added to include programs to protect bees and other beneficial

insects such as parasites and predators that contribute to the biological control of serious agricultural pests.

#### AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

**Entomology Research Division**—The Entomology Research Division should assemble a package of information on various subjects to support the Federal Extension Service program designed to protect the bee industry.

The Division also should review its pest control recommendations to determine those which constitute a hazard to bees and highlight those with a warning or caution statement.

**ARS Information Division**—This Division should plan timely news releases containing information on insect outbreaks and cooperative State programs which will be pertinent to beekeepers. Feature stories about value of bees as pollinators should be prepared.

**Plant Protection Division**—1. It is recommended that this Division in its cooperative State-Federal programs where materials known to be hazardous to bees are required should plan its programs well in advance of the control season. This information should be disseminated through the ARS Information Division and State Departments of Agriculture in time for the migrant beekeeper to avoid such areas in his search for summer range.

2. Where bees are working and there is a choice of control material available to control those pests involved in Cooperative Federal-State programs, the one least hazardous to bees should be selected. Further, it should be applied during the time of day or season when minimal numbers of bees are in the field.

3. The Plant Protection Division conducts an economic insect survey and publishes a comprehensive weekly report on insect conditions. This information is provided under contract or through the voluntary submission of insect notes gathered at the State level. The Division should insist that State cooperators assembling this information use it at the local level promptly to notify beekeepers of insect conditions that will require control programs.

4. The Plant Protection Division should explore the possibilities or working out arrangements with its cooperators to move bees from those areas where emergency outbreaks preclude the opportunity to provide beekeepers adequate notice of control operations.

5. **Pesticides Regulation Division**.—A conference between the bee-keepers and the Pesticides Regulation Division last year has resulted in suitable precautionary labeling.

#### ALTERNATIVE CHEMICALS

One of the critical problems clearly identified at the November conference involved the use of carbaryl for corn earworm control. The need for alternate materials to prevent serious bee losses in those areas of the country where sweet corn is grown was clearly established. Inquiries were made with respect to the registration status of Gardona, Lannate and Thiodan.

The Committee contacted the Pesticides Regulation Division to determine the current status of these materials.

Lannate (Methomyl) has been registered for corn earworm control. Its only restriction cautions against grazing or feeding treated plants to livestock within 3 days after the last application. This material appears to have real promise as an alternate for corn earworm control.

Thiodan (endosulfan) has been registered for corn earworm control for fresh corn only. It was learned that the company restricted the use of this material to fresh corn. It has a further restriction in that the label cautions against feeding treated foliage, or ensilage to livestock and against grazing treated fields. These restrictions se-

verely limit the use of this material as an alternate to carbaryl, except under limited circumstances.

Gardona has been registered for use against the corn earworm on corn grown for seed. The company has applied for a registration that will permit its use on sweet corn. This application with data to support the petition for tolerances on forage and grain was filed in February 1969. The Department certified the usefulness of this material for this purpose and forwarded the application to the Food and Drug Administration in April. We expect a tolerance decision early in 1970.

If a tolerance is approved, this material should be an excellent replacement or carbaryl. The label states that it may be applied up to the date for harvest on fresh corn for human consumption and a 5-day interval between the last application and feeding forage to cattle.

#### USDA POLICY

The Committee recognizes specific agencies have been selected to initiate certain activities oriented toward the protection of the bee industry against the losses associated with the need for pesticides. The committee does not intend to limit concern for bees to the agencies and organizations named.

Indemnity payments are not necessarily the answer to the beekeeper's financial situation. There are those on the Committee who feel that pollination of specialty crops should rightfully be a production cost paid by the grower. Because losses are sustained by the beekeeper under situations beyond his control, the Committee feels that some financial assistance to maintain this industry is necessary.

This matter was reviewed with representatives of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and the Office of the General Counsel. These discussions were conducted in terms of existing legislative authority as the basis for some form of direct compensation or payment by USDA to beekeepers for loss of their colonies resulting from the use of pesticides. In the opinion of the Committee, there is no present legal authority for direct payments to beekeepers.

There was considerable discussion as to the basis and substance of a proposed program to provide financial assistance to beekeepers. The loan-type program of Farmers Home Administration, for example, does not appear appropriate since these must be repaid, and it is our opinion that this would not satisfy the needs of beekeepers. There were indications that some form of "insurance program" probably would be the most practical approach, especially in line with the other actions recommended in this report.

The Committee recommends that the basis and substance of an "insurance program" be developed and necessary legislative authority be proposed to implement such a program of financial assistance by USDA to the Nation's beekeepers.

UNITED STATES ASKED TO PAY \$28 MILLION TO WEALTHY SOUTH VIETNAMESE LANDLORDS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of this body the recent remarks of Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, distinguished Capitol Hill commentator, concerning the shamelessness of certain allies:

[Broadcast from WMAL-TV, Washington, D.C., Jan. 27, 1970]

COMMENTARY OF JOSEPH McCaffrey

President Nixon is waging his own war on inflation, in his own way, but it doesn't seem to be paying off.

The real root cause of most of the inflationary pressure in this country is coming from that war in Vietnam. It is impossible—and the war itself proves this—to sustain such an effort over a period of more than eighteen months or two years without setting off an inflationary spiral.

We survived fairly well with minimal inflation during the early years of the war in 1964 and 1965 and part of 1966, and then the lid began to bubble off the pot as it boiled over.

Now along comes the General Accounting Office to tell the hard pressed American taxpayer that he is paying through the nose for that war in more ways than one. In addition to Uncle Sam paying some twenty-five billion dollars a year to fight in South Vietnam, he has also shelled out more than twenty-eight million dollars in taxes to wealthy South Vietnamese landlords.

The General Accounting Office says that it is inappropriate for the United States to pay South Vietnam taxes, directly or indirectly, while spending billions of dollars annually in defense efforts there and elsewhere.

And yesterday South Vietnam President Thieu said the allies weren't doing enough to help his government.

There is some difference of opinion on that, here in this country.

#### EUGENE C. PULLIAM RECEIVES WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE JOURNALISM AWARD FOR 1970

### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1970, Mr. Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis News, Indianapolis Star, Arizona Republic, and Phoenix Gazette, received the William Allen White Award for journalistic merit for 1970 and delivered the 21st annual William Allen White lecture at the University of Kansas School of Journalism.

In his lecture, Mr. Pulliam recalled his personal acquaintance with White and related White's journalistic principles to today. The text of Mr. Pulliam's speech follows:

#### TEXT OF PULLIAM AWARD LECTURE

LAWRENCE, KANS.—This is the text of the 21st annual William Allen White memorial lecture given yesterday at the University of Kansas by Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis News and The Indianapolis Star.

Pulliam's talk, "The Unchanging Responsibility of the American Newspaper In a Changing Society," was made as he accepted the William Allen White award for journalistic merit.

This is one of the happiest days of my newspaper career . . . to come back home to my native state of Kansas—home, where I was born, where my son was born, and where I began my newspaper work—to meet so many of my newspaper friends and to be reminded of so many friends who came out of K.U. to become nationally-known newspapermen.

Oscar Stauffer and Roy Roberts were among my fellow reporters when I was breaking in

on the Kansas City Star—Marvin Creager, Courtney Riley Cooper, George Longden, John Lovett, Jerome Beatty and so many other great ones.

We all had tremendous respect—almost an awe—of William Rockhill Nelson, then publisher of the Kansas City Star. He was one of the three or four great newspapermen of his time and we all knew it.

#### WHITE—GREAT INSPIRATION

But even then it was William Allen White who was really the great inspiration to those of us who aspired to greatness.

Most of us had the privilege to know him personally, for he was never too busy nor too bored to have a chat—to offer a word of advice or a paragraph of encouragement to his still-unknown young colleagues.

More than any other man, William Allen White embodied the tradition and the spirit of independence for which Kansas was renowned; more than any other man he encouraged and expanded that spirit across the country.

More than any other man of his generation he inspired newspapermen—of all ages—to strive for steadfast adherence to the highest ideals of journalism. In our hearts we revered and cherished him. He was the reporter, the editor, the newspaperman we most wanted to be like.

The annual award of the William Allen White Foundation gives continuing recognition to the great man himself and this is as it should be—for no American more truly embodied the noblest ideals of American journalism in his life and in his work.

It's now more than a quarter of a century since he left the scene, but the "words of his mouth and the meditations of his heart" are still an undiminished inspiration to all newspapermen who want to become great newspapermen.

#### "SENTIMENTAL JOURNEY"

And so you can surely understand why this is a sentimental journey for me—to come back to the University of Kansas to be recognized by my own colleagues in the field of journalism . . . and you must know I am honored and humbled to accept the William Allen White Award for Journalistic Merit.

And now—today—how can we best express our love and esteem for William Allen White? How can we translate it into practical service? What must we do to reaffirm and strengthen the determination of American newspapermen to protect and perpetuate, as a basic right of the free press, the inviolable right to know and to print the truth? Let us examine our situation.

We have crossed the threshold and have stepped into the 70s. Once again the American press faces a great challenge. We commence this new decade as the strongest, freest, most compassionate and humane nation on earth; yet from all sides we daily hear intemperate criticism and ridicule of our way of life, of our cherished values, of our inspired traditions and of our national character.

And millions of us, in what President Nixon has called the "silent majority," are silent, doing nothing to challenge and to disprove these criticisms.

For more than 10 years a hodgepodge of downgraders of America has tried to convince us that everything we believe in, everything we have done in the past and everything we plan to do in the future is wrong.

Their violent actions on college campuses, their desecration of public buildings, their despoliation in our cities—mostly unhindered and unchecked—are paraded before us in newspapers and magazines and on TV as though these people actually were the prophets of some glorious future instead of the destroyers of both our necessary public institutions and our private property.

#### BOMBARDED BY DOWNGRADEES

We are bombarded by these downgraders of America with their claim that our system is oppressive of freedom. Can they name any country that really permits more personal freedom? That willingly extends more private charity—more than \$6 billion of it per year?

That guarantees more civil rights, has more democratic institutions, more freedom of speech, more freedom to travel—in short, more of everything that makes life promising and good and rewarding?

To be sure I am shocked and ashamed and often angered by some of the things these people have said and by most of the things they have done. But they have a right to say what they believe. No good will come from silencing them. We have to listen—and, in fact, we need to listen. But we do not have to follow—nor do we have to stand by in silence and inaction.

Let us look ourselves straight in the face. As newspaper people—who always have insisted on objectivity and still do—we have got to ask ourselves whether we honestly have been objective in our coverage of the violent words and actions of the dissenters.

Have we really printed both sides—or have we succumbed to the lure of printing essentially the sensational? What have we done to awaken Mr. Nixon's silent majority? What have we done to make it a vocal majority—with a voice powerful enough to be heard at least as clearly as the voice of the dissenters?

In this troubled era, have we given all the facts—or have we allowed the self-appointed leaders, the noisy publicity seekers, the quasi-righters-of-all-wrongs—to make the news by over-coverage of their criticisms and condemnations?

In short, have we honestly served our country and our consciences by reminding our readers again and still again that in spite of our weaknesses, and they are plenty, there is, nevertheless, much that is right with America?—and that this and this and this is what it is?

#### CAUTIONED BY LINCOLN

More than 100 years ago Abraham Lincoln cautioned us thus—"never to violate the laws of the country and never to tolerate their violence by others" . . . to "let reverence for the law . . . be taught in the schools, seminaries and colleges, let it be written in primers, spelling books and almanacs, let it be preached from the pulpit and proclaimed in the legislative halls, and enforced in the courts of justice" . . . in short, to "let it become the political religion of the nation."

That was Lincoln's reaction to the murder of Elijah Lovejoy. But long before that he had recognized the danger of unrestrained and unpunished violence. He was castigated far more bitterly than than any of us who today, insist that there must be respect for the law or the country is doomed.

If we object to the law, let us amend it or modify it or repeal it. But while it is the law, let us obey it.

Violence in expressing opposition to the law has become a way of life with far too many among us today. The health—and in fact the survival—of this country demand that this be stopped; and as the freest voice on earth, the American press must face the hard fact that this job is squarely on our shoulders.

It is on our shoulders because we elected to become newspapermen. As newspapermen, we rely upon constitutional guarantees of our right to know—and to tell—the truth; and we are charged with the responsibility to arouse the people of this country to the danger of their silence and their inaction; for they, in turn, must arouse their elected officials, including the Congress of the United States, to the fact that the American people



demand action; that they will no longer stand silent, lulled by the affluence of this era or spoiled by the permissiveness and indulgence which seem typical of the century.

#### AGNEW'S BLUNT CRITICISMS

Now about Mr. Agnew and his blunt criticisms of the network newscasters and commentators and of those newspapers which follow a policy of sensational instant-presentation of the news and their interpretations of it.

If this were a one-time shot, a one-time complaint, we wouldn't need to be too disturbed about what the vice-president said. All of us know that much of what he said is true.

Despite all the disclaimers to the contrary, however, there was at least an implied threat of a crackdown on network licenses in the vice-president's remarks. The public, more wide awake than usual, I think, felt he was sounding a warning to the networks to behave—or else. And we have been told and told again that the vice-president spoke with the President's advice and consent.

If Mr. Agnew's remarks had gone unchallenged it is quite possible that the Federal Communications Commission would—before long—have taken some restrictive or even punitive action against the networks; if not now, then at some later date when some other government official lashes out at TV and the press.

Of course government officials have a right to complain, as often and as loudly as they wish, about how bad they think the press and TV are. But if newspapers and TV did not answer these complaints with the truth, and with a reaffirmation of their right to know the truth and to give free expression to it, it wouldn't be long until network news would be regulated outright.

After that, there would most certainly be an all-out effort by the Federal bureaucracy to license and regulate the press.

#### COMPELLING RESPONSIBILITY

Right here I want to emphasize the compelling responsibility which newspapers have to defend the networks and TV in their program of covering the news.

We may not agree with everything they say and we may not agree with how or when they say it.

Granted they have hardly over-exerted themselves to defend the newspapers when we instead of they have been under attack, nevertheless the fact remains—their fight is our fight, just as ours is theirs.

We must remember that when the First Amendment to the Constitution was adopted there were no such things as radio and TV.

From their beginnings, radio and TV were obliged to get their license to live from the Federal government . . . and they still are even today, when radio is more than 40 years old and TV has come of age.

Even today neither is permitted to run its own affairs without having the Federal government looking over its shoulder and so, at best, radio and TV remain only half-free, subject to the caprice of the Federal government.

I would remind you that in January of this year the task force of Dr. Milton Eisenhower's Commission on Crime and Violence dared to suggest, in all seriousness, that the government set up a review commission to pass upon the performance of TV and newspapers.

It was a definite and direct call for positive censorship of the press. It was done in the guise of trying to show the press how it could solve all the problems of violence on the campus, in the streets, et cetera, et cetera, for which Dr. Eisenhower's task force charged that TV and newspapers are largely responsible. That charge, of course, is ignorant and mischievous nonsense.

Newspapers are a unique sort of institu-

tion. They have been set apart for the protection and the promotion of the public welfare. They have been set apart as the guardians of the peoples' freedoms, individually and as a people. They have a continuing and constant responsibility to present not only both sides but all rational viewpoints.

#### LEADERS SUPPORT PRESS FREEDOM

One of the most interesting and significant things in the history of the free press in America—far too often overlooked—is that almost without exception every great leader in American history has spoken out emphatically in support of freedom of the press.

In 1786 Thomas Jefferson, who often criticized the press, said: "Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press—and that cannot be limited without being lost."

Recall a few more of our great own men and those in other parts of the world who agreed with Jefferson. Immediately, of course, we think of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln; of Madison and Adams; of Emerson and Dickens and Henry Ward Beecher; we think of Disraeli and Churchill and Justice Brandeis; of Joseph Pulitzer; of Sen. Borah and Justices Brandeis and Frankfurter . . . it is a long and an illustrious list.

These men were not theorists. They were men in positions of great responsibility and their experience told them that only with a free press could any government endure.

In the knowledge of such overwhelming support and appreciation of a free press by so many great world leaders, we can reassure ourselves that it is ridiculous and irresponsible for Dr. Eisenhower's committee—or any other—to charge that newspapers and TV are to blame for the crime and violence in this country and that the government should establish a commission to review their performance.

Today, on this occasion of again recalling the greatness of William Allen White, I want to come very close to home now—and call to mind the American Society of Newspaper Editors, of which I have long been a member.

I am shocked and nearly incredulous that any member of that society should be influenced by demands such as those made by the Dr. Eisenhower task force.

I am appalled that a handful of the members of that society have seriously proposed the establishment of a so-called "grievance committee" of the society to review the performance of its members.

#### CENSORING MOST DANGEROUS THING

Whether it is by the government, by the American Society of Newspaper Editors or by any other group—no matter who it is—I say with all the strength at my command that any organization set up for the purpose of censoring the press of this country—and succeeding in doing so—would be the most dangerous thing the people of this country could possibly face.

I have sufficient respect for the membership of the American Society of Newspaper Editors to predict that any real attempt to establish a "grievance committee" to review the performance of its members would be overwhelmingly defeated.

Let me recall once again the words of Jefferson which I quoted earlier in this speech: "Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost."

William Allen White and all his peers in the roster of great American newspapermen committed themselves to a lifelong fight against censorship. They committed themselves to the proposition that the American press has the right to know the truth and freely to report it to the American people.

Any curtailment of that right by any committee or bureau or official of the government is undisguised censorship; and, as of today, thank God, our Constitution forbids it.

The world has changed dramatically since William Allen White lived in it, but the things he believed in are timeless and unchanging. And so I have spoken today, as he so often did, with emphasis on the preservation of freedom of the press and, through it, the protection and perpetuation of the peoples' right to know.

Without a free press, who can truly speak for man? Who can present to him the truths he must have in order to develop enduring solutions to the agonizing problems which plague the world today—the problem of finding the means for stopping war; for ending real poverty and ignorance and racial stress with their concomitants of crime and violence and disregard of the law; the problem of rescuing man's environment from further corrosion before our air and water and food sources are permanently poisoned and our invaluable treasury of wildlife totally wiped out.

#### WITHOUT A FREE PRESS

These are only a part of the problems which man faces. But make no mistake about it, without a free press he faces these and all others practically without a prayer.

Only the newspapers have the peculiar resources to arouse the American people to the part they can and must play in demanding the solutions to their problems—and to back them up in their demands until they have been met.

I urge all who are newspapermen, and all who would be, to face up to the awesome challenge of today. Unless we do, we are not fit to be newspapermen and our newspapers are not deserving of the singular safeguards given us by the First Amendment.

In closing, I want to salute the William Allen White Foundation, the University of Kansas and its great school of journalism.

It is an admirable service to America to have accorded this continuing recognition of the splendid contribution William Allen White made to freedom of speech and of the press during his lifetime.

We can be everlastingly grateful that his example continues to be the inspiration of America's greatest reporters and editors and publishers; that his goal is their goal.

Again, my most grateful thanks for this award. You have been a wonderfully gracious audience and I have been happy beyond words to be here today.

Good luck—and God bless all of you.

#### SILVER COINS

### HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, among the nations currently issuing silver coins is Haiti. That country is minting three of them at the present time—in denominations of 25, 10, and 5 gourdes.

The number of coins minted is not known, but it is believed that they have been put in circulation principally for sale to coin collectors.

Also, the Communist country of Albania issued three silver coins last year, in denominations of 5, 10, and 25 leks. The coins have been minted in pure silver.

Throughout the world, governments continue to issue coins of intrinsic value. Some are obviously issued to satisfy the demands of coin collectors alone. Others are minted in sufficient numbers so as to meet the needs of commerce. It is regret-

table that the leading country in the world is phasing out silver coins and replacing them with relatively worthless tokens.

#### YOUTH GROUP FOR TITLE II REPEAL

### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, refreshing evidence that a large segment of our youth today possesses conscientious concern and a sense of personal responsibility for the larger society is shown by the unanimous adoption by the California YMCA Model Legislature of a resolution calling for the repeal of the Emergency Detention Act.

The model legislature is an annual event held in Sacramento and sponsored by the Young Men's Christian Association. This significant program, now in its 22d year, provides high school youth from all over California with an opportunity to involve themselves in a 4-day study of the legislative process. Each branch brings with it to the model legislature a specific piece of legislation which it feels is important to the people of California. The delegation from the Crenshaw branch of the Los Angeles YMCA was one of the 73 branches to participate this year, and it spearheaded the unanimous adoption of the joint resolution calling for the repeal of title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

This indication of support from a broad cross section of our Nation's youth for the removal of the concentration camp authorization law from our statute books is indeed noteworthy. I congratulate the participants in the model legislature, especially members of the Crenshaw branch of the Los Angeles YMCA.

Those deserving special commendation for the leadership they displayed in adoption of the resolution are: Norman Senzaki, 16; Timmie Manaka, 16; and Wayne Shimoguchi, 16; all of the Mercuries Hi-Y Club; Kendric Kapikawa, 17; of the Comets Hi-Y Club; and Peter Hubbard, 17; of the Leaders Hi-Y Club.

In order that the Members of Congress may have the opportunity to read the recently adopted resolution of California's YMCA Model Legislation, I submit it for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

#### ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION No. 123

(Introduced by members representing the Crenshaw branch of the Los Angeles YMCA, Jan. 29, 1970)

A joint resolution relating to the repeal of title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950

Whereas, the Congress of the United States has heretofore adopted Subtitle II of the Internal Security Act of 1950, commonly known as the Emergency Detention Act; and

Whereas, the Emergency Detention Act authorized detention of any person on the mere probability that he will engage in acts of espionage or of sabotage during proclaimed periods of "Internal Security Emergency"; and

Whereas, a person detained under the Emergency Detention Act will not be brought to trial under law, but instead will be judged by a Preliminary Hearing Officer and a Detention Review Board, wherein the detainee must prove his innocence, but the government is not required to disclose evidence or produce witnesses to justify the detention; and

Whereas, in 1942, 70,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry were removed to detention camps, and their loyalty to this nation's government was challenged without protection of the civil rights and liberties guaranteed to them under the Constitution;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California strongly urges the Congress of the United States to repeal Subtitle II of the Internal Security Act of 1950; and

Be it further resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the President of the United States Senate; the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; and the Honorable Ronald Reagan, Governor of the State of California.

#### NO ROOM FOR SLOBS

### HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw an article by Dr. K. Ross Toole entitled "No Room For Slobs" to the attention of my colleagues.

This article appeared in the February 8, 1970, issue of the Billings Gazette. Dr. Toole addresses himself to the problem of the "anti-establishment" youth of America and suggests some actions which the older generation might take to alleviate this discontent.

The article follows:

#### NO ROOM FOR SLOBS

(By Dr. K. Ross Toole)

I am 49 years old. It took me many years and considerable anguish to get where I am—which isn't much of anyplace except exurbia. I was nurtured in depression; I lost four years to war; I am invested with sweat; I have had one coronary. I am a "liberal," square and I am a professor. I am sick of the "younger generation," hippies, yuppies, militants and nonsense.

I am a professor of history at the University of Montana, and I am supposed to have "liaison" with the young. Worse still, I am father of seven children. They range in age from seven to 23—and I am fed up with nonsense. I am tired of being blamed, maimed and contrite; I am tired of tolerance and the reaching out (which is always my function) for understanding. I am sick of the total irrationality of the campus "rebel," whose bearded visage, dirty hair, body odor and "tactics" are childish but brutal, naive but dangerous, and the essence of arrogant tyranny—the tyranny of spoiled brats.

I am terribly disturbed that I may be incubating more of the same. Our household is permissive, our approach to discipline is an apology and a retreat from standards—usually accompanied by a gift in cash or kind.

#### TIME TO CALL A HALT

Its time to call a halt; time to live in an adult world where we belong and time to put these people in their places. We owe

the "younger generation" what all "older generations" have owed younger generations—love, protection to a point, and respect when they deserve it. We do not owe them our souls, our privacy, our whole lives, and above all, we do not owe them immunity from our mistakes, or their own.

Every generation makes mistakes, always has and always will. We have made our share. But my generation has made America the most affluent country on earth; it has tackled, head-on, a racial problem which no nation on earth in the history of mankind had dared to do. It has publicly declared war on poverty and it has gone to the moon; it has desegregated schools and abolished polio; it has presided over the beginning of what is probably the greatest social and economic revolution in man's history. It has begun these things, not finished them. It has declared itself, and committed itself, and taxed itself, and damn near run itself into the ground in the cause of social justice and reform.

Its mistakes are fewer than my father's generation—or his father's, or his. Its greatest mistake is not Viet Nam; it is the abdication of its first responsibility, its pusillanimous capitulation to its youth, and its sick preoccupation with the problems, the mind, psyche, the *raison d'être* of the young.

Since when have children ruled this country? By virtue of what right, by what accomplishment should thousands of teenagers, wet behind the ears and utterly without the benefit of having lived long enough to have either judgment or wisdom, become the sages of our time?

The psychologists, the educators and preachers say the young are rebelling against our archaic mores and morals, our materialistic approaches to life, our failures in diplomacy, our terrible ineptitude in racial matters, our narrowness as parents, our blindness to the root ills of society. Balderdash!

#### YOUTH THE PRODUCT OF 3,000 YEARS OF DEVELOPMENT

Society hangs together by the stitching of many threads. No 18-year-old is simply the product of his 18 years; he is the product of 3,000 years of the development of mankind—and throughout those years, injustice has existed and been fought; rules have grown outmoded and been changed; doom has hung over men and been avoided; unjust wars have occurred; pain has been the cost of progress—and man has persevered.

As a professor and the father of seven, I have watched this new generation and concluded that most of them are fine. A minority are not—and the trouble is that minority threatens to tyrannize the majority and take over. I dislike that minority; I am aghast that the majority "takes" it and allows itself to be used. And I address myself to both the minority and the majority. I speak partly as a historian, partly as a father and partly as one fed up, middle-aged and angry member of the so-called "establishment"—which, by the way, is nothing but a euphemism for "society."

Common courtesy and a regard for the opinions of others is not merely a decoration on the pie crust of society, it is the heart of the pie. Too many "youngsters" are egocentric boors. They will not listen, they will only shout down. They will not discuss but, like four year olds, they throw rocks and shout.

#### ARROGANCE IS OBNOXIOUS

Arrogance is obnoxious; it is also destructive. Society has classically ostracized arrogance without the backing of demonstrable accomplishment. Why, then, do we tolerate arrogant slobs who occupy our homes, our administration buildings, our streets and parks, urinating on our beliefs and defiling our premises? It is not the police we need, (our generation and theirs) it is an expression of our disgust and disdain. Yet we



do more than permit it, we dignify it with introspective flagellation. Somehow it is our fault. Balderdash again!

Sensitivity is not the property of the young, nor was it invented in 1950. The young of any generation have felt the same impulse to grow, to reach out, to touch stars, to live freely and to let the minds loose along unexplored corridors. Young men and young women have always stood on the same hill and felt the same vague sense of restraint that separated them from the ultimate experience—the sudden and complete expansion of the mind, the final fulfillment. It is one of the oldest, sweetest and most bitter experiences of mankind.

Today's young people did not invent it; they do not own it. And what they seek to attain, all mankind has sought to attain throughout the ages. Shall we, therefore, approve the presumed attainment of it through heroin, speed, LSD and other drugs? And shall we, permissively, let them poison themselves simply because, as in most other respects, we feel vaguely guilty because we brought them into this world? Again, it is not police raids and tougher laws that we need; it is merely strength. The strength to explain, in our potty, middle-aged way, that what they seek, we sought; that it is somewhere but not here and sure as hell not in drugs; that, in the meanwhile, they will cease and desist the poison game. And this we must explain early and hard—and then police it ourselves.

#### ESTABLISHMENT MALLEABLE

Society, "The Establishment," is not a foreign thing we seek to impose on the young. We know it is far from perfect. We did not make it; we have only sought to change it. The fact that we have only been minimally successful is the story of all generations—as it will be the story of the generation coming up. Yet we have worked a number of wonders. We have changed it. We are deeply concerned about our failures; we have not solved the racial problem but we have faced it; we are terribly worried about the degradation of our environment, about injustices, inequities, the military-industrial complex and bureaucracy. But we have attacked these things. We have, all our lives, taken arms against our sea of troubles—and fought effectively. But we also have fought with a rational knowledge of the strength of our adversary; and, above all, knowing that the war is one of attrition in which the "unconditional surrender" of the forces of evil is not about to occur. We win, if we win at all, slowly and painfully. That is the kind of war society has always fought—because man is what he is.

Knowing this, why do we listen subserviently to the violent tacticians of the new generation? Either they have total victory by Wednesday next or burn down our carefully built barricades in adolescent pique; either they win now or flee off to a commune and quit; either they solve all problems this week or join a wrecking crew of paranoids.

Youth has always been characterized by impatient idealism. If it were not, there would be no change. But impatient idealism does not extend to guns, fire bombs, riots, vicious arrogance, and instant gratification. That is not idealism; it is childish tyranny. The worst of it is that we (professors and faculties in particular) in a paroxysm of self-abnegation and apology, go along, abdicate, apologize as if we had personally created the ills of the world—and thus lend ourselves to chaos. We are the led, not the leaders. And we are fools.

As a professor I meet the activists and revolutionaries every day. They are inexorably ignorant. If you want to make a revolution, do you not study the ways to do it? Of course not! Che Guevarra becomes their hero. He failed; he died in the jungles of Bolivia with an army of six. His every move was a miscalculation and a mistake. Mao Tse Tung

and Ho Chi Minh led revolutions based on a peasantry and an overwhelmingly ancient rural economy. They are the pattern-makers for the SDS and the student militants. I have yet to talk to an "activist" who has read Crane Brinton's, "The Anatomy of Revolution," or who is familiar with the works of Jefferson, Washington, Paine, Adams or even Marx or Engels. And I have yet to talk to a student militant who has read about racism elsewhere and/or who understands, even primitively, the long, and wondrous struggle of the NAACP and the genius of Martin Luther King—whose name they invariably take in vain.

An old and scarred member of the wars of organized labor in the U.S. in the 1930's recently remarked to me: "these 'radicals' couldn't organize well enough to produce a sensible platform let alone revolt their way out of a paper bag." But they can, because we let them destroy our universities, make our parks untenable, make a shambles of our streets, and insult our flag.

I assert that we are in trouble with this younger generation not because we have failed our country, not because of affluence or stupidity, not because we are antediluvian, not because we are middle-class materialists—but simply because we have failed to keep that generation in its place and we have not because we are middle-class materialists—but simply because we have failed to keep that generation in its place and we have failed to put them back there when they got out of it. We have the power; we do not have the will. We have the right, we have not exercised it.

#### NEED REAPPRAISAL

To the extent that we now rely on the police, mace, the National Guard, tear gas, steel fences and a wringing of hands, we will fail.

What we need is a reappraisal of our own middle-class selves, our worth and our hard-won progress. We need to use disdain, not mace; we need to reassess a weapon we came by the hard way, by travail and labor, firm authority as parents, teachers, businessmen, workers and politicians.

The vast majority of our children from one to 20 are fine kids. We need to back this majority with authority and with the firm conviction that we owe it to them and to ourselves. Enough of apology, enough of analysis, enough of our abdication of responsibility, enough of the denial of our own maturity and good sense.

The best place to start is at home. But, the most practical and effective place, right now, is our campuses. This does not mean a flood of angry edicts, a sudden clamp-down, a "new" policy. It simply means that faculties should stop playing chicken, that demonstrators should be met not with police but with expulsions. The power to expel (strangely unused) has been the legitimate recourse of universities since 1209.

More importantly it means that at freshman orientation, whatever form it takes, the administration should set forth the ground rules—not beligerently but forthrightly.

A university is the microcosm of society itself. It cannot function without rules for conduct. It cannot, as society cannot, legislate morals. It is dealing with young men and women, 18 to 22. But it can, and must, promulgate rules. It cannot function without order—and, therefore, who disrupts order must leave. It cannot permit students to determine when, what and where they shall be taught; it cannot permit the occupation of its premises, in violation both of the law and its regulations, by "militants."

#### STUDENT PARTICIPATION

There is room within the university complex for basic student participation but there is no room for slob, disruption and violence. The first obligation of the administration is to lay down the rules early, clearly and positively, and to attach to this state-

ment the penalty for violation. It is profoundly simple—and the failure to state it—in advance—is the salient failure of university administrators in this age.

Expulsion is a dreaded verdict. The administration merely needs to make it clear, quite dispassionately, that expulsion is the inevitable consequence of violation of the rules. Among the rules, even though it seems gratuitous, should be these: 1. Violence, armed or otherwise, the forceful occupation of buildings, the intimidation by covert or overt act of any student or faculty member or administrative personnel, the occupation of any university property, field, park, building, lot or other place, shall be cause for expulsion.

2. The disruption of any class, directly or indirectly, by voice or presence or the destruction of any university property, shall be cause for expulsion.

#### RECLAIM OUR COUNTRY

This is neither new nor revolutionary. It is merely the reassertion of an old, accepted and necessary right of the administration of any such institution. And the faculty should be informed, firmly, of this reassertion, before trouble starts. This does not constitute provocation. It is one of the oldest rights and necessities of the university community. The failure of university administrators to use it is one of the mysteries of our permissive age—and the blame must fall largely on faculties because they have consistently pressured administrators not to act.

Suppose the students refuse to recognize expulsions, suppose they march, riot, strike. The police? No. The matter, by prearrangement, publicly stated, should then pass to the courts. If buildings are occupied, the court enjoins the participating students. It has the lawful power to declare them in contempt. If violence ensues, it is in violation of the court's order. Courts are not subject to fears, not part of the action. And what militant will shout obscenities in court with contempt hanging over his head?

Too simple? Not at all. Merely an old process which we seem to have forgotten. It is too direct for those who seek to employ Freudian analysis, too positive for "academic senates" who long for philosophical debate and too prosaic for those who seek orgastic self condemnation.

This is a country full of decent, worried people like myself. It is also a country full of people fed-up with nonsense. We need (those of us over 30) tax ridden, harried, confused, weary and beat-up, to reassert our hard won prerogatives. It is our country too. We have fought for it, bled for it, dreamed for it, and we love it. It is time to reclaim it.

#### AMERICAN LITHUANIANS

### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. Speaker, Americans of Lithuanian origin and their friends in my hometown of Omaha and throughout this great Nation commemorate two very important anniversaries this month.

On February 14, they observed the 719th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State. This came when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251.

Today marks the 52d anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of

Lithuania on February 16, 1918. For the past 29 years, this nation has been occupied and exploited by the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain it is the fervent hope of all Americans that one day this nation, which has suffered so very much, will again be free of Communist bonds.

#### PREDATORY MAMMAL CONTROL

### HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1969, I introduced H.R. 11405, which would establish a national policy and program with respect to wild predatory mammals. This is not the first time I have called for such a policy. In the first session of the 90th Congress, I introduced a substantially similar bill.

H.R. 11405 differs from my preceding bill in that it specifically prohibits the use of poison in any such national program on predatory mammals. I believe the use of poison is not only cruel, but also self-defeating.

I have argued against poison many times in the past. On February 13, 1970, Haynes Johnson, of the Washington Post, eloquently set forth in great detail what is wrong with the infamous "1080 program" in Arizona. The 1080 compound, as the article indicates, kills directly and indirectly, without discrimination and without regard to the delicate balance of nature that must be preserved.

I would like at this time to include Mr. Johnson's article in the RECORD. I hope that it will stimulate a vigorous debate among my colleagues and among the American people, and that as a result the necessary legislation will be enacted to control this so-called control program. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 1970]

#### POISON RAVAGES DESERT'S LIFE CYCLE

(By Haynes Johnson)

PHOENIX.—Coyotes are predators. They prey on rodents, game and, when they can find them, sheep and cattle. For years the federal government has been "controlling"—that is, killing—them by an extensive poison program.

Across the Arizona desert, and in other western states, hundreds of bait stations are put out each year. In each station, treated meat is set out alongside government signs announcing that poison is being used "to kill predatory animals which would harm your livestock and game animals."

Inside the meat is implanted Compound 1080, a highly toxic chemical capable of killing at very low concentrations. A single pound is enough to kill 1.8 million squirrels. It is an odorless, colorless poison that does not decompose in bait or poisoned carcasses. It attacks the central nervous system, affecting the brain, heart, liver, and kidney. There is no known antidote for it.

It can be fatal to man. There have been at least 13 proven fatal cases and five suspected deaths from 1080 poison.

The 1080 poison has another quality that is a key part of this story: Its ability to kill continues beyond the first animal to eat it.

It has the potential, as one government

paper describes the process, of acting as "a biological high explosive. Cats, dogs, and other carnivorous animals feed on dead rodents and may be poisoned by the 1080 in the carcasses."

The coyote (being a member of the dog family, is killed by 1080, with a special reaction. After eating the poison, he may run as far as 20 miles before dying. As he runs, he vomits as many as five times. Each time, he spews poison out onto the grasses and desert soil. Birds, and even cattle, who might eat the affected grass are liable to the poison themselves.

Rodents and carrion-eating birds such as eagles, buzzards, hawks and ravens that might feed on the carcass of the coyote become poisoned also.

Beyond that, conservationists and ecologists say the killing of coyotes sets off a biological chain reaction with devastating effect.

The coyote-rodent cycle is a prime example.

#### FEED ON RODENTS

Coyotes normally feed on rodents—prairie dogs, ground squirrels, rats, gophers and other pests, including rabbits. When the coyote population is "controlled," the rodent population springs up in greater number, posing another kind of agricultural threat: rodents damage the crops.

So a second "control" program is then utilized. Grain mixed with 1080 poison is seeded across the landscape to control the rodents. Some of the grain is scattered by helicopters. It becomes a deadly bait for the prairie dogs, squirrels, gophers and others. As they are killed, their death leads to still another round in the cycle.

Many of the dead rodents end up on the surface of the ground. There, they are readily available to be consumed by carnivores and scavengers of all kinds. That leads to the secondary poisoning of yet another class of animals.

Badgers, bears, foxes, raccoons, skunks, opossums, eagles, hawks, owls, vultures—all are exposed to possible secondary poisoning.

#### FERRET NEARLY EXTINCT

The black-footed ferret, one of the rare species of North America, is nearing extinction. The primary cause, that same government study says, "is almost certainly poisoning campaigns among the prairie dogs which are the main prey of the ferret."

To such arguments, the Wildlife Service maintains that it employs the poison because it kills "selectively" and efficiently.

Yet there is an even more serious question involved: Whether, in fact, the control program is necessary at all. Figures about losses to livestock are hard to come by, but two estimates, one private, the other governmental, show that the cost of the poison program actually exceeds the livestock losses. In addition, the number of sheep raised in the country has been declining in recent years.

The 1080 poison is not the only part of the government's "predator control program." Implanted in the desert are thousands of what are called "coyote getters." They are guns that shoot cyanide in the coyote's mouth when he tugs at the scented trap. In addition, some 20,900 strychnine tablets are being used this year in Arizona.

"You go back and sit in a restaurant in Washington, D.C., or New York and tell people what's happening out here in Arizona and I'd bet that half of the people wouldn't believe you," said Max Finch, general manager of the Arizona Humane Society.

Finch was expressing part of the intense controversy the poison program has generated here and in other western states. For years, conservation groups have been attacking the program with little effect. Yet for all the emotion and bitterness it has aroused, only now is it beginning to surface as a national concern.

#### PART OF WIDER ISSUE

The current focus on environmental problems is taking in more than air and water pollution. Pesticides and herbicides and their impact on the environment are also at the center of attention. The position control program is a part of this.

As only one indication of the deep feelings—and the new interest—aroused, consider the letter written by Dr. Raymond F. Bock Jr. of the Pima County Medical Society in Tucson to the director of the U.S. Wildlife Services Division in charge of the poison program in Arizona.

"The Pima County Medical Society is becoming increasingly concerned with our environmental problems," Dr. Bock wrote. "The Society realizes that poisons of various kinds have an adverse effect on this environment, to the ultimate detriment of many species, including homo sapiens.

"This letter was triggered by your Department's map of proposed poison (1080) sites for 1970 and your admission of about a 40 per cent increase in this poison program. When one considers that each dot on that map represents 40 pounds of sodium-monofluoroacetate-treated meat, dosage enough to kill some 1,500 animals each dot, one wonders whether someone in your department has gone mad from a personal hatred of predators.

"In this regard, consultation with trained biologists, ecologists and mammalogists has indicated some startling inconsistencies.

"Concerning your division of Wildlife Services, we have found consistent objection to your methods by trained biologists. Further investigation into the entire animal control program seems to indicate widespread senseless killing of largely beneficial animals.

"Since we have been unable to find any conservation organizations that favor your methods, or for that matter, any trained biologists that favor them, we wonder what kind of misfits may be perpetrating this poison campaign?"

#### OFFICIALS DEFENSIVE

Perhaps because of such criticism, the government agents react extremely defensively to questions about the poison program. In an interview with Robert Shiver, director of the Wildlife Services Division here, virtually every point advanced by the critics was dismissed.

"There are ecologists and ecologists," he said. "I try to keep emotion out of this."

He was striving, he said, for a "practical approach" to a practical problem, and spoke of weighing the interests of wool growers, cattlemen's associations and sportsmen against those of conservationists. Once, while referring to livestock losses, he remarked that there "is a constitutional right for someone to protect himself."

As for the larger questions of environmental degradation: "There's a whole lot of things disturbing the balance of nature. When man set foot on this planet he upset the balance."

The 1080 poison, he said, "is recognized as the most effective, efficient and selective method of controlling predators."

Shriver also said there is no evidence that the poison does impair other wildlife. On that point, at least, there seems no doubt that he is wrong.

Four years ago, in a congressional hearing about the predator control program, the following exchange took place between Rep. John D. Dingell of Michigan and Stanley A. Cain, assistant secretary of interior for fish, wildlife and parks:

Dingell: . . . "If I remember you folks in the Interior Department have had some instances where you cleaned out your coyotes very thoroughly in the area and followed up the next year by being overrun with rodents and then had to conduct a fairly extensive



rodent program to bring the population back into balance."

Cain: "I think that is a general fact of federal history in control of these large predators. This is what produced, at least this is partly what produced, the control problems for deer and elk in national parks, the reduction in predators."

That, it would seem, is reason enough to question whether such a program should continue.

There are other serious objections.

"An ecological system that is less stable is more liable to collapse," says Dr. Gerald A. Cole, a professor of zoology at Arizona State University. "This is an ecological principle that seems to hold true down the line. Why are the deer in trouble? We don't know. Have we done something we don't even know about?"

"When you start managing the species you're creating strange fluctuations. A lot of things die, and what, precisely, does happen? Are soil and vegetation affected? At this point, there is no way of any honest appraisal."

As one vivid example, Dr. Cole pointed to a problem involving the famous saguaro cactus, the giant cactus that is so identified with the Arizona desert. Today, he says, they do not seem to be reproducing and are in danger of extinction.

One reason, he suggests, is that an increase in the rodent population causes them to become increasingly destructive in eating the roots and seeds of the cactus.

Other critics of the poison program make these points: that it is bound to damage the entire wildlife system, and eventually man will be affected; that it makes better sense to upgrade the environment instead of degrading it; that the day of the frontier long has passed, and with it comes a recognition that wildlife should be preserved on esthetic grounds alone.

Finally, they say, the government itself in a study report submitted to the then Interior Secretary Stewart Udall in 1964 recommended against the use of 1080 poison. More hostile critics charge the government bureaucracy with continuing to use it for a baser reason—to perpetuate their own jobs.

No one placed the problem in better perspective than Joseph Wood Krutch, who retired after a distinguished career as a New York critic and nature writer to live in the Arizona desert. Krutch, a mild and thoughtful man, sat in the living room of his ranch-house style home in Tucson, looking out across the desert toward the distant mountains, and said quietly, "I'm one who believes in catastrophe."

About wildlife problems, he said, "It's a fairly bad problem everywhere, but Arizona is especially bad. One reason why it's so difficult to do anything about it is people are so naive. They think if the state or federal government spend so much money employing so many people it must be important."

"But lots of time it's really a case of vested interests, people protecting their own jobs. The same thing is true throughout our society."

"What it comes down to is this: Science and technology are creating more problems than they're solving—and yet we go right on with it."

Krutch reflected on the changes he has witnessed since coming to the desert. "Twenty years ago in Tucson those mountains would have stood out as if they were only two blocks away, and the sky was brilliant and clear. Now its beginning to look like Los Angeles."

He ended on a gloomy note.

"This may be the end of our civilization. It's going to be either catastrophe or a new civilization, either collapse or change."

He might have added that when it comes to a question of predators, one familiar figure still stands at the head of the list. Man.

## TRIBUTE TO BRAVE PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join other Members of the House today in paying tribute to the brave people of Lithuania on the 52d anniversary of their declaration of independence. Unfortunately, the Lithuanian people are now captives of communism, and this great holiday is forbidden by their present Red tyrants.

Therefore, on this great historic day for Lithuanians, we must rededicate ourselves to efforts to see that freedom is restored to these brave people and all the other captives of communism.

After 123 years of czarist Russian occupation, the Lithuanians declared their independence on February 16, 1918, and instituted a democratic republic. This government flourished for 22 years, but Lithuania was forcibly seized by the Soviet Union in 1940 and has been under Communist rule since that time.

As we know, Mr. Speaker, in recent years numerous documents of protest against the suppression of basic human rights by the Soviet regime have reached the Western World. The courage of those who openly defy the Soviet police for national, political, and religious causes, as well as the breadth of such protests, indicate the existence of important subterranean processes of erosion and ferment in contemporary Soviet society. Significantly such protests are not restricted to the liberal intelligentsia in Moscow, but have appeared in the periphery among the nations incorporated into the Soviet empire.

A few weeks ago another significant evidence of protest was received in the form of an appeal of 40 priests of the Vilnius diocese to the Soviet Premier Kosygin against the deliberate persecution and destruction of the Catholic Church in Lithuania. The document is the most authentic evidence of the real status of religious rights in Lithuania, which are formally guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution, but which are openly violated by the Soviet authorities. But perhaps even more important, this document shows the continuing viability of the struggle for basic human rights despite more than a quarter of a century of efforts to eradicate national and religious consciousness in Lithuania.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I insert with my remarks the translation of the declaration by the Priests of the Catholic Church in Lithuania to the chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers which is an extremely eloquent document meriting our review:

#### DECLARATION

(By the Priests of the Catholic Church in Lithuania)

In his article "To the Country Poor", Lenin, generalizing the tasks of the social democratic party, wrote: "Social democrats demand that every person must have full liberty to freely profess any religion" (*Writings*, vol. 6, Vilnius, 1961, p. 364).

By criticizing the government of the czar and the means it used against those who had different beliefs, Lenin wrote: "Every person must have full freedom not only to profess any religion he wants, but also to publicize and change his faith . . . this is a matter of conscience and let no one dare to interfere in these matters" (*Writings of Lenin*, vol. 6, Moscow, 1946).

The USSR Constitution guarantees to its citizens freedom to practice any religion. The laws of the Soviet Union will defend the rights of the faithful to practice their religious rites. Article 143 of the Penal Law speaks about the penalties, if anyone interferes in the exercise of these rights. But in reality it is not so. The laws which protect the rights of the faithful are broken without any consideration. The Catholic Church in Lithuania is condemned to die. The facts speak about this. If in 1940 there were four seminaries for priests in Lithuania and about 1,500 priests, then after 1944 there was only one seminary left, in Kaunas. About 400 seminarians used to flock to it from all the dioceses. In 1946, in the very midst of the school year, only 150 seminarians were permitted to stay. During the last few years, in all the five courses in the seminary, the limit is 30 seminarians. If a seminarian leaves or gets sick, no one is allowed to take his place. About 30 priests die in Lithuania every year, but only 5-6 are ordained. This year (1969) only three new priests were ordained. Already, at this time, many priests have to serve in two parishes. There is a good number of parishes where the pastor is 70 years old. Even invalids have to serve as pastors, for instance, in Turmantal.

Young people who want to enter the seminary meet many more difficulties than those who intend to go to other schools of higher education. The candidates are not chosen by the representatives of the Church, but by the officials of the government. This is not normal. What would we say if candidates for music would be selected by veterinarians or other specialists?

In January of 1969 the priests of the diocese of Vilkauskis addressed themselves to the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers concerning this abnormal situation in the interdiocesan seminary in Kaunas. During the month of February of the same year they contacted the still active bishops and administrators of the dioceses about this same matter. Because of these moves, two priests, Rev. S. Tamkevicius and Rev. J. Sdepskis, lost their work certificates. They had to seek other work, they cannot perform their priestly duties.

In 1940 there were 12 bishops in Lithuania, today there are only two left: bishop Matulaitis-Labukas, born in 1894, and bishop J. Pletkus, born in 1895. Two still effective and able bishops: J. Steponavicius (for 9 years) and V. Sladkevicius (more than 10 years) have been deported to far away parishes (house arrest, tr.). Although according to Articles 62-69 of the Penal Code deportation is foreseen only for five years and that for grave offenses, but what have our shepherds done, without any court action or proven guilt, to be punished for an indeterminate time?

From time immemorial Vilnius is the center of religious life, but today this city is not allowed to have its bishop, even though other smaller religious communities, for instance, the Orthodox, have their bishop, and others some equivalent religious leader.

According to the Church Canon Law, the capitular vicars are only temporary administrators who are chosen when a bishop dies or leaves the office. The archdiocese of Vilnius and the diocese of Panevezys now have been administered by capitular vicars for 9 years, and that of Kaunas for 23 years.

It is not always, even for those who have official authorization, that the bishops and administrators are permitted to visit the par-

ishes and confer the Sacrament of Confirmation according to the canons of the Church. In the dioceses of Panevezys this sacrament has been conferred only once since 1961. In other dioceses it is permitted to be conferred only in the centers, for instance in Vilnius, Kaunas, but very rarely in the regional cities. Those who want to receive the Sacrament of Confirmation have to travel from distant places, endure all the hardships with their small children. Thus great pressures and difficulties are created.

The pastoral work of the priests is being hindered in a number of ways: one is not allowed to help the neighboring parishes in religious services nor to invite the necessary number of priests on special occasions of devotion. The faithful who want to confess have to wait for a long time, suffer inconvenience and lose much of their precious time. On special days of devotion in some churches about 1000 people come for confession. If only three minutes would be given to each penitent, one priest would have to hear confessions for 50 hours, and this is impossible.

Specialists in all fields come together for conferences to perfect themselves and learn from the experiences of others. The Church Canon Law also requires that the priests should make a three day retreat at least every three years. Such retreats at this time are forbidden not only at the diocesan centers, but also in the deaneries: even priests of one deanery are not permitted to get together.

Official representatives of the government (delegate of the government for religious affairs, leaders of the regions and districts) give various directives to the priests only by word of mouth. It happens that these orders contradict one another. For instance, a representative of the executive committee's chairman of the Varena region forbade the pastor of Valkininkai to accompany the burial procession to the cemetery, while an agent for religious affairs instructed that the priest can go to the cemetery, but he cannot do the same from the home to the church. On April 15, 1969 an agent for religious affairs in Svencionellai, in the presence of government officials and the members of the church committee, told the pastor that when there is a priest in the procession of the deceased no hymns are allowed, but this can be done without the priests. If a person is buried with religious rites, an orchestra is not permitted; collective farms and organizations cannot help materially.

Catholics in Lithuania cannot avail themselves of the freedom of the press for their religious needs. They cannot make use of the radio and television, of movie theaters, schools, lectures. We do not possess even the most elementary religious textbook, prayerbook or other religious writings. During the Russian occupation not even one catechism was printed. Only in 1955 and 1958 a Catholic prayerbook was printed and in 1968 a liturgical prayerbook. But both of the editions had a very limited number of copies so that only a few families could acquire them. Besides, the liturgical prayerbook was supposed to include a short explanation of the truths of the faith, but the delegate for religious affairs would not allow this to be printed. The priests and the churches received only one copy of the Roman Catholic Ritual and documents of Vatican II were available only for the priests, one copy each. The faithful did not even have a chance to see these books.

Although the USSR Constitution guarantees freedom of conscience, and parents do want and request that their children would be educated in a religious spirit, the priests and the catechists, however, are forbidden to prepare children for their First Communion. The delegate for religious affairs allows the children to be examined only singly. Those who do not follow this unwritten law are severely punished. For instance, the government officials have fined Rev. J. Fabijanskas

for catechization; Rev. M. Gyls and Rev. J. Sdepskis were sent to a forced labor camp. In Anykscial Miss O. Paskeviciute prepared children for their first confession. For this she was deported to a forced labor camp, where there followed her overexhaustion, sickness and death. Parents themselves have the right to prepare their children, but they have no means: they are not prepared for this job, have no time for religious books. In like manner, during the czar's reign, workers and serfs could not make use of the right: to give their children higher education.

Children who frequent the church experience much abuse. They are made fun of, wall bulletins write about them. In schools, children are constantly being taught that religious parents are backward, have no knowledge and can give them no directives. Thus the authority of the parents is destroyed. When children cease to respect their parents, it is difficult to control them both in the school and outside its walls. Besides, religiously minded children are not allowed to take active part in the liturgy, sing in the choir, participate in processions, serve Mass. Thus the rights of the faithful children and parents are severely violated. They are harshly discriminated, coerced and forced to compromise others. For instance, on the 26th of December, 1967, the secondary school Director Baranauskas and other teachers in Svencionellai kept the II-VI class students for two hours and a half until they forced them to write letters against the local pastor Rev. Laurinavicius. For one of those youngsters, J. Galla, an ambulance had to be called because of the threats. Second class student K. Jermalis was sick for a couple of months because of fear. The pastor, who allowed the children to serve Mass and participate in a procession, was removed from Svencionellai. The offended parents of those children turned to Moscow. How much time was lost, expenses incurred, health impaired? Just recently Rev. A. Deltuva was fined 50 rubles because he allowed the children to serve Mass.

According to the law, the convictions of one who believes and one who does not should equally be respected, but the practice goes its own way. In many hospitals, for instance, in Vilnius, Utena, Pasvalys, Anykscial, even when sick people ask to receive the sacraments, their request is refused. In 1965 a driver, K. Semenas, and Miss B. Sudekyte married in the Church. By this act they lost their previous grant of a piece of land where they were going to build a house. Notwithstanding the fact that all the material was bought for the construction, they were told: "Let the priest give you land."

In Pasvalys, Anykscial and other places, even taxicabs, cannot bring the witnesses of the marrying couple to the church. There is much suffering for the intellectuals who secretly baptize their children, marry or attend Mass in the church. These facts are brought up at their work, often they are reprimanded or even lose their jobs. For instance, in 1965 Miss P. Cicenaitė, a school teacher in Daugelis, was released from her work by the school director because she would not forsake the church. When the school officials told her to leave, she, wishing to have her book "clean", wrote a request to be released from work. Often the faithful are released from work or are punished because of their convictions, covering this fact with some other motives.

In 1956 the Pension Act bypassed the servants of the church. Organists and sacristans can only dream about pensions. For instance, Mr. P. Pagalskas joined a collective farm when the Soviets came to Lithuania. As all other citizens, he delivered his horse and farming tools to the authorities. He was working in the office of a collective farm as an accountant, on Sundays he used to play the organ in the church. When he had the misfortune to get sick and became an invalid

and could not work in the office, he night-watched the animals on a collective farm. When he reached old age (b. in 1889), he applied to the Social Welfare Office of the Ignalina Region. An answer came back from his office that organists do not receive any pension.

Many of the churches are not allowed to ring bells, use loudspeakers or any other technical means. Materials are not allotted for the upkeep of the churches. The cities are growing, but since 1945 only two churches have been built in Lithuania (one of which, in Klaipeda, has been turned into a music hall), many older churches are serving as storage places, museums and so forth.

These and many other painful facts which we have mentioned here show that the priests and the faithful are discriminated against and they cannot fully use those rights which the USSR Constitution guarantees them.

Consequently, we have dared to address ourselves to you, Mr. Chairman of the USSR Ministers, hoping that you will correct this unnatural situation of the Catholic Church in the Lithuanian SSR and see to it that we, the Lithuanian priests and faithful, as all other citizens do, will be able to exercise the rights as they are foreseen in the Constitution.

Signed by the Priests from the archdiocese of Vilnius: 40 signatures, August, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude my remarks I would like to add a memorandum which was prepared by the Lithuanian American Community of the U.S.A. which spells out in a very effective manner the present day circumstances in Lithuania and very properly points out the positive steps that can be taken on behalf of the suffering people of the brave country of Lithuania:

The memorandum follows:

A SEVEN-CENTURY QUEST FOR FREEDOM  
(Brave Lithuania)

CHICAGO, ILL., FEBRUARY 1970.

During the month of February, Lithuanian-Americans will be commemorating the 719th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251 and the 52nd anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania which took place on February 16, 1918. But this celebration of Lithuania's Independence Day will not be similar to American celebration of the Fourth of July. It will contain no note of joy, no jubilant tone of achievement and victory. On the contrary, the observance will be somber, sorrowful, underlined with the grim accent of defeat and tragedy. For Lithuania has lost its independence, and today survives only as a captive nation behind the Iron Curtain.

The Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania and other Baltic States by legal or democratic processes. The Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by force of arms in June of 1940. The Kremlin is fond of saying that Russian imperialism died with the czar. But the fate of the Baltic nations—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—shows this to be a cruel fiction.

The Lithuanians are a proud people who have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic from time immemorial. Their language is the oldest in Europe today. They were united into a State more than 700 years ago, and by the 15th century their nation extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea and almost to the gates of Moscow. Their fortunes gradually declined and the nation was completely taken over by Russia in 1795.

The intensive and determined struggle for freedom and independence from Czaristic Russia was climaxed on February 16, 1918, by the Declaration of the Lithuanian National



Council, proclaiming the restoration of the Independence of Lithuania.

The February Sixteenth Declaration was unanimously approved by the freely elected Constituent Assembly in 1920. Thus, following the will of the Lithuanian people, the re-establishment of an Independent State of Lithuania, with its capitol in the city of Vilnius was accomplished. A diplomatic recognition by many free countries followed. On September 22, 1921, Lithuania was received as a bona fide member of the League of Nations, thereby Lithuania became a member of the international community of sovereign nations. A full diplomatic recognition by the United States of America on July 28, 1922, was followed soon, also with de jure recognition, by other world powers—Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan.

Soviet Russia recognized de jure the Independence of Lithuania in 1920, and on July 12th of the same year signed a peace treaty with Lithuania which stated that:

"The Soviet Union recognizes the sovereignty and independence of the Lithuanian State with all the juridical rights associated with such a declaration, and forever renounces, in good faith, all Russian sovereign rights, which it previously had in regards to Lithuanian Nation and its territory."

The re-establishment of an Independent State of Lithuania and her return to the self-governing community of nations is the most significant historical event of the Twentieth Century for the Lithuanian Nation, whose political maturity, economic achievements and cultural creativity were manifested during the period of restored Independence (1918-1940).

During the Second World War, the Republic of Lithuania became a victim of Soviet Russia's and Nazi Germany's conspiracy and aggression, and as a result of secret agreements between those two powers of August 23rd and September 28th, 1939, became invaded and occupied by Soviet Russian armed forces on June 15, 1940.

Since the days of Soviet Russian occupation, however, the Lithuanian people have waged an intensive fight for freedom. During the period between 1944 and 1952 alone, some 30,000 freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the invaders. Hundreds of thousands of others were imprisoned or driven to Siberia. Though that resistance movement was weakened and finally subdued due to a failure to get any material aid from the West, nevertheless, the Lithuanian people are continuing their passive resistance against Soviet Russian genocidal aggression to this very day.

The United States of America, mindful of its own struggle for freedom and independence, has remained sensitive to the aspirations of other people for self-determination. For this reason, Americans of Lithuanian descent are grateful to the Government of the United States for denouncing the Soviet Russian aggression in Lithuania and for refusal to recognize the alien subjugation of Lithuania since 1940. The United States continues recognizing the sovereignty of Lithuania. The Lithuanian Legation at Washington, D.C., Consulates General in New York, Los Angeles, Chicago and a Consulate in Boston are recognized and are functioning.

Recently the United States Congress passed H. Con. Res. 416 that calls for freedom for the Baltic States. All freedom-loving Americans should urge the President of the United States to implement this legislation by bringing up the question of the liberation of the Baltic States in the United Nations and urging the Soviets to withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

Thus, on the occasion of the 719th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state, and the 52nd anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania, the

Lithuanian-American Community of the USA, Inc., representing all Lithuanian-Americans throughout the nation, most fervently appeals to the representatives of the Federal, State and local governments, religious leaders, labor unions, civil, political and professional organizations, academic and cultural institutions, news media and to the people of good will, to support the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for self-determination and to national independence in their own country.

The free world can never rest in peace, knowing that in Lithuania under Soviet Russia rule, genocide and Russification are common place, religious persecution is prevalent, and basic human freedoms and rights are denied to the Lithuanian people.

LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COMMUNITY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.

## CHICAGO'S PROPOSED LAKE AIRPORT—II

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1970, I made some remarks concerning the proposal to build in Lake Michigan Chicago's third major airport.

Last winter, Prof. Stanley Berge and his graduate students in transportation management at Northwestern University's Graduate School of Business Administration studied the problems of the location, access, and financing of Chicago's third major airport. The report's general conclusion was that Chicago's next major airport should not be constructed in Lake Michigan but should be located 35 to 45 miles south of Chicago's "Loop" on what is now relatively flat farmland.

Since several of my colleagues have indicated an interest in the problems surrounding the location of Chicago's next airport, I commend to their attention the report's abstract of findings and conclusions. The abstract follows:

[Northwestern University Graduate School of Business Administration, transportation management research project, winter, 1968-69]

AIRPORT LOCATION, ACCESS, AND FINANCING—WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE CHICAGO REGION: ABSTRACT OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

(By Prof. Stanley Berge)

### LOCATION

1. The general consensus at the conclusion of the 10-week study was that Chicago's next major regional airport should be located 35 to 45 miles south of the "loop" on what is now relatively flat farmland in eastern Will County or partially in Will and Kankakee Counties.

2. The most important factor influencing the choice of this south suburban area for a major airport is the provision of adequate airspace separation to facilitate safety and efficiency in air traffic control for the new airport in conjunction with the continued operation of O'Hare International Airport.

3. Representatives of the class were advised by FAA air traffic controllers at O'Hare that to establish desired separation between major airports in a common terminal area (for holding areas, vectoring and final ILS approach patterns) a new major Chicago regional airport should not be located closer

than 40 miles from O'Hare and preferably not closer than 50 miles. While a dynamic simulation study is being conducted by the Federal Aviation Administration which should shed further light on the question of air traffic separation in the Chicago region, the class, for the present, is impressed that the airport separation standards suggested by the O'Hare traffic controllers should be taken seriously.

4. Atmospheric conditions, such as relative freedom from fog, smoke and heavy snowfall, favor the choice of the south suburban area over an airport site located in Lake Michigan. Maximum visibility during final IFR approaches to runways is still considered to be a vital requirement of aviation safety by airline pilots consulted by the class during the study. While concerted efforts are being made to permit automated all-weather commercial aircraft landings in the 1970's, the present state of instrumentation suggests that we are still uncertain with respect to the achievement of this goal by 1975—the date by which it is believed that a new major airport for this region will be greatly needed.

5. Since the flow of air traffic into and out of the Chicago terminal area is essentially East-West, it is desirable that the new airport, Midway Airport and O'Hare Field should be oriented roughly North-South to minimize conflicting approach and takeoff patterns for the three airports.

6. Since the advent of jet aircraft, noise abatement procedures have been widely employed at major airports. For the sake of maximum flight safety and optimum use of airspace it is desirable to minimize noise abatement procedures. This can be done only if the airport is well removed from built-up residential areas and if surrounding lands are carefully zoned against incompatible uses—possibilities which still exist in portions of Will and Kankakee Counties which are nevertheless relatively close to the Chicago "loop" in terms of travel time.

7. Population growth trends as well as prospective industrial and commercial development south and southwest of Chicago projected by the Northwestern Illinois Planning Commission favor the location of a new regional airport south or southwest of the city to balance and to relieve the pressure on O'Hare. NIPCC expects Will County to grow more rapidly in the future than any other part of the six-county metropolitan area.

8. Present Illinois statutes permit a major city, such as Chicago, to acquire non-contiguous land for an airport. Existing Illinois laws also permit political subdivisions owning or controlling airports to prevent the creation of airport hazards by adopting zoning regulations within an area not exceeding two miles from the airport boundary. These provisions should facilitate acquisition of open land and appropriate zoning to insure compatible surrounding land uses for Chicago's third major regional airport.

9. To provide room for expansion to accommodate projected growth of air passenger and cargo traffic and to develop compatible surrounding land uses as income sources an airport having an area of approximately 25 square miles would appear necessary to meet only minimal needs (more than twice the area of O'Hare). Such a large area would be difficult and very costly to create as an island airport in Lake Michigan but is still available in the open lands south which are within approximately one hour's driving time from the "loop."

10. With the continuing outward march of suburban growth the "open lands" south of Chicago in Will and Kankakee Counties will not long remain unobstructed and available at low cost for a major regional airport. Studies leading to public acquisition of a desirable land site should not be put off pending continuing studies of the feasibility of a site in Lake Michigan.

11. The time required to construct a major regional airport on an open land site in the south suburban area would appear to permit it to be operational within five years, or by 1975, assuming a beginning is made without delay. It is highly improbable that a lake site and suitable access facilities could be made operational in time to accommodate the expected heavy aeronautical demands of the mid-1970's.

12. Growing general aviation requirements make it highly desirable to maintain both Meigs Field and Midway Airport as conveniently located general aviation facilities. This would be difficult if not impossible if a major regional airport were to be located with its center 8½ miles off 55th Street in Lake Michigan.

#### ACCESS

1. Because of the wide dispersion of air traveler origins and destinations in the Chicago region, the private automobile is likely to continue to be the dominant mode of access to airports. It will nevertheless be desirable to develop auxiliary access services by helicopter, V/STOL and high-speed rail to accommodate major corridor movements such as between distant high capacity airports and the Chicago central business district.

2. A major airport in the south suburban area would be conveniently served by four existing interstate expressway routes (I 57, I 80, I 294 and I 94). Additional highway access may be provided by the planned Will-Cook Freeway extending west from I 65 in Indiana to Frankfort and north to the Tri-State Tollway at Burr Ridge.

3. From the standpoint of surface access, the proposed lake site poses a serious congestion problem. Not only would highway and rail access be expensive and difficult to achieve but they would create additional rush hour congestion in or near the central business district where rush hour congestion is already critical.

4. Congestion could be reduced and portal-to-portal time improved for air travelers, airport employees and air cargo by "remoting" many of the time-consuming, space-consuming functions of the airport along a high-speed rail line. Parking, ticketing, baggage check-in and many air cargo functions could be removed at least to some extent from the airport and performed at one or more transportation centers or transfer points located on a high-speed rail line.

5. While to date rail access experience in England, Belgium and Japan has been only moderately successful, reported results of the new Cleveland Rapid Transit airport connection opened in November 1968 have been encouraging.

6. A high-speed rail access line should be as direct a route as possible, have no grade crossings and have an alignment as free as possible from grades and curvature. The Illinois Central right-of-way closely approaches these criteria between downtown Chicago and a potential airport site 35 to 45 miles south. In addition to electrified suburban service tracks, the railroad has two slightly used "passenger mains" (not presently electrified) extending southward almost 30 miles from Central Station. These tracks could be dedicated to high-speed airport access use, employing specially equipped multiple-unit electric cars.

7. Air shuttle to and from major regional airports will become more attractive as improvements in helicopter and V/STOL craft reduce seat-mile costs, which are still relatively high. Heliport and V/STOL port sites at convenient locations will be needed.

8. Because of its geographical location Chicago has always been and probably will continue to be a major point of air transportation interchange. O'Hare International Airport is rather unusual among major U.S. airports in having nearly half of its passengers transferring or continuing their journey by air. Assuming a wide choice of connect-

ing carriers, it would appear possible to relieve O'Hare's air traffic congestion to a considerable extent by providing attractive interchange services at a south suburban airport. Interchange passengers are not concerned with proximity to the "loop."

#### FINANCING

1. Estimates by Harza Engineering Company and Real Estate Research Corporation suggest that a 12,000-acre airport site with its center 8½ miles out in Lake Michigan would involve an investment cost of more than \$500 million, inclusive of access roadway and shoreline interconnections.<sup>1</sup> This represents an estimated cost of nearly \$42,000 per acre.

2. Open farm land sufficiently extensive and with suitable characteristics for a major regional airport development is currently available in eastern Will County at prices ranging from \$800 to \$1000 per acre. Even after considering appreciation, demolition and grading, relocation of existing roads and utilities, etc. It appears that the cost of a 16,000-acre site in Green Garden Township or in the Peotone area would be less than one-fourth as much as the cost of a 12,000-acre site in Lake Michigan.

3. The principal costs (site plus improvements) for a lake airport of 12,000 acres are estimated to be approximately at least \$900 million. Assuming it could be financed by 40-year tax-free revenue bonds, as in the case of O'Hare, the annual debt repayment, assuming an interest rate of 6 percent and a requirement of 125 percent coverage of annual interest and principle requirements, would be approximately \$75 million per year. Thus over a 30-year period the total investment cost of a lake airport could amount to \$2,244,000,000.<sup>2</sup>

4. A land site in the south suburban area of 16,000 acres (or 25 square miles) plus airport improvements should not involve principal costs in excess of \$500 million. This plus debt service at 6 percent (\$24 million per year) would bring the total investment to \$1,260,000,000. Thus it appears that a land airport of considerably larger size can be developed for nearly a billion dollars less than the total investment cost over 30 years involved in the development of an airport in Lake Michigan.

5. Currently the financial burden of initial airport financing in the United States is being borne primarily by local governments, who are in turn being underwritten by the airlines (and to some extent by general aviation). The Federal government contributes about 20 percent of initial cost, and the local governments about 80 percent.

6. The Office of the Comptroller, City of Chicago reports that for the year ending Dec. 31, 1967 O'Hare International Airport collected \$27.6 million in total revenues (\$18.5 million in rentals, concession income and utility sales, \$7.6 million in flight fees less ramp rental credits and \$1.5 million from interest on investments). Variable expenses amounted to \$10.1 million, leaving \$17.5 million available for fixed charges. Since fixed charges (interest, principal and reserve requirements) for the year amounted to only \$12.5 million, they were well covered in 1967.

7. With O'Hare now operating at virtually full capacity and having less than \$18 million available for fixed charges in 1967, it is evident that financing a lake airport calling for \$75 million in annual debt service will present a major financial problem. Such considerations greatly enhance the advantages

<sup>1</sup> This estimate includes only \$75 million for "access highway system improvements which would be required to serve the lake site" which may be inadequate to cover the cost of such facilities.

<sup>2</sup> Current rates for tax-exempt airport revenue bonds are approximately 6 percent. O'Hare Airport revenue bond covenants now call for 125 percent annual coverage of interest and principal requirements.

of a south suburban land site where annual fixed charges should not exceed \$42 million.

8. The U.S. scheduled airlines, with a total net worth of \$3.1 billion, have ordered \$10 billion in flight and ground equipment up to 1975 and have indicated that they will spend nearly \$2 billion more for their own facility improvements at airports prior to 1975. The airline industry's rate of return on investment fell from 9½ percent in 1967 to 6 percent in 1968. In the face of their own financial problems, it is not surprising that the airlines, speaking through the Air Transport Association, feel that they cannot continue to guarantee local airport bonds to the extent necessary to meet future airport needs. They are therefore urging the passage of Federal legislation to create an aviation trust fund financed by a 2 percent tax on domestic airline tickets and a \$2.00 tax on every enplaning international passenger.

9. The trend is clearly away from general fund or general obligation bond financing of major airports. In the future it appears that airport development will be financed by taxes levied on airport users—either directly or indirectly. Airport users therefore have a major interest in airport financing and in the comparative investment costs involved in alternative development projects.

10. Any proposal for a third Chicago airport site should consider the requirements for future expansion. Excess acquisition at the outset can provide for future expansion without having to pay the price of the increased value of the land after the airport is constructed. After providing for expansion of such facilities as new runways and hangars, passenger and freight terminals, fueling facilities, parking needs, etc., planning should include in the excess acquisition project the areas which will be most adversely affected by aircraft noise. Areas of excess "noise pollution" may be profitably set aside for the development of compatible commercial and industrial uses. Such development could become an important source of funds for the agency developing the airport. Land in the vicinity of O'Hare has been developed and sold with improvements (streets, sewers and water) for from 90c to \$1.50 per square foot, representing a net return of more than \$40,000 per acre, for industrial development, after estimated development costs. Thus the initial acquisition of a large area of open land offers an opportunity to provide for expansion, insure compatible surrounding land uses and at the same time provide substantial funds for payment of the costs of acquiring the site and constructing Chicago's next major airport.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE ANNIVERSARY

#### HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians throughout the world are observing today the 52d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania.

Although their homeland has been subjugated since 1940 by Communist rule, Lithuanians cherish the memory of freedom and nurture the hope for eventual liberation.

As a free man who was profoundly shaken upon visiting the Berlin Wall, and dismayed by the wanton invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union in 1968, I share the hopes of the free world that liberty will thrive again in Lithu-



ania and the other captive nations. I sincerely hope for the restoration of their national identity and their right to achieve their own destiny.

The Lithuanian American Council is an American civic organization dedicated to the ideal of peaceful restoration of freedom to these nations. I want to take this opportunity to extend to the council and to all Lithuanians my best wishes for success in their difficult and sometimes heartbreaking task.

Their unbroken spirit is a spark of light in the darkness of tyranny.

**YOUNG WORLD DEVELOPMENT GROUPS—THEY WALK FOR A BETTER WORLD**

**HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I have only lately become aware of the activities and ambitions of the Young World Development groups—the youth arm of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation.

These are the young people of whom Mr. SCHWENDEL and other Members spoke, here in this Chamber, on January 28th of this year, and I regret that it happened to be impossible for me to participate in the discussion of their efforts that day that Mr. SCHWENDEL led during the special order hour that he had obtained for that purpose.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I wish now to also take formal note of the highly commendable work of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation in furtherance of a goal we all share in common—to eliminate hunger and malnutrition in this country, and abroad.

As I understand it, the purpose of this nonprofit, nonsectarian organization that is supported wholly through contributions is to work to develop public awareness and greater understanding of the existence and causes of hunger and malnutrition not only here in the United States—a paradox in view of our affluence—but also elsewhere in the world. One way it has sought to accomplish this—and a dramatic way it is, indeed—is through sponsoring so-called "Walks for Development," in which by now over 10,000 persons, many of them enthusiastic young people, have participated in numerous areas around the Nation, including the Washington area last year.

But, spreading out from this sort of a beginning, has been an awakening of a desire on the part of some of our finest young people to go on further, in constructive ways, to involve themselves in the great search for solutions to other challenges we face—to the development of action programs aimed at such other problems as those posed by our abuse of the environment around us, a topic of growing concern to us all, the causes and cures for conditions of poverty, in general, and, of especial significance for it bears heavily on our ability to truly solve any of these other problems, the question of overpopulation.

These young people can, through channeling their enthusiasm, their sense of dedication to a better America and a better world, and, yes, even their obvious impatience, into constructive efforts utilizing the orderly processes of our governmental and political system—which, despite all its obvious failings, is still the best such system ever devised—become a great force for good.

I am particularly pleased to note that this movement is now reaching into the congressional district I serve. I have, for instance, been recently informed by letter from Mr. Tracy N. Price, of 12 Division St., Binghamton, N.Y., that a "Walk for Development" is being planned in the Whitney Point, N.Y., Central School District area, the event now scheduled to take place on Sunday, April 26, 1970. I commend Mr. Price and his coworkers for having undertaken such a project and I hope it will be successful.

Similarly, I have had letters from both Mr. William F. West and Mr. Scott D. Kantor, both students at Cornell University at Ithaca, N.Y., in my district, advising me that they attended the second national conference of the Young World Development organization at Chicago last month, had listened there to Mr. SCHWENDEL and others who spoke to them and then, later, discussed with them some of the great issues that concern them—not always, of course, finding consensus about the details of the kind of new and better programs the people of this Nation must undertake in these areas for action, but finding that there is little, if any, disagreement among any of us as to the goals to be served.

I anticipate hearing further from these two Cornell students concerning what they might endeavor to do in the Ithaca area—and I am pleased to tell them, in advance, that I will be glad to do all I properly can to be of assistance to them.

In closing these remarks, let me take note, Mr. Speaker, as did Mr. SCHWENDEL several weeks ago here, that one of the major ambitions of this group of young people is to help in, the creation of a world free from hunger, environmental abuse and overpopulation, the fight for which—they demand—must be fought and won."

None of us, here, would disagree with that purpose, nor take issue with their sense of determination; and most of us here, I am sure, will understand and welcome the demands they may now make upon us, in our positions of collective responsibility, for new and more effective Federal programs, adequately funded, and zeroing in on hunger, malnutrition, poverty, environmental abuse and overpopulation. We, in and out of government, must now undertake to make sure that government does its full share in encouraging solutions and in providing the leadership that has so largely hitherto been absent in these crucial areas. But these young people should, I think, not make the mistake of concentrating solely on Federal solutions to the problems that concern them so seriously. For there is much they, themselves, can do in their own separate communities—through their enthusi-

asm, their impatience with the innate slowness of government, and yes, through their own physical labors.

As an example of what I have in mind, let me just tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that not long ago I received a series of letters from, I would judge, members of a junior high school class in one of the cities of my district. The students had evidently been encouraged by their teacher to write to me, in their own way, to express their concern about the various forms of pollution they saw around them. In any event, a fair number of them—living as they do, and as I do, along the banks of the once beautiful Susquehanna River—expressed their disgust at the amount of debris and trash that now litters its banks in too many areas. They asked me what I was going to do about it—and in some cases with some rather obvious displeasure with me over the fact that I had, somehow personally, allowed such an unsightly and unhealthy condition to develop. I answered as best I could—and, believe me, I did not mind at all their taking their collective frustrations out on me. In part I suppose that is what I am here for. But the thing that did disturb me, Mr. Speaker, is that none of them—despite their high motivation, their obvious concern, and their desire for somebody to do something—recognized the fact that here was a perfect place for them to begin, personally, to apply their youthful vigor and determination for a better world, by organizing a volunteer brigade of young people to clean up their own river banks in their own community.

Mr. Speaker, obviously there is much to be done—the problems we face, together, are difficult but not, one has to believe, insurmountable. By working together—young and old—they can and will be solved.

**LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY**

**HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to observe the 52d anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It was on this date in 1918 that the declaration of independence of Lithuania was proclaimed in Vilnius, its capital.

Unfortunately, independence was short lived as this valiant nation was overrun by the Nazi hordes early in World War II and remained under such rule for 2 years when the German reign of terror was replaced by Soviet domination, which has remained until today.

Although the U.S.S.R. has unilaterally proclaimed Lithuania as a component Soviet republic, the free world knows full well that the Lithuanians have not been bowed in spirit. While they suffer under Russian tyranny, the spirit of independence and liberty beats strong among these courageous and industrious people.

I join with men of good will throughout the world in commemorating Lithu-

ania's declaration of independence and in reaffirming our desire to see it free once again as a full, sovereign member of the family of nations.

**DENTAL CARE FUNDS FOR ILLINOIS VETERANS SHORT NEARLY \$500,000—VETERANS' HOSPITALS UNDERSTAFFED AND UNDERFUNDED**

**HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration is not receiving enough funds to operate a first-class medical program in its 166-hospital system. There are serious staffing deficiencies at many of these hospitals and a number of Vietnam veterans are having to wait for months after they are discharged from the Armed Forces to have their teeth fixed. Based on projected case loads, it is estimated that in Illinois alone almost \$500,000 is currently needed in additional funds to clear up dental treatment backlogs and authorize timely dental care mostly for Vietnam veterans. Some of these ex-servicemen are paying for dental care out of their own pockets rather than wait for the VA.

Mr. Speaker, other day-to-day funding shortages in the VA hospital system are forcing hospital directors to divert funds from maintenance and equipment budgets to pay higher costs of food, drugs, and other medical supplies, and this delays purchase of new equipment to provide up-to-date treatment for our veterans and delays maintenance of hospital facilities. The VA hospital system has an average national staffing ratio of about 1.5 staff for each patient in general medical and surgical hospitals as compared to a 2.72 ratio in general medical community hospitals and State and local hospitals. I believe the ratio in most VA general medical hospitals should be increased to at least two employees for each patient and at least one-for-one ratio in psychiatric hospitals.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee investigation of six Illinois Veterans' Administration hospitals revealed funding deficiencies in fiscal year 1970 of over \$4 million to operate about 6,700 hospital beds serving approximately 1½ million Illinois veterans.

In Illinois, there are two hospitals in the city of Chicago, Research Hospital and West Side Hospital. Hospitals are also located at Danville, Downey, Hines, and Marion.

The investigation being conducted by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee reveals that under the hospital staffing formula which I advocated, Illinois VA hospitals are approximately 1,300 positions short of needed staff. These extra positions would cost about \$12.5 million annually. A few of these positions, particularly physicians and some nursing personnel, would be difficult to recruit at current VA salary rates, but most are recruitable. Illinois VA hospital directors

also reported that community nursing-care programs at their hospitals were underfunded in fiscal year 1970 by over \$1 million, and that more funds were needed for increased dental workloads created primarily by returning Vietnam veterans.

The Illinois VA hospital directors subsequently reported to the congressional committee that supplemental funds in the amount of \$391,422 had been received following review and consideration of their funding deficiencies by VA's Central Office. The community nursing home-care program was allotted \$124,922 to apply against the reported \$1,000,000 deficiency. Supplemental funds totaling \$66,500 were received to alleviate the backlog of free dental authorizations for Vietnam veterans. The balance of the supplemental funding, \$200,000, was to be used to reduce the amount of the fund deficiency for salaries of employees.

Hospital Director Charles M. Turner at VA's Chicago research 500-bed hospital reported that funding was insufficient to fill all of the additional full-time positions that he had been authorized for fiscal year 1970. Approximately \$266,000 more was needed for 28 positions. Turner reported to the Veterans' Affairs Committee that his personnel employment in 1970 would exceed his fiscal year 1969 level as additional positions had been provided for activation of a hemodialysis unit, an intensive-care and a cardiac catheterization laboratory during the second half of fiscal year 1970.

To achieve a minimal staffing ratio of two employees per inpatient at the Research Hospital, Turner reported that 143 additional positions would be needed at an annual cost of almost \$1.4 million. He conceded that a radiologist and pathologist that were needed were probably not recruitable at present VA salary rates, but that most of the positions would be recruitable.

Turner also reported that support personnel such as file clerks, librarians, medical illustrators, supply and house-keeping personnel were presently funded, from the medical care appropriation rather than the medical research budget. A total of eight positions at an annual cost of in excess of \$70,000 were being diverted from patient care activities.

Director Turner reported a shortage of space within the Research Hospital facility. He stated:

Construction of facilities for special medical programs, such as medical, surgical and coronary intensive care units, required diversion of classroom, locker room, patient day rooms, and a portion of the medical library.

He reported the clinical laboratory requires at least 6,000 more square feet of additional space to accommodate the current workload and staff, broaden the laboratory test armamentarium, and to support the school of medical technology. The Chicago Research Hospital subsequently was advised by VA's central office that no additional funds would be received. Accordingly, Director Turner stated they would be unable to fill the 28 positions in the hospital's authorized ceilings.

At Chicago's 500-bed West Side Hospital, Director Dr. Joseph J. Frankel reported funding deficiencies of more than \$1½ million for fiscal year 1970. Most of this was needed to cover approximately 84 on duty staff positions. Dr. Frankel stated that he would divert approximately \$70,000 in equipment and maintenance and repair funds to help meet the deficiencies, and that he had already initiated action beginning July 1, 1969, to defer filling 40 positions which included six doctors, 10 nurses, 15 technicians, three guards, and six others. Dr. Frankel stated he was prepared to fill these vacancies when and if he received supplemental funds during the fiscal year. Dr. Frankel reported to the House Veterans Affairs' Committee that the hospital had received funds for and opened a three-bed intensive coronary care unit. However, he stated they could use at least five additional beds which are specially monitored so that the patient is electronically under the watchful eye of a physician or nurse at all times. The electronic equipment would note any change in vital signs and would immediately notify such personnel to take necessary action. The intensive-care unit would require about eight more personnel at a cost of about \$80,000 to operate the remaining five beds.

Dr. Frankel also stated the hospital could outplace more patients to community nursing homes than was funded by VA central office. He stated with an additional \$96,000 he could maintain an average of 46 patients in community nursing homes rather than the 40 that had been funded. Dr. Frankel also indicated that the hospital's medical care budget was supporting two positions in medical research at a cost of about \$16,000. He stated that 10 more positions were needed at a cost of about \$61,000.

Dr. Frankel also stated:

Because of the increasing demand and cost along with the fact that the Red Cross cannot supply our total needs, we anticipate a deficit of \$15,000 based upon the current rate of spending for blood and blood products.

Dr. Frankel reported that to achieve a minimal 2.0 ratio of staff for each inpatient at the VA's West Side Hospital would require more than 200 more employees at a cost in excess of \$2.5 million. He stated that physicians and surgeons, registered nurses, some technicians and some administrative personnel were not recruitable at VA's present salary scales.

Dr. Frankel later advised the committee that:

No additional funds were received to correct any funding or staffing mentioned previously.

He reported that increasing demands for fee basis dental treatments made it necessary to request supplemental funds and that \$66,500 had been received for the balance of fiscal year 1970.

The hospital director at VA's huge Danville VA Psychiatric Hospital reported a deficiency of about \$1 million. Most of this, about \$725,000, was required to maintain 85 on duty employees.

Director Marvin A. Chapman of the 1,500-bed hospital at Danville reported that he has "markedly reduced level of



maintenance, diverted equipment funds, enforced reduced expenditures for supplies and services, halted nonrecurring projects, and has established a month-by-month descending level of employment." Chapman said that unless additional funding support was received it may be necessary to request a reduction of 77 beds to improve space and staff utilization. He stated there was "insufficient funds to staff what we consider to be an adequate level of employment to meet the needs of our patients."

Director Chapman reported to the committee that he began the fiscal year 1970 with 41 patients in community nursing care facilities. Based on the funding received to support this patient load it would be necessary to reduce his assigned average number maintained daily in community nursing homes. He stated \$158,000 "is the amount that would have been required to meet the estimated average daily nursing load for fiscal year 1970."

The Danville VA hospital received a supplemental allotment of funds in January 1970 in the amount of \$170,000 for salaries and \$18,689 for the community nursing care program. Director Chapman advised that the \$170,000 would "sustain current year employment levels." He further stated, however, that:

The accomplishment of non-recurring maintenance and repair projects, purchase of equipment replacements, and additional equipment will not be possible.

Chapman said the \$18,689 for the community nursing care program would permit placement of 10 more veterans during the remainder of the fiscal year.

Dr. William W. Bourke, Director of the Veterans' Administration's largest psychiatric hospital, the 2,487-bed facility at Downey, Ill., reported a funding deficiency of more than \$217,000. All of this amount was needed to cover 26 on duty positions. Dr. Bourke also disclosed in his report to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that an additional \$40,000 was needed to fund five full-time positions in his ceiling for fiscal year 1970.

Dr. Bourke stated that he had deferred filling 25 positions since July 1, 1969, because of lack of funding. These positions included three social workers, one dental hygienist, three therapists, one chemist, nine nursing assistants, seven food service workers, and one pharmacy assistant. Dr. Bourke said:

All of the above positions were eliminated due to funding limitations. While we would like to fill each of these positions, we do not believe that funding during Fiscal Year 1970 will permit filling all of them.

Dr. Bourke stated there were two specialized medical programs that were inadequate in scope or could not be implemented during fiscal year 1970. These were the alcoholic treatment unit which Dr. Bourke said required two more employees, one physician and one social worker, at an annual cost of \$35,000. The other specialized activity was the electron microscopy program which Dr. Bourke reported required eight more positions at an annual cost of \$100,000.

Dr. Bourke reported that he began the fiscal year with 39 patients in commu-

nity nursing homes and that funding support would provide for an average of only 15 during the year. Dr. Bourke stated:

Because of budgetary limitations it will not be possible to place any additional patients in the community nursing homes for the remainder of fiscal year 1970.

He estimated that an average daily community nursing home load of 58 could have been maintained which would have cost an additional \$254,000 during the fiscal year.

The Downey VA hospital is understaffed according to the minimal standard for a psychiatric hospital which I advocate. Dr. Bourke reported that 325 more positions at an annual cost of \$2.6 million would be required to meet the standard. Bourke said that physicians and surgeons and registered nurses would not be recruitable at present VA salary scales and that licensed practical nurses and some physical medicine therapists would be difficult to recruit. Dr. Bourke subsequently advised the congressional committee that the Downey Hospital had received supplemental funding of \$17,043 for the community nursing care program. Dr. Bourke said:

This additional money will enable us to place eight patients for the months of April, May and June. No other funding was received.

Dr. Lee H. Schlesinger, director of the Hines VA hospital, reported a fund deficiency in excess of \$900,000 to operate his 1,500-bed hospital. Over \$600,000 of this fund deficiency was needed to cover 56 full-time positions to avoid staff reductions. Schlesinger stated he had deferred filling 14 positions which were essential since July 1, 1969. Included were one dental assistant, two dietitians, one accountant, two medical technologists, two blind rehabilitation specialists, two clinical psychologists, two medical radiology technicians, one general supply specialist, and one warehouseman. In addition, he anticipated the use of special funding support for equipment additions and replacements and the maintenance and repair of facilities totaling \$195,000 to offset the cost of personnel salaries, the cardiac catheterization laboratory, and the blind rehabilitation center.

Dr. Schlesinger reported to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that he began the fiscal year with 153 patients in the community nursing home care program, and that it would be necessary to reduce the average number of patients maintained to 99 to stay within the funding allotment received. Dr. Schlesinger stated:

Decrease in average daily nursing load is due to lack of funds. Demand for placements increased in fiscal year 1970.

He reported that the hospital could outpace an average of 145 patients in community nursing homes during fiscal year 1970 if sufficient funds were provided.

Dr. Schlesinger also reported to the committee that there were five personnel presently funded from medical care appropriated funds which are being diverted from patient care activities. These

were support personnel such as medical illustration, housekeeping aid, maintenance and repair, and engineering operations. The annual cost of these positions was in excess of \$40,000. He reported six additional support personnel were needed and the fiscal year 1970 cost was about \$20,000.

The Hines VA hospital subsequently received \$60,000 in January 1970 for the community nursing care program according to Dr. Schlesinger. He said this would permit an average daily nursing home care load of 107 for the fiscal year, an increase of eight over the originally planned 99. No other funds were received to alleviate other reported deficiencies.

The director at VA's 176 bed hospital at Marion, Ill., reported a funding deficiency in fiscal year 1970 of more than \$370,000. L. M. Frazier, Jr., hospital director, reported:

During the last 6 months of fiscal year 1970 we may have to reduce: pathologist, nurse-anesthetist, a dietitian, clerk, and not fill a position of chief of staff in order to remain within the present target allowance.

He stated he was short \$133,000 to cover 13 on duty positions and that funding support for the fiscal year did not include \$64,000 for five assigned full time positions in his personnel ceilings.

Frazier said he would divert approximately \$32,000 of additional equipment and maintenance and repair funds to cover unfunded deficiencies of \$22,000 for drugs and about \$10,000 for beneficiary travel.

Frazier also reported to the committee that there were 75 patients in community nursing care facilities on July 1, 1969, but that funding support provided would permit an average load of only 43. He stated the hospital could have made additional outplacements during the fiscal year with additional funding support; an average load of 82 patients could have been maintained with an additional \$238,000.

In order to achieve a minimal staffing ratio of two employees per patient in this general hospital, Frazier reported that 90 additional positions would be needed at an average annual cost of approximately \$850,000. He stated all of the positions necessary, including six physicians and six registered nurses were recruitable.

The Marion VA hospital received supplemental funding support in the amount of \$59,190 in January 1970. Director Frazier stated \$30,000 of the total would be used to cover salaries and other personnel services costs. He said the positions previously reported for abolishment would be funded through the end of the fiscal year "except for the nurse-anesthetist whose position has been declared surplus as of April 15, 1970." Frazier reported the additional \$29,190 for community nursing home care would permit 20 more placements during the year.

Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent need to correct these deficiencies in Illinois VA hospitals. Many of these have been building up for years and cannot be corrected immediately; however, a higher priority must be placed on the VA medical program in the future so as to assure first-class medical care for our veterans.

ARCHITECTS AND ENGINEERS  
CHALLENGING NEW PROBLEMS  
FACING AMERICA

**HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, as an honorary member of the American Institute of Architects, I am honored to announce that architects and engineers from the 50 States and Puerto Rico are in the Nation's Capital today to probe some of the most vexing and challenging problems facing the American people—how to plan the approaching wave of urban growth and at the same time restore clean air, water, and land damaged during the Nation's quick economic advance.

There are numerous signs that protection and enhancement of our environment have become paramount concerns of the public.

A Gallup public opinion poll taken last year showed 73 percent of those questioned as willing to pay additional taxes in order to improve their environment and public pollution.

President Nixon and the Democratic Party, although differing in details and emphasis, are united on the priority status of antipollution measures and the need for a national policy on urbanization.

Today's Public Affairs Conference of the Consulting Engineers Council, with its 2,336 firms, and the American Institute of Architects, with 24,200 members, will focus on these issues.

A successful campaign against pollution and new devices and policies to better control urbanization will depend in large measure on how well architects and engineers can work with citizens, government, private owners, and industry. No campaign can be a success without this necessary teamwork.

Already, architects and engineers are displaying evidence of this teamwork in cities across the Nation.

Design concept team have made significant improvement in planning freeways in Baltimore and Chicago, reducing citizen opposition, avoiding wasteful use of land, and coordinating transportation with housing, schools, commerce, and industry. The teams were composed of engineers, architects, landscape architects, and other professionals plus social scientists and neighborhood organization leaders. They were successful because they had backing from city hall.

As Margaret Mead told a House Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Urban Growth recently:

We are having at every point a demand that the people . . . have the opportunity to say something about the good that is being done them.

Professional teams in heavy consultation with citizens can produce projects that build the social environment and protect the natural habitat.

"We cannot wantonly build new and abandon the old," Rex Whitaker Allen,

FAIA, of San Francisco, president of the AIA, told fellow architects last month at three regional meetings. "Preservation, reconstruction, and rehabilitation must become accepted procedures."

Armed with this new appreciation of the need for renewal and the necessity for community consultation, the professional designers ask the opportunity to help cities, States, and the Federal Government.

A survey by the CEC showed private consulting engineers already have the capability of designing pollution abatement facilities far in excess of the amount budgeted or planned in the next 5 years by the administration.

Both CEC and AIA are stepping up efforts to increase the supply of design professionals and assisting technicians.

The CEC's Colorado plan already has enrolled around 250 engineering and technician trainees around the Nation.

AIA's national organization and chapters, such as the New York component, have announced 5-year drives to add to architectural manpower. AIA is also pledged to gain full academic accreditation for six mostly black schools of architecture to help increase manpower in southern States.

AIA members are helping finance and staff around 20 community design centers in cities as varied as Philadelphia, Cleveland, Nashville, Albuquerque, San Francisco, and Chicago. Donating time, and in some cases equipment, the professionals are working with neighborhood groups on parks, housing, stores, and factory development. The design centers are also offering important alternatives to city plans for highways and other buildings.

In New Mexico, the CEC chapter has voted to support the design center already underway with AIA help, a move the organizations hope will foster similar joint ventures in other cities.

The public education role of the professionals is also receiving new emphasis, an interesting parallel effort to that of congressional committees and the national environment teach-in April 22.

In Seattle, CEC on February 24 will sponsor a public hearing to air facts and recommendations regarding the Interstate 90 link between Mercer Island and Seattle.

In Miami last year the South Florida AIA chapter chartered a boat to invite leading local financiers to consider better planning methods to preserve the fragile ecology of the beautiful region.

On the national level, AIA has established committees of architects, engineers, and planners to help advise school districts on installing environmental awareness courses and to bring alternative environmental protection policies to the political parties in time for their inclusion as national issues in the 1972 presidential campaign.

Meanwhile, Mr. Allen has urged citizens to consider local and State lawsuits to stop pollution. He also suggested to Congress on February 3 the establishment of a joint congressional Committee on the Environment, and a National Pollution Abatement Authority with regulatory powers perhaps comparable to

those granted the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. Allen said:

Americans have been careless with their environment.

The concerns of the speakers and the participants in this Public Affairs Conference will demonstrate that architects and engineers want to join with the Government and the public in an urgent redress of that past carelessness.

FREE KNOWLEDGE PROVES TOO  
COSTLY

**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I am acutely aware of what a significant factor world illiteracy is in the perpetuation of misunderstandings among nations. If we could educate all men we would not only promote brotherhood, but we would firmly establish the foundations for world peace.

One man who shares this philosophy is Mr. Walter Sysak, a constituent of mine from Mineola, N.Y., who has done more than just think about the matter. He has undertaken, for the past 4 years, a one-man crusade to supply underdeveloped nations with used textbooks. Unfortunately, however, this dedicated gentleman has met with frustration which threatens to halt his mission. What is worse, moreover, is the fact that the frustration stems not from foreign nations but from our own Government.

Mr. Speaker, since his story is one from which we all can learn, and one in which we may be able to supply a happy ending, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my remarks to include a recent article from *Newsday*, a well-known Long Island newspaper, on Mr. Sysak and his attempt to provide free access to knowledge for those who are in need:

FREE KNOWLEDGE PROVES TOO COSTLY  
(By Martin Buskin)

After four years and the shipment of 215,000 books to all parts of the world, Walter Sysak is giving up his one-man campaign to send used and outmoded textbooks to poverty-stricken schools. The project, he says, needs more than just one man.

Sysak, a Mineola surveyor who has also raised funds to help the Peace Corps build schools in underdeveloped countries, said that he has appealed in vain to scores of government and private agencies for assistance with his campaign, which involves only textbooks which would ordinarily be burned by school districts. As of yesterday, the net result of all his pleading was 15,000 books still waiting to be shipped, \$200 for shipping expenses and 75 letters from Africa and Asia pleading for books.

"This is the cheapest way to project good will for this country," he said. "When a kid from Kenya reads a book from Hicksville, what better good will is there? It seems that we concentrate on big things, but we can't do the little things that count . . ."

Sysak has conducted a private war with a sympathetic bureaucracy that praises him



for his efforts but cites many reasons why it cannot help. His biggest problems are finding storage space for the unwanted textbooks and raising funds to pay for their shipment.

When he wrote to the U.S. Embassy in Kenya last year asking help in shipping books to that country, the embassy referred him to a special U.S. Navy project designed to help schools, orphanages and hospitals. The Navy told Sysak that its help, if any, would be small-scale and slow.

When he wrote to President Nixon in October asking for help, it took almost two months before he received a letter from James A. Donovan Jr. of the State Department. Donovan told Sysak that "your letter has finally arrived at the right place" but said, "I must say I am not sanguine about financial assistance from any part of the Government for your idea . . ." No action followed.

Sysak said that he has received financial aid from the Kiwanis Club of the Willistons, Smith College, private donations and that he has spent a "substantial amount" of his own funds to ship books. He estimated that he has shipped 200,000 books overseas and 15,000 books throughout the U.S. since 1965. The Town of North Hempstead provides free storage space for 15,000 textbooks, but Sysak said that he knew of "thousands of books" in various Long Island schools he could collect if he had storage space.

But Sysak has a file of other letters telling of the impact of his program. A Peace Corps volunteer in India wrote, "I guess I could best express our appreciation with the words of one of our students—first class books with colored pictures from America . . ." An African teacher in Tanzania wrote, "This war you have undertaken to fight is a silent one, but has far-reaching end results . . ."

But Sysak said that he needs more than letters. He said that he would need a minimum of \$25,000 a year to continue the operation. "I'm giving up the entire project," he said. "Everyone talks about lack of communication, but who really does anything?"

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to remind this Chamber that on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was declared an independent state, based on independent principles, with its capital to be at Vilnius.

Since 1785, Lithuania had been annexed by Russia. During almost the entire 19th century it was subject to a repressive policy, wherein Russia attempted to replace the language and culture of the Lithuanians. The Lithuanian people resisted, remaining faithful to their religion, language, and traditions.

In 1914, when Lithuania was overrun by the German Army, Russian domination came to an end. Although the retreating Russians and the invading Germans sacked whatever portions of this country they could, the German defeat in the First World War together with the Russian Revolution made possible a claim for Lithuanian independence. The German Government authorized the gathering of a congress of Lithuanian delegates, which in turn proposed an independent Lithuanian state. Although the Red army

entered Vilnius and installed a Communist government on January 15, 1919, the Polish Army combined with Lithuanian fighting forces drove out the invaders the following year. This forced Russia to sign a peace treaty with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, which recognized the independence of this hardy nation. The League of Nations admitted Lithuania to its membership on September 22, 1921.

During the time of Lithuanian independence, agriculture techniques improved, land reform programs were instituted, and Lithuania became a nation of small farmers. Industrialization also made great headway. Labor control laws were enacted, and other significant social measures were introduced. In addition, Lithuanian literature, opera, and music abounded.

Following the loss of Memel to Germany in March of 1939, the Soviet Union forced a mutual assistance treaty upon this small nation. A questionable election held in July 1940 produced a congress that asked that Lithuania be incorporated into the Soviet Union. On August 3, 1940, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

Then followed the German attack on the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, with Nazi forces overrunning Lithuania only a few days thereafter. When the tide of battle turned against Germany, Lithuania returned to Soviet domination, having been retaken by the Soviet Army on July 13, 1944.

The United States has never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, and maintains diplomatic relations with the representative of the former independent government. It is my hope that someday this stalwart nation may regain the freedom it so valiantly sought.

#### CLEVELAND ORCHESTRA

### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, at Constitution Hall, it was my privilege to attend the remarkable performance of the world-renowned Cleveland Orchestra under the baton of its eminent conductor, George Szell.

As a Clevelander, I was thrilled and proud of the enthusiastic and warm reception provided by the Washington audience.

Great orchestras and great museums must be encouraged and perpetuated by private philanthropy as well as public endowments. Every Member of this Congress must be mindful of our obligation to develop and sustain the humanities, which also suffer the problem of inflation and cost escalation. Future historians will judge today's generations by our response to the arts which are the hallmarks of purposeful survival.

Following are today's glowing reviews in the Washington Post and the Washington Evening Star on the Cleveland Orchestra's performance:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1970]

#### INCREDIBLE ENSEMBLE

(By Alan M. Kriegsman)

The Spoilers blew into Constitution Hall yesterday afternoon—who else but conductor George Szell and that incredible assemblage of virtuosos he calls an orchestra. The part about the spoilers is more than a joke. After a couple of hours with the Cleveland ensemble, you're liable to feel discouraged about attending any other symphonic concerts for months.

The program wasn't especially adventurous, but that didn't prevent Szell from turning it into an exalted experience. Things began with one of the Clevelanders' "specialites de la maison," Smetana's "Bartered Bride" Overture.

From those first uncannily buzzing string unisons to the thrilling trumpet staccatos toward the close that cut like scalpels through the whole orchestral fabric, it was a performance that has my spine tingling again just in memory of it.

What followed—William Walton's Variations on a Theme by Hindemith—showed that Szell and the Cleveland can triumph even over mediocrity. Like some other old-timers steeped in classical tradition, Szell can go only so far with 20th-century iconoclasm, and no further. This occasionally leaves him clinging to works like the Walton—tasteful and technically facile, but essentially bland and uninventive.

Hindemith almost drowns out Walton entirely in these Variations. Not only the theme, taken from the 1940 Cello Concerto, but also the instrumental coloring, the harmonies and the contrapuntal leanings are drawn from the model. Unfortunately, Walton's inspiration is also secondhand.

Even so, any piece of music that allows us to hear, for example, the Cleveland strings rustling like a curtain of translucent silk, has a lot going for it—in Szell's hands, at least.

The pinnacle, however, was Beethoven's "Pastoral" Symphony. Szell's performance reminded us of something we are in danger of forgetting in the misguided orgy of celebration this bicentennial year will bring—namely, that Beethoven was one of the great creative souls of the ages. By heaving strictly to the letter of the composer's intentions, while never for a second ignoring his spirit, Szell once again permitted us to recognize and revel in the sublimity of the Sixth Symphony, freed from the accrued dross and distortion of so many other interpreters.

In desperation, and for lack of specific flaws, some critics have taken to accusing Szell of being "too perfect." If this "Pastoral" was a sample of what they meant, then I'll opt for perfection-in-excess—what a way to go!

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 16, 1970]

#### SZELL, ORCHESTRA AT THEIR FINEST

(By Irving Lowens, music critic of the Star)

The Cleveland Orchestra was in excellent form yesterday afternoon in Constitution Hall, and that means that George Szell and his men sounded like one of the best ensembles in the world, if not the very best. It is really a magnificent musical instrument that Szell has fashioned in the 24 years he has been in Cleveland.

The concert got under way with a sizzling performance of the Overture to the Bartered Bride, continued with a supple reading of Sir William Walton's 1963 Variations on a theme by Paul Hindemith, and came to a close with a characteristic Szell interpretation of the Beethoven 6th Symphony.

Szell is essentially a classicist on the podium—brisk tempos, transparent texture, marked precision, no liberties with the score. But he is not entirely a classicist, and that is part of the secret of his success, I believe.

He knows how to stretch a phrase when he wants to, how to instill the breath of life, and the fact that he utilizes romantic techniques so rarely makes them all the more effective when he does.

Still, he is a musician one admires rather than loves. Walton's conservative complexity is extremely congenial to his temperament (as is the contrapuntal web of the Hindemith variations), but it didn't rouse the audience to shouts of approval.

The bravos were reserved for the Pastorale, and to my ears, the audience's evaluation was quite accurate.

In this, the most naive of all Beethoven symphonies, Szell unbent enough to allow his listeners to savor its sweetness. An unusually lovely touch was the breathtaking allargando in the last movement, just before the final cadences.

It was Szell at his best, and that's worth more than walking a mile for.

#### ANOTHER HONOR FOR PHILADELPHIA'S FIRE DEPARTMENT

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Philadelphia's distinguished fire department has been honored once again.

Philadelphia's outstanding fire commissioner, James J. McCarey, a man who rose from the ranks, knows from tough experience more than half his battle is in preventing fires rather than putting them out.

The image of the gallant fireman desperately battling roaring flames is a familiar and dramatic one. But equally heroic and certainly more effective are those firemen who discourage these calls to danger by effectively campaigning to prevent fires.

Chief McCarey's Philadelphia Fire Department knows this and its vigorous programs on fire prevention once again have been cited as the best among major American cities.

With the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I place in the RECORD an account of the Philadelphia Fire Department's most recent distinction:

Philadelphia's award-winning Fire Department has added another citation to its long and distinguished list of honors by again winning first place for major cities with a population exceeding 500,000 in the Annual National Fire Prevention Association's fire prevention contest.

Fire Commissioner James J. McCarey received a telegram from Charles S. Morgan, General Manager of N.F.P.A., notifying him of the award for 1969. Nearly 17,000 entrants from the United States and Canada vied in various classes with the awards based on year-round community efforts to reduce fire and to educate the public on fire safety practices.

Philadelphia's entry, entitled "Our Great Heritage," illustrated in three large display books through text and color photographs, the numerous and different methods the Fire Department used last year to maintain and expand the City's progress in reducing fires, casualties and property loss.

In 1968, the City also led the nation's municipalities in reducing building fires. The national average of building fires per thousand population was 4.1 while Philadelphia's was 3.3.

The nation's number one Fire Department has now won first prize in this competition for the last 13 years and has won the N.F.P.A.'s Grand Award four times in the same period. To be eligible for the Grand Award, the entrant must initially capture first prize in their specific category. Philadelphia placed second in the Grand Award running in 1969.

Commissioner McCarey commended the officers and men of the Fire Department, the public and parochial school systems, and Mayor James H. J. Tate's Fire Prevention Committees, representing all segments of the community, for making Philadelphia number one in fire safety for large cities once again.

The N.F.P.A. is the only world-wide organization with the expressed purpose of advancing, through science and education, the protection of lives and property from fire. The non-profit organization founded in 1896 with headquarters in Boston, Mass., seeks to stimulate universal fire safety consciousness and encourage wider use of modern techniques in fire prevention efforts.

#### GALLAGHER CALLS FOR NATIONAL COMMITMENT TO CURE CANCER WITHIN THIS DECADE

### HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I speak on a matter of pressing concern to all Americans, and, indeed, to all peoples of the world.

There is a killer loose among us. It is a killer which systematically takes the lives of countless millions of persons each year. It diabolically stalks the earth, with virtually no restraint.

That killer is cancer.

Can there be any doubt but that if this killer were human in form we would marshal the full extent of our resources to capture, convict, and drive him forever from the earth?

Yet cancer is more deadly than the most monstrous criminal, and it proceeds along its savage path while we watch, and wait.

So, the ghost of cancer hangs over all mankind. It is estimated that 33 million Americans alone are afflicted with the dread disease; and cancer has tragically touched the lives of countless others, including those who are not as yet diagnosed.

However, Mr. Speaker, we have a weapon—a weapon that might, if developed and employed, enable us to stop cancer for once and for all.

That weapon is medical science.

Our physicians and research personnel have clearly indicated that they can cure cancer with the proper financial support. Professionals in the field believe that we today stand on the brink of discovery. It is no longer a question of "can we do it"; it is only a question of "when."

It is a devastating fact to note that the central obstacle to stopping cancer is merely money.

Somehow, Mr. Speaker, we find the money to spend on development of a supersonic transport of dubious value at

best—one wonders where this plane will ever find room to land if it ever finds room to take off. While we might escape problems of the moment on a crash through the sound barrier, we cannot escape cancer that easily.

Somehow, we locate the funds for countless weapons that become obsolete as they are manufactured. But while we already possess sufficient armaments to destroy the world six times over, our arsenal in the war against cancer is badly depleted.

To be sure, it seem that we are never at a loss to find money for those projects we decide to fund. Can it be, then, that we have become so immune to human tragedy that our decision on cancer is to continue to watch, to wait, and to suffer?

For such a decision, we all bear the consequences.

Mr. Speaker, with these thoughts in mind, I am today proposing that this Nation immediately undertake a firm financial and moral commitment to curing cancer within this decade.

I am further proposing that our representatives to the United Nations be authorized to work toward a binding international agreement for the pooling of financial and medical resources in a global effort against this common enemy of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I have embodied these proposals in a letter to President Nixon, and respectfully submit them today for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if this country could successfully organize a manned landing on the moon, and return to earth, within a short span of 10 years, then we could surely conquer cancer in at least a similar period of time.

In fact, we are today closer to a cure for cancer than we were to a moon landing when that national commitment was first ordered. Surely, a mission against this great scourge of cancer is at least as integral to our survival as a mission to the moon; it demands no less dedication.

Today, we are considering a manned space flight to the planet Mars. It would seem highly repugnant to any decent ordering of priorities that we could embark upon such a venture before taking care of our earth. Though man's destiny might be in the stars, he must first be alive and strong in order to meet that destiny.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the voices of the American people have been raised in unison upon this issue. No one is immune to cancer; this disease knows no racial, national, religious, or class boundaries. It strikes with equal ferocity at the old and young, rich and poor. Thus, a government which resolved to destroy cancer within this decade would be a government which had the full support of its people in this resolution.

Questions of expense may be relevant here, but they should not, and must not become determinative. We pay greater costs in terms of lost lives and human suffering by permitting cancer to continue its killing pace than we could ever pay in terms of dollars. The equities do not even approach a balance.



Nobody will ever forget the day upon which a preventive vaccine for polio was announced to the world. Similarly, who would ever cease to remember the day upon which we can state that the ghost of cancer has at last been exorcised from the earth? Is there any price not worth paying in order for us to reach that day?

Mr. Speaker, I am, frankly, not certain as to how we can most effectively translate national concern into national action in order to cure cancer by 1980. I am certain, however that this is something which we must do.

Accordingly, I am hopeful that the American people will continue to bring the full weight of their opinion to bear on this issue. I am also hopeful that the administration will decide to undertake the commitment I have proposed today.

However, let us not be remiss in our own responsibility as the National Legislature. I plan to introduce legislation in the next weeks aimed at creating a cancer cure program to defeat this disease by the close of the decade. And I urge my colleagues in both this House and the other body to join me in this effort.

Let us provide our doctors with the weapons they require to drive cancer forever from the earth.

#### COMMUNISM'S DOUBLE STANDARD

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, typical of the double standard of conduct in a Socialist operation is that reported from the Communist emerging nation of Tanzania which has now decreed a hard labor penalty for any man proved to be the father of an unmarried woman's child.

In free societies, agents of the same Communist conspiracy constantly erode the laws of decency to promote immorality and illegitimacy and then demand welfare benefits for the unmarried mothers to permit them to live as well, or better, than normal working families.

Perhaps as President Nixon and his HEW crony, Mr. Finch, contemplate their new revision of the welfare subsidy, they would do well to heed the tightening up of the existing loopholes in our own illegitimacy laws. Every State in the Union has bastardy laws but their operation to protect decent society is hindered or prevented by HEW guidelines written and enforced by tear jerking and hand wringing domestic Socialists.

Yet history reflects time and time again, when the free society is destroyed and the Socialists take over the helm, the permissive immorality ends abruptly.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a Reuters report of February 14, 1970, from Zanzibar, Tanzania, following my remarks:

#### ZANZIBAR TOUGHENS ILLEGITIMACY LAWS

ZANZIBAR, TANZANIA, February 14.—Any man proved to be the father of an unmarried woman's child is liable to not less than five

years at hard labor under a decree issued by the Zanzibar island government today.

If an unmarried woman refuses to disclose the name of the father of her child, she will be detained until she does disclose it, the decree said.

If she gives false information she is liable to be imprisoned for not less than a year.

Any unmarried girl found to be pregnant while still at school must be expelled.

The decree does not apply to widows and divorcees.

#### INFLATION

### HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1970, our distinguished New Jersey colleague, Mr. HENRY HELSTOSKI, placed before the Lyndhurst Industrial Association at a luncheon meeting in Passaic, N.J., a presentation on the ravages of inflation.

Because this deals with a problem of major concern to all of us, I hereby place in the RECORD the text of Mr. HELSTOSKI's address:

I appreciate this opportunity of appearing before the members of the Lyndhurst Industrial Association. I cannot address you as fellow businessmen for I am an educator and public officeholder.

Yet I expect that many things occurring today trouble you as much as they trouble me for we all are citizens, serving in our assigned niches in life, seeking to build a better and more stable United States of America.

One of the things troubling me is inflation. I see no signs on the horizon that the fast-moving spiral of inflation is going to be halted or even braked. Administration steps directed at braking inflation do not appear to be working even to a minor degree. In fact, inflation grows worse week by week.

What is inflation doing to us?

It is making the Social Security System inadequate.

It is making your company retirement plans inadequate.

It is making your life insurance policies inadequate.

It is driving up the costs of your insurance coverage for hospitalization, medical care, automobiles and trucks, and disaster and theft policies on your homes and businesses.

It is pushing up, up and up the costs of food and services. The costs of everything you need to exist and enjoy life.

It is costing you more and more for your raw materials and equipment with a resulting higher selling price for your products.

It is devaluating your savings for retirement and the education of your children.

It is making it impossible for the average person to buy a home, which is the dream of most young people.

It is driving neighborhood retailers to the wall because of the high interest rates they must pay on bank loans made to replenish their stocks.

It is sending higher and higher the costs of your local government, with resulting heavier property taxes, because your local officials must pay more for the services they render to you, for equipment they must purchase and construction costs they must meet.

We could go on and on giving examples of what is happening to our people in this wild period of inflation much of which I believe has been primarily induced by the costs of the war in Vietnam.

Inflation might or might not die overnight

if we ended the war, but the end of the military action would effectively put the brakes on it.

But from where I sit, I see no signs from our national administration that we are anywhere near ending the Vietnam War. On the other hand, I see definite indications that the Administration is preparing us for a prolonged war, which incidentally, is not strange for the Far East.

It is all to the good that we are cutting down on our troop commitments in Vietnam, but the indication is that the President plans to keep 200,000 of our military men a year in the area. This means 1,000,000 men and boys if the war goes on for five years, and 2,000,000 if it goes on for ten years.

I believe you all know my views on Vietnam. We should not have become involved. We should be making far greater effort to become uninvolved. If Congress had the say-so on ending the war, I am sure more rapid progress would be made in that direction, but under our Constitution the President holds all of the cards and makes the decisions and many times by consulting with only his own appointed, not elected, advisers.

We could go on discussing the war, but my subject today is inflation and I have brought up Vietnam because in my opinion, it is the key cause of inflation.

What do we do about inflation?

Up to now, our President, under the duties of his office, has taken steps he says are designed to brake inflation. What are the results? Let me read to you a column by Mr. Clayton Fritchey, a well-known national writer. Mr. Fritchey wrote in December:

"This is a report on the progress of the Nixon Administration's fight against inflation during his first year in office.

"The President's intention to halt and roll back inflation was made clear in a campaign statement last year (Labor Day of 1968) in which he condemned Lyndon Johnson for practicing the 'politics of inflation—the curse of the working man.' At that time inflation was running at an annual rate of four percent. Now, 16 months later, the rate has climbed to almost six percent, highest since the Korean War.

"Since the inauguration of the new Administration, it has repeatedly assured the public that its anti-inflation program was working and that relief was just around the corner. As far back as April, Treasury Secretary David Kennedy was saying: 'In the next few months we will be seeing clear signs of a turn.'

"In August, this refrain was echoed by Paul McCracken, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William Martin, and Ronald Ziegler, Mr. Nixon's press secretary. The indicators, Ziegler summed up, 'are beginning to look encouraging.'

"The Consumer Price Index (the nation's best barometer on the cost of living) told a different story. In August it shot up another 0.4 percent. In September, when McCracken found new 'evidence of cooling off', the index again climbed, this time by 0.5 percent. Also on September 11, General Motors announced the steepest price rise for its cars in a decade. And on September 17, the interest rate on United States notes shot up to 8 percent, the highest in 110 years.

"On October 14, President Nixon told Republican Congressional leaders that 'we have turned the corner on inflation', and on October 17 in a national radio address, he told the public that 'we are on the road to recovery from the disease of runaway prices'. On October 20, the Consumer Price Index again went up 0.4 percent. Worse, the wholesale price index climbed an ominous 0.4 percent, or double the 0.2 percent for September.

"In November, it was the same story. The President told 2,000 businessmen that 'we

see the first signs that our policies are working'. But the cost of living still went up, especially for food and housing, and, it will go higher and higher unless the Administration has the courage to do more than it has done so far.

"The Administration has been saying all year (and is still saying) that its tight money policy would do the trick. But it hasn't. Noting that interest rates have risen this year to the highest point in history, Hubert Humphrey said: 'I don't think the Nixon Administration would go back that far for its standards'.

"The predictions on money rates have been no better than those on prices. Months ago, Arthur Burns, presidential adviser and newly-appointed chairman of the Federal Reserve, said: 'I expect interest rates to move down sometime soon.' Yet, the rates still are climbing to record heights".

At this point I would like to place before you an example of what is happening. Very recently the Veterans Administration and the Federal Housing Administration increased to 8½ percent the mortgage interest rate for insured loans under their widely-used programs. They are the highest interest rates in the history of the programs.

Now I resume with Mr. Fritchey's column: "Experience shows that virulent, wartime inflation can be curbed only by stabilizing wages and prices, which means mandatory controls, or voluntary guidelines, or both. President Nixon is against government controls 'on principle' and upon taking office, he said he was not going to 'jawbone' labor and management to exercise restraint.

"So, as 1969 comes to an end, the Administration still is pinning its hopes on hope. Sometime ago Burns was asked if the present rate of inflation could be cut to 3 percent by the end of the year and he said: 'I hope that we can do better than that.' It was, at best, a forlorn hope, and now it is palpably an unreal one, on a par with predictions of imminent victory in Vietnam."

That is the end of Mr. Fritchey's column and it brings us to the subject of price and wage controls. Should we have them in this war period? They worked in World War II and the Korean War when the leaders of the eras got around to imposing them. I might say they did not move with any great speed. In fact, they only moved when inflation became utterly unbearable.

I fully realize that mandatory controls are repugnant to our free enterprise system, but at certain times in our history we must take hard steps if we are to preserve our Nation, its economy and destiny.

Is now the time to impose wage and price controls? We in Congress would like to hear from the people we represent. Thus, I ask you for your opinion, either now or in letters sent to my Washington office. I assure that your views will be imparted to my Colleagues in Congress.

I leave you with this thought: If we do not halt inflation, we are courting economic disaster and the very existence of our present form of government. Read your history books about the fall of other nations if you doubt this.

#### COSTA RICA: WHERE WERE THE TROOPS?

**HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT**  
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the recent presidential elections in the Central American Republic of Costa Rica provide food for thought.

Jose Figueres Ferrer was elected President over former President Mario Enchandi Jiminez. The election was orderly, honest, free, and thoroughly democratic. This is somewhat unusual in Latin America these days.

Costa Rica is also remarkable in that it has the highest per capita income and the highest literacy rate in that part of the world.

But what makes Costa Rica unique is that it receives not 1 cent of military aid from the United States. In fact, it has—hold on to your hats—no armed forces at all. It has no army, no navy, no air force. We have come to accept the cold war concept that military strength is the only bulwark against Communist takeover from within or without. Yet there sits little Costa Rica: Free, happy, relatively prosperous, demilitarized, and unmolested by Castro or anyone else.

Finally, American travelers report that the people of Costa Rica are overwhelmingly pro-United States. As Mr. Rockefeller discovered, this too is unusual, if not unique, in Latin America these days.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past time we reexamined our obsession with security through militarism. Throughout Latin America we have supported rightist military regimes in the name of anticommunism. Now we find, almost without exception, that these countries' economies are in chaos, their governments corrupt, their desperate social ills virtually untouched, their "freedom" a travesty. And all this has not bought security. Revolutions are frequent, anti-Americanism is the order of the day, and indigenous Communist movements thrive.

Our policies seem determined to insure that when the popular revolutions come, as they certainly will, they will be violent and anti-American.

Have we learned nothing from the Vietnam disaster? Why do we not recognize that a representative and responsive government need have no fear of subversion, while a repressive and reactionary regime is always sitting on a powder keg? Why do we not copy our successes instead of our failures?

#### NEW LEFT

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the self-styled new left, a conglomeration of anarchists and radicals, are a present-day phenomena but unfortunately, this breed has obtained an obvious degree of leverage within local, State, and even the national Democrat Party groups.

For that reason thoughtful commentary on the new left by Copley News Service Washington Correspondent, Dumitru Danielopol, in the Sacramento, Calif., Union on Sunday, January 25, is worth pondering.

The article is as follows:

#### THE UNEDUCATED "NEW LEFT"

WASHINGTON.—Why do the students of the New Left ignore the fate of democracy behind the Iron Curtain?

Dr. Stefan Possony, a foreign affairs scholar and director of international studies for the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University, says there is an answer: "faulty education."

"The education failed," he says in a recent article in the magazine "Twin Circle," because their educators did not recognize the conflict between totalitarianism and democracy as the foremost reality of our time.

Since students must take sides, Possony says, they deserve to be thoroughly instructed about this conflict.

Those "idealistic Communists" of the New Left are often critical of the Soviet Union on the grounds that it has become too bureaucratic, but they hold Mao and Che Guevara as idols.

"They obviously haven't studied Red China or Cuba," says Possony.

Communism has failed in those countries too and there is little chance for the New Left to succeed where Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, Mao and Castro failed.

The Communist economic system has never worked and can only be maintained by police terror and, as Possony says, "the New Left has not invented any new economic technique that would promise a better performance."

Not even Dr. Herbert Marcuse.

The New Left has proved void of constructive ideas. It wants to smash and destroy what exists, but offers nothing in its place.

These are not revolutionaries but merely rebels, Possony says.

Because the students have not been properly educated they have not been given a chance to find out the truth about the failings and crimes of totalitarianism and therefore they cannot judge the issue objectively.

For instance, says Possony, "the student rebels oppose hunger and misery, yet they sympathize with communism which produces famine and perpetuates misery."

They oppose inequality, yet they espouse communism which has built the most stratified class society in modern history.

They hate Nazism, yet they have never been taught that Stalin and Mao were far more monstrous than Hitler.

They reject war, but they accept preparations for war in Moscow, Peking and Hanoi.

But Possony doesn't believe these young people of the New Left will determine the future.

They may belong to the next generation, he says, but they do not represent it.

The future belongs to those students who are educated properly and who "are true idealists," he says, "those who learn there are higher laws of ethics which cannot be violated without causing catastrophe."

Let's hope he is right.

#### SEX EDUCATION—THE WAR TO WHICH NOBODY CAME

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, whenever the SEICUS crowd has succeeded in sneaking their educational racket into a school through the back door, their standard line is that the program is in response to popular demand and that



decent parents who object are some kind of nuts, probably wearing tennis shoes.

In neighboring Montgomery County last week we saw a new twist to the popular leftist line about calling a war to which nobody comes. In Gaithersburg High School plans were made to handle an overflow crowd for an adult sex education show entitled "The Psycho-Social Aspect of Human Sexuality"—supposedly in response to popular demand.

Nobody came—nobody, that is except the school psychologist, three school administrators and one married couple who came to monitor the proceedings as part of their program of opposition to the sex education program which has caused controversy in the county.

The article is, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 1970]  
CROWD EXPECTED, BUT ONLY TWO ATTEND SEX  
EDUCATION TALK

(By Richard M. Cohen)

The topic Wednesday night was "The Psycho-Social Aspect of Human Sexuality," and announcement of the lecture was mailed to every home in Montgomery County, to every PTA, to all radio and television stations and to all newspapers.

Gaithersburg High School's cafeteria had been reserved for the crowd. Plans were made to handle the overflow. A psychologist was to speak.

Two persons showed up.

Thus ended Montgomery County's attempt at sex education for adults. Its two lectures, Wednesday night and Feb. 4, played to a grand total of eight persons, two of whom attended twice.

School officials had been certain that huge crowds would be drawn to the lecture series because of the publicity the sex education controversy has generated in the last year.

"Most of the people who go on the PTA circuit have been asked time and time again, 'Why don't the schools help the parents become better sex educators?'" said Joel Crausman, a school system psychologist and Wednesday night's speaker.

"I don't know where they are now," he added. "Maybe they're enrolled in knitting."

Not exactly. There were 29 women that night studying sewing at the high school and another 15 attending a class on antiques. Welding attracted 18.

But in the cafeteria there were only Mr. and Mrs. George Robinson of Colesville, opponents of sex education in the schools and the parents of five children. They came for a lecture. Instead, they stumbled into what amounted to a private session with Crausman, the school psychologist and three school administrators.

Crausman gamely launched into his prepared lecture—"What we are here to talk about tonight is psycho-sexual relationships"—but soon abandoned his format and his suit jacket to conform to the occasion.

"In a little group like this," he said, "this is a rare opportunity to answer your questions."

"Well, I don't have any questions," Mrs. Robinson said. "I'm just here to keep an eye on the program."

The program, which was to have been a three-lecture series, was the county's response to a strong recommendation made by the State Department of Education, itself a target of sex education critics.

"A course covering family life and human development shall be offered if funds are available by local school systems as part of an adult education program," the state said.

In addition, opponents of sex education in the schools have frequently charged that

it violates the sanctity of the home and maintained that if there was any educating to be done it should be at the parental level.

Moreover, school officials said yesterday, there was a substantial number of requests for the program from parents who supported sex education in the schools. These parents wanted a refresher course for themselves so that children wouldn't catch them ill-prepared to supplement what they had learned in school.

For these reasons, school officials said, they thought the sex education seminar might enjoy a longer run than "The Sound of Music," not to mention welding.

"I'm at a loss to understand the small attendance," said Dr. Robert Schneider, an assistant superintendent for health education and services. "In view of the fact that more than a few parents requested it, we offered it. They were saying you ought to educate the parents and not the children."

"I'll tell you," said Mrs. Robinson. "I have a friend and she has three boys. She says, 'Why should I come? They can't get hurt.'"

"Well, I have three girls and I don't feel that way."

For just a moment Wednesday night it appeared that a third person had come to the lecture. A man walked into the cafeteria and asked:

"Is this driver education?"

"Sex," replied one of the administrators.

"Sex!" the man exclaimed.

"Sex education," he was informed.

"That's not for me," he said as he left.

#### GALLAGHER CALLS FOR NEW ARMS AID TO ISRAEL

### HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 15, I had the high honor and privilege to address a meeting of the Zionist District, of Bayonne, N.J.

At this meeting, I was presented with the Golden Scroll Certificate of the Jewish National Fund. To say that I was humbled by this award would not be sufficient—I was indeed overwhelmed.

Mr. Speaker, the Zionist groups in the United States do not stand alone in their grave concern over the current situation in the Middle East. Israel is locked in a struggle for its very survival; it is the victim of constant aggression and terrorist attacks.

Now, as in 1967, it is our duty to offer firm support to the State of Israel. In short, it is at least our responsibility to furnish arms to Israel to counter those arms being furnished to the Arabs by the Soviet Union, France, and others.

Mr. Speaker, I am sponsoring a resolution which calls upon the administration to immediately enter into negotiations with Israel for the sale of Skyhawk fighters, Phantom jets, and other necessary arms. There is war in the Middle East, and we must leave no doubt as to where our interests are aligned.

I set forth in detail my position in my speech to the Bayonne Zionist District. Under unanimous consent, the full text of my remarks follows:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN CORNELIUS E.  
GALLAGHER

As I was sitting here this morning, in this wonderful community center, I began to think of the often repeated phrase, that the age of miracles came to an end long ago. The giants who walked the earth in ages past have, it is said, disappeared and left us with nothing but overwhelming memories. And as I considered these statements, I began to realize how untrue they really are.

So, I stand before you today as one who believes he has seen a miracle occur, and as one who believes he has seen giants among men make that miracle a continuing, everyday reality.

For who among us who has seen the State of Israel can deny that he has observed a true miracle?

And who among us who has watched Israel grow and prosper amidst natural and nationalist enemies can deny that he has seen anything but giants control the destiny of the Israeli State?

I am really not the one to speak to you people about Israel; for you, far more than I, know its true significance for the world, and for the Jewish people.

But I have had the privilege and good fortune to visit Israel several times; and, if you will, I would just offer a few observations. Because I have come to see Israel in so many different ways.

I have seen it spiritually as a long-awaited and richly-deserved Jewish homeland, a land which fulfills the covenant of the Bible to the people of Israel. A land, indeed, which stands as a strong and symbolic witness to the triumph of the Jewish people over the countless adversaries they have faced throughout history. The promise of Zion reached through fruition in the State of Israel. Indeed, never before have the words uttered at the conclusion of the Passover seder had such true significance: for when the words of "next year in Jerusalem" ring out on Passover, we feel how truly possible that impossible dream has become.

And, I have seen Israel as a sparkling oasis in the midst of the vast, dry deserts of the Middle East. Here, from the cradle of civilization, has indeed sprung forth a new breed of men—men who have taken water from the dry lands, men who have constructed cities from barren hollows, and villages from uninhabited plains. As Jacob wrestled with his God, so have the people of Israel wrestled with their environment and reaped a harvest of milk and honey, both bountiful and blessed.

The Jewish refugee who stood in the ashes of the Nazi holocaust, homeless and despairing, has found home, and hope, and, indeed, a touch of heaven in the land so long promised to his fathers.

The world can only marvel at what has occurred in Israel. Hardly twenty young years old, and Israel has already assumed her place in the ranks of the most developed, most modern, and most progressive states of the world. Who can look upon what has happened in Israel and not see more than the work of mere Man?

I have also seen Israel as the last best hope of democracy in the Middle East, as a partner for all times in progress with those peoples of the world who cherish peace, liberty, and justice above all other considerations.

In a world gone seemingly mad, we find two strongholds of sanity: the United States and the State of Israel. And that is why, among many other reasons, that—as your slogan goes—you don't have to be Jewish to love Israel; you need only be American.

Wherever the forces of freedom stand defiant against the challenge of aggression,

there the United States has a natural alliance. And so, in Israel the United States has a natural ally and a friend. It is not a father-son or a big brother-little relationship; but it is, and must continue to be, one of equals, of partners.

Thus, I fought for the inclusion of money for a joint American-Israeli prototype desalination plant, to be built in Israel, in last year's Foreign Aid Bill. Some Members of the Congress desired to delete these funds; indeed, the Administration did not include them at all, nor did it include funds for the Hadassah hospital on Mount Scopus, nor did it include funds for the Weizmann Graduate School in the initial Foreign Aid request which it sent to Capitol Hill. But, as I said on the Floor of Congress when managing the amendments, this appropriation was vitally necessary for the United States as well as for Israel. Because this is the type of Foreign Aid in which we ought to always be involved; money to promote the implements of peace in order to avoid future wars.

Israel has turned every cent of its aid money from the United States into a dollar's worth of value: it has paid us dividends beyond comprehension on the relatively small amounts of capital we have invested. In fact, our investments in Israel have turned out to be the best foreign investments since the French put their money in thirteen British colonies back in 1776. If we care about the best interests of the United States of America, then we automatically care about the best interests of Israel, for they have become nearly identical.

But let us be perfectly frank: wish as we may, money for economic development and for scientific progress is not the stopping point and must not become the stopping point of American friendship to Israel. Because, Israel is today at war, and none can be blind to that grim reality. Israel is faced by a multitude of enemies which surround its borders; it is confronted by utterly terrifying odds; it is locked in a struggle for survival.

It is not enough to sit back satisfied and point out that Israel has conquered these odds before, and so can be expected to do so again with or without our assistance. That really misses the point. Nobody will deny that one of Israel's miracles is its' continued success against Arab aggression. But, the vital point here is that while the Arabs can afford to lose several wars, Israel cannot afford to lose even one.

And so, I have been greatly disturbed by the current tenor of American Foreign Policy towards Israel.

I am disturbed by a policy that smacks of appeasement; appeasement was not right for Hitler in 1939, and it is no more correct for Nasser in 1970.

I am disturbed by a policy that threatens to draw us into a tragic morass of missed intentions such as developed in Vietnam. For, unless American policy is clear, convincing, and coolly demonstrated in the Middle East, we may be tempting the Arabs, and their Soviet advisors, to think the unthinkable and move where no free state could ever let them go.

I am disturbed by a policy that threatens to cancel twenty years of friendship, support, and progress between the United States and Israel. What better friend have we had than Israel? What other nation has made it relatively easy for us to be its friend by standing self-reliant, proud, and always successful in defense of its own liberties? No American troops have ever fought in Israel; and none will ever need to do so if we but maintain our traditional policy.

And, what is this policy? It is nothing more than a realistic assessment of the Middle East; it is a policy which faces the facts and acknowledges the true enemy of peace in the Middle East; it is a policy that brooks

no compromise with wanton aggression; it is a policy which proclaims to the world the integrity of Israel's borders and the sovereignty of her government.

In sum, it is a policy which leaves no doubt as to where America's interests are aligned in the Middle East.

And how is this policy administered? It is administered by sending arms to Israel when arms are required to counter the arms sent to the Arabs by the Soviet Union. Accordingly, I sponsored the resolution which sent Phantom Jets to Israel in 1968, and I am announcing here today that I will sponsor the resolution which will send Skyhawk Jets to Israel today, not next year, but in 1970! I will introduce this resolution in Washington this week.

This policy is administered by supporting direct, face-to-face negotiations between Israel and the Arabs. Accordingly, I co-signed the National Declaration in support of such talks in 1969, and I have sponsored the Congressional resolution calling upon our President to support such talks today, not next year, but in 1970! Israel must be the master of her own destiny. It is always appropriate for the so-called Big Four powers to talk about world problems; but, it is never appropriate for these powers to grossly impose their will on an independent state.

To those who shout that Israel must give back the Golan Heights; let them remember the deadly Syrian artillery which rained terror on peaceful Israeli villages before 1967. Those guns are quiet today. To those who proclaim that Israel must move out of Jerusalem; let them recall how Jerusalem's Arab Guardians denied Jews entry to the sacred shrines and to the holy Wailing Wall. And, to those who see no need for Israel to stand guard over Sharm El Sheik; let them remember the pounding guns of Islam which destroyed Israeli shipping before 1967, and closed the Suez Canal to the world. Those guns are silent now.

My friends, if I have spoken more than is appropriate, you have my apologies. But, I can think of no subject more vital to the peoples of the world than peace in the Middle East.

And so, I want to promise you, and to give you my pledge, that I will continue with renewed vigor, my struggle to maintain a policy of strong friendship and firm support between the United States and the State of Israel.

I will speak with any persons, appear before any forum, and stand firm against any challenge in what I believe to be freedom's first test in this decade.

With your hearts, and your hands, and your voices, we will help America to help preserve a land where milk and honey, and above all, peace, flow with abundance for all.

#### THE GOLDEN STATE COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTER

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, very often I find myself amazed at what can be achieved by the cooperative efforts of the Federal Government and concerned citizens who have initiative and determination to work in the public interest.

In 1963, Congress enacted long-needed legislation to provide a comprehensive program for mental health and mental retardation. President Kennedy signed the Community Mental Health Centers

Act into law less than a month before his tragic death. President Johnson, in 1964, reaffirmed his commitment to the objectives of the program and asked for congressional support to extend and improve it. The Congress gave it to him.

A group of San Fernando Valley community leaders and mental health professions, in the fall of 1964, undertook the task of studying the surrounding community to determine the feasibility of developing a mental health facility, under the provisions of the Federal act, to provide financial assistance for building and staffing such a facility. Prominent among the group was the Reverend John G. Simmons, long an innovator of plans and programs to serve community needs. As an outgrowth of the survey, a pilot program was initiated on January 1, 1966, at the Pacoima Memorial Lutheran Hospital, which I am proud to say is located in my congressional district.

In the spring of 1966, a grant application was submitted to the Federal Government to establish a comprehensive community mental health center with Pacoima Memorial Lutheran Hospital as the sponsoring agency. The grant was approved, and on September 1 of that year, the Golden State Community Mental Health Center was established, with Reverend Simmons as the center's administrator.

In the beginning, the center provided services consisting of hospitalization, outpatient, day care, 24-hour emergency and community consultation services, with an inpatient six-bed unit located in the hospital. It was just a beginning, and the community profited well from it.

The need to grow and expand was evident, and the same constellation of forces set to work. Early in 1967, plans for a new facility, to include a 26-bed unit, consultation offices, a day-care center and a group therapy facility, got underway.

The hospital complex was approved for a combined Hill-Harris and State of California grant of \$704,000. An additional \$796,000 was secured from gifts, pledges, and financing, with another \$100,000 to be solicited during the construction period.

On December 18, 1969, the site for the new facility was dedicated with an impressive ceremony. Reverend Simmons' remarks in his dedication address are a testament to what can be accomplished by community efforts, and I include his address in the RECORD. The achievements and expectations of the Golden State Community Mental Health Center are, I am sure, of interest to every Member of the House for they attest to the promise we hoped would be realized when the Community Mental Health Centers Act became public law.

#### DEDICATION ADDRESS

(By John G. Simmons)

This is the event, among many events, for many, many people. Especially, for me. This Event embraces a never to be repeated Experience of Joy and Satisfaction. This Event is the Birth of Expectations.

Events decide the direction of our lives. Twenty years ago I watched Luther Youngdahl, Governor of Minnesota, light the torch to hundreds of strait jackets and leather



wristlets while over a thousand patients in the Anoka State Hospital cheered themselves hoarse. That event, in retrospect, inspired me to devote myself to the humane treatment and prevention of Mental Illness. That event led to a succession of events and experiences and expectations too numerous and too unimportant for this day and this event.

This event, today, is the result of numerous experiences, of expectations and frustrations, of starts, spurts and stops; of defeats and victories; of tragedies and triumphs; of successes and failures; of dreams and smashed dreams. Therefore, this event is a joy filled to overflowing. It is more than a passing, transient, shadow happiness. It is a Joyful Event of the Spirit with enduring Substance.

The experiences that produced today's event are many and varied, individual and familial, institutional and community. Life's seemingly insignificant experiences, like the finger of the Dutch lad in the Dike, are meaningful. For instance, last week a poster was prepared announcing today's event. The painter was apologetic, "I omitted the word 'mental' before Health Center." "I'm pleased you did—that highlights a significant truth of my experience."

Health is Wholeness. Health is Organic. Health is Salvation. Salvation is Health. When we are healthy all of the physical, mental, spiritual, political, economical, and social parts of our lives are functioning as one . . . as a Whole. We have too long experienced what the fragmented, isolated, piecemeal, separated, segmented Health Care System has done to undermine and destroy the ecological nature of man's health. Our experiences have been that we have not been able to keep up with the health needs of people, nor have we been successful in preventing the increase of illness in our society because of this anachronistic approach to health.

Our experience at P.M.L.H. indicates that health care for all illnesses and diseases that afflict people can be treated more adequately in a community general hospital. We have experienced that going to where the people live in the community is a healthier approach than merely confining them in large impersonal institutions away from their loved ones and their community.

Our experience has taught us that a healthy person must have the continuing opportunity to participate in decisions affecting his life; that a healthy person must have the opportunity to learn from his experiences, including his mistakes and failures and must have the opportunity to develop his own resources and skills to deal with his problems. We have experienced the truth that every person has problems but that at certain times they cannot solve them by themselves. They need help. We must be prepared to make help available.

We have had a very small inadequate inpatient facility, but this has been helpful to us. The presence of a Mental Health staff improves the patient care of all of the patients in the hospital. For instance, the obstetrical patient who develops a psychotic reaction following the birth of a child can be helped. Or the surgical patient who becomes depressed following surgery can be helped. We have provided consultation in the innumerable psycho-physiological diseases discovered in many patients. We have discovered that follow up care can be most helpful to patients not specifically admitted as "Mental Health Patients".

We have also experienced that we can provide consultation for patients who come to P.M.L.H. through an emergency, suffering from different traumas as a result of accidents, alcoholism, drugs or attempted suicide. We have experienced the need for rehabilitation with patients who show no apparent visible scars.

This event today is filled with expectations. There has been a rising tide of ex-

pectations within the P.M.L.H. family and within our community. They are typical of nearly all human expectations. Many of them may fall when we are frustrated by the resistance of other people or by the happenings of life. We are people of hopes. Our hopes move us today for creating a more meaningful tomorrow.

We expect that during the months of the building of this facility that more and more persons within our family and within our service community will become aware and informed and educated concerning Mental Health, as well as the relationship of Mental Health to Health.

We hope to create a healthier environment for all the people of our community, rather than molding people to fit into their unhealthy environment. We too often send people back into the same environment that forced them into the hospital in the first place. We usually behave as our 'environment' tells us. We must seek to prevent Mental Illness and to teach Mental Health. This means meaningful work is needed for all persons. This means adequate housing, adequate diet, adequate space for the recreation of our lives. Poverty follows the diseases of the Heart and Cancer as the third major cause of death.

We have environmental pollution which makes a livable environment for healthy living difficult and death premature. The pollution of air and water, the atmosphere, the misuse of land, the lack of adequate public transportation, the noise which destroys our environment must be attacked vigorously if we are to effectively use the facility we construct here. This facility is important, but more important is the program of services that are rendered to people, where they live and work, to prevent illness and disease. We must avoid the Edifice Complex as well as avoiding institutional multiple sclerosis.

We need to spend the next twelve to fifteen months in educating every member of our community, including the Personnel, the Medical Staff and the Board of Directors within the P.M.L.H. Family. We need to involve every person in our community of service in the program of our Mental Health Center. The building will reflect the attitude, the philosophy and the expectations of all who build it, serve, or are served by it.

Disease and sickness affect both the rich and the poor. Prosperity and Poverty both produce their own diseases and illnesses. Health is now a promised right for all our people and not merely the privilege of the favored few. We expect that all of us working together will make it possible for the promised right of health care to be the realized right of all people in our community.

I invite you to give your hands and hearts and minds and all your resources to the achievement of our expectations for this Community Mental Health Center.

The earth moves in its orbit around the sun through the seasons, through night and day, according to God's plan. We, the people of the earth move, but not always according to God's plan. We laugh, we weep, we fight and we forgive, we hate and we love, we suffer and we die, we reach out and we reach in, we hurt and we heal, but always we must work through and with others. P.M.L.H. seeks to serve and to be served to make healthy and whole all God's children.

#### QUEST FOR FREEDOM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Lithuanian descent observe

two important anniversaries in February. During this month in 1251, Mindaugas the Great unified all the Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom. On February 16, 1918, 52 years ago, the Republic of Lithuania was established. I should like to commemorate these anniversaries by inserting the following statement and resolution in the RECORD:

#### A SEVEN-CENTURY QUEST FOR FREEDOM

During the month of February, Lithuanian-Americans will be commemorating the 719th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251 and the 52nd anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania which took place on February 16, 1918. But this celebration of Lithuania's Independence Day will not be similar to American celebration of the Fourth of July. It will contain no note of joy, no jubilant tone of achievement and victory. On the contrary, the observance will be somber, sorrowful, underlined with the grim accent of defeat and tragedy. For Lithuania has lost its independence, and today survives only as a captive nation behind the Iron Curtain.

The Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania and other Baltic States by legal or democratic processes. The Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by force of arms in June of 1940. The Kremlin is fond of saying that Russian imperialism died with the czar. But the fate of the Baltic nations—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—shows this to be a cruel fiction.

The Lithuanians are a proud people who have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic from time immemorial. Their language is the oldest in Europe today. They were united into a State more than 700 years ago, and by the 15th century their nation extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea and almost to the gates of Moscow. Their fortunes gradually declined and the nation was completely taken over by Russia in 1795.

The intensive and determined struggle for freedom and independence from Czaristic Russia was climaxed on February 16, 1918, by the Declaration of the Lithuanian National Council, proclaiming the restoration of the Independence to Lithuania.

The February Sixteenth Declaration was unanimously approved by the freely elected Constituent Assembly in 1920. Thus, following the will of the Lithuanian people, the re-establishment of an Independent State of Lithuania, with its capitol in the city of Vilnius was accomplished. A diplomatic recognition by many free countries followed. On September 22, 1921, Lithuania was received as a *bona fide* member of the League of Nations, thereby Lithuania became a member of the international community of sovereign nations. A full diplomatic recognition by the United States of America on July 28, 1922, was followed soon, also with *de jure* recognition, by other world powers—Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan.

Soviet Russia recognized *de jure* the Independence of Lithuania in 1920, and on July 12th of the same year signed a peace treaty with Lithuania which stated that:

"The Soviet Union recognizes the sovereignty and independence of the Lithuanian State with all the juridical rights associated with such a declaration, and forever renounces, in good faith, all Russian sovereign rights, which it previously had in regards to Lithuanian Nation and its territory."

The re-establishment of an Independent State of Lithuania and her return to the self-governing community of nations is the most significant historical event of the Twentieth Century for the Lithuanian Nation, whose political maturity, economic achievements and cultural creativity were

manifested during the period of restored Independence (1918-1940).

During the Second World War, the Republic of Lithuania became a victim of Soviet Russia's and Nazi Germany's conspiracy and aggression, and as a result of secret agreements between those two powers of August 23rd and September 28th, 1939, became invaded and occupied by Soviet Russian armed forces on June 15, 1940.

Since the days of Soviet Russian occupation, however, the Lithuanian people have waged an intensive fight for freedom. During the period between 1944 and 1952 alone, some 30,000 freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the invaders. Hundreds of thousands of others were imprisoned or driven to Siberia. Though that resistance movement was weakened and finally subdued due to a failure to get any material aid from the West, nevertheless, the Lithuanian people are continuing their passive resistance against Soviet Russian genocidal aggression to this very day.

The United States of America, mindful of its own struggle for freedom and independence, has remained sensitive to the aspirations of other people for self-determination. For this reason, Americans of Lithuanian descent are grateful to the Government of the United States for denouncing the Soviet Russian aggression in Lithuania and for refusal to recognize the alien subjugation of Lithuania since 1940. The United States continues recognizing the sovereignty of Lithuania. The Lithuanian Legation at Washington, D.C., Consulates General in New York, Los Angeles, Chicago and a Consulate in Boston are recognized and are functioning.

Recently the United States Congress passed *H. Con. Res. 416* that calls for freedom for the Baltic States. All freedom-loving Americans should urge the President of the United States to implement this legislation by bringing up the question of the liberation of the Baltic States in the United Nations and urging the Soviets to withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

Thus, on the occasion of the 719th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state, and the 52nd anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania, the Lithuanian-American Community of the USA, Inc., representing all Lithuanian-Americans throughout the nation, most fervently appeals to the representatives of the Federal, State and local governments, religious leaders, labor unions, civil, political and professional organizations, academic and cultural institutions, news media and to the people of good will, to support the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for self-determination and to national independence in their own country.

The free world can never rest in peace, knowing that in Lithuania under Soviet Russian rule, genocide and Russification are common place, religious persecution is prevalent, and basic human freedoms and rights are denied to the Lithuanian people.

[89th Congress, 2d session, Calendar No. 1573]

H. CON. RES. 416  
[Report No. 1606]

In the Senate of the United States, June 23, 1966, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, September 19 (legislative day, September 7), 1966. Reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT (without amendment.)

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

Passed the House of Representatives June 21, 1965.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,  
Clerk.

#### LITHUANIAN ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, two significant events in the history of the Lithuanian people occur this month. February 14 marks the 719th anniversary of the unification of all the Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom by Mindaugas the Great in 1251, while February 16 is the 52d anniversary of the restoration of the Republic of Lithuania. In commemorating these events we should also take time to consider what has happened to Lithuanian sovereignty since the Communist domination of that valiant nation.

From the very beginning of the Soviet takeover, Lithuania has been subject to the extreme cruelties of Russian colonialism, including mass arrests, arbitrary imprisonment, suspension of civil liberties, deportations, and the systematic suppression of organized religion. Likewise, Soviet imperialism has developed economic policies designed to enhance the welfare of the Russian State at the expense of the interests of the Lithuanian people.

Communist totalitarian planning has sought to eliminate Lithuanian cultural values and religious traditions. Some of the calculated schemes used have included large-scale Russian immigration, the rewriting of Baltic history to show an alleged cultural and political affinity with the Soviet Union, and an ever-increasing enforcement of the use of the Russian language in public life.

In spite of the ruthless methods employed and the complete disregard for Lithuanian rights and liberties, the So-

viets have been unable to weaken the ethnic and cultural identity of the Lithuanian people, and have been unsuccessful in wresting their loyalty to the Lithuanian Nation. It is my sincere desire that in observing these important events in Lithuanian history, and by recognizing the current plight of the Lithuanian people, we may encourage them in the maintenance of their unflinching spirit through the darkness of tyranny until the inevitable day when they will again join the company of free nations.

#### PLANNING THE EARTH'S SURFACE

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, since the turn of the century this country has made some admirable moves to preserve some of our environmental resources. Our national parks and the recent widespread legislative and administrative action at all levels of government illustrate the concern we have had for sections of our environment.

Yet, our entire environment has become endangered by our lack of foresight and planning. Indeed, our ignorance in matters of population control, ecology, and the unexpected environmental effects of our ever-expanding material production prevent us from embarking on any immediate efforts to preserve and restore our environment.

Prof. Henry P. Caulfield, of Colorado State University, has written a paper with suggestions for government action on these matters which I believe my colleagues will benefit from.

#### PLANNING THE EARTH'S SURFACE

(By Henry P. Caulfield, Jr., professor of political science, Colorado State University)

The 1960's will become known to history, I suspect, as the decade in which popular awareness of environmental degradation in the United States and recognition of the need for common action to achieve liveable environments began to take hold.

Insight and concern with respect to natural environments and the need to maintain compatibility between man and nature has long been a part of our intellectual heritage in the works of Emerson, Thoreau, Marsh, Powell, Muir and others. The great city parks created in the last century, the unique areas of natural beauty and scientific and historic interest set aside as national parks, the spread of the national park idea abroad, the Adirondack Preserve and other State park action, setting aside of wilderness areas in national forests, management programs to preserve fish and wildlife and the city planning movement of this century all attest to the heroic efforts of dedicated individuals and small groups of the past. We, and those who come after us, should be forever grateful for their work. But clearly, their successes in preserving natural areas and in giving some degree of architectural form to man-made communities were only piecemeal within an over-all context of rampant industrial development, increasing production of material wealth, and the development of large urbanized areas.

Within the decade of the sixties intellectual awareness of our environmental plight has achieved new dimensions of concern.



Ecology is becoming a part of the general vocabulary. Popular reaction is manifest to manifold environmental pollutants, to degradation of specific areas of wild and scenic beauty, and to the claustrophobia of urban areas without open space. A New Conservation, as a public philosophy and guide to political life, is in the beginning stages of development. *Silent Spring* by Rachel Carson, the report of Lawrence Rockefeller's Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, *The Quiet Crisis* by Stewart L. Udall, his vigorous and fruitful political leadership for eight years as Secretary of the Interior, the White House Conference on National Beauty in 1965, Mrs. Lyndon Johnson's beautification projects, the report on environmental pollution of the President's Science Advisory Committee, the many good works of private organizations constituting the Natural Resources Council of America, the many proposed Environmental Quality Acts now before Congress, President Nixon's creation of a Cabinet-level Council on Environmental Quality, and Secretary of the Interior Hickel's recent Conference on Water Pollution with the nation's leading industrialists—all of these are but a few of the many signs of a major concern of our times. That we as a Nation should be concerned with our total environment, not just with the quantity of our material production but also with the quality of our environment, is the main policy thrust of the New Conservation. Its widespread and general acceptance in principle would seem to have been achieved.

But more than this has been achieved. Too few, but still many, specific advances have been made.

City governments increasingly are taking steps to abate water and air pollution, improve solid waste disposal, provide open space, lessen congestion by improved mass transit, renew central cities and control development with urban plans.

State governments are increasing their aid to city governments focusing upon abatement of water and air pollution more generally, fostering flood plain management and rural zoning, and providing State recreation and fish and wildlife areas. Moreover, some states are taking the lead in the prohibition of certain long-life pesticides that are becoming pervasive in the environment and dangerous to man and other life.

The Federal government through the Land and Water Conservation Fund and other means has provided substantial financial assistance to States and local governments with respect to: purchase and development of natural, recreation and open space areas; abatement of air and water pollution; solid waste disposal; development of "model cities" and other types of urban renewal; and undertaking of comprehensive and functional planning. Additions to the National Park and National Forest Systems, improved recreational and environmental measures in Federal water and related land resource projects, establishment of the National Wilderness System, National Wild and Scenic River System, and National Trails System constitute direct Federal forward moves. Some of these advances will require many specific implementing actions before they will achieve their full impact. Establishment of a National Offshore Island Preservation System and a National Scenic Road System are possibilities for action in the near future. Improved environmental consideration in the development of the interstate road system and more thoroughgoing action with respect to environmental pollution from pesticides, fungicides, fertilizers, automotive combustion including lead are also on the agenda, hopefully, for early national action.

International activity includes such multilateral developments as the nuclear test ban treaty, the treaty on the peaceful use of outer space, treaties with respect to conservation

of fishes, use of the sea bed, and migratory waterfowl. Bilateral activity too is significant, such as our joint efforts with Canada to abate pollution of the Great Lakes. International concern for environmental quality has been expressed in several conferences in the last twenty years sponsored by the United Nations, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and National Resources and other international groups. The UNESCO Intergovernmental Conference of Experts in 1968 on the Scientific Basis for Rational Use of the Biosphere is a particularly important forerunner of the United Nations Conference on the Environment scheduled for 1972.

Most, but not all, action to date at local, state, national and international levels has been a reaction to clear and present dangers—pollution of air, water and the whole biological environment by atomic wastes, pesticides and other contaminants; loss to development of specific natural areas; historic sites or areas, or a beautiful vista; and extinction of specific species of fish or wildlife. Public reaction to the prospect of population explosion, on the other hand, involves more a public vision of long-term future consequences. This is also true of support, generally, of all antipollution activities, of a system of wild and scenic rivers, and of other major strategic actions.

Only in the most inchoate form, however, would it appear that this public vision reflects knowledge of the basic insight of scientific ecology. Thus ecological policy concern (i.e., sustainable accommodation of mankind within his natural environment on this earth) is not yet the foundation, clearly, of a new sense of community of man in which the enhancement of environment quality pervades all decisions.

Hence, planning comprehensively the environment of, say, 1967, 2000, 2050, and 2100 is not undertaken anywhere in the world. Comprehensive multiplepurpose river basins planning, as conducted today in the United States by Federal, State and local agencies under the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, comes as close to comprehensive environmental planning as there is today. Moreover, *The Nation's Water Resources*, the first national assessment of the Water Resources Council, published in November 1968, comes as close to a national environmental assessment as there is today.<sup>1</sup> But support for both of these efforts is found today more among those concerned with adequate resource development than with environmental quality.

The several Environmental Quality Acts now under consideration by the Congress provide for periodic national environmental assessments. But none of them come to grips with the organizational problems of planning all public-sector activities, including environmental quality planning, and of the relative roles therein of Federal, State and local governments. The plethora of uncoordinated "Councils" now surrounding the President is not considered either.<sup>2</sup>

A much more fundamental problem, with which an environmental quality act now could not hope to cope, are the implicit policies of the United States and most countries in favor of ever increasing population and per capita national income. President Nixon has followed up on the proposal of former Secretary of the Interior Udall with respect to the establishment of a Population Policy Commission.<sup>3</sup> Presumably the Commission will consider the need for stability of population some time in the future and the means that might be viewed as appropriate to achieve it. The Nation passed the 200 million mark in late 1967 and, on the basis of a 1.6 percent annual increase compounded, the United States will have a population of 468 million, more than double our present num-

ber, by 2020. Clearly, official national consideration of this matter is long overdue.

But so is our policy of ever increasing per capita real income, which largely reflects material well being. The Nation experienced a remarkable rate of growth of gross national product (GNP) of 4.7 percent per year for the period 1960-1965. From 1910 to 1965 the rate was less, 3 percent per year. An annual rate of growth of 4 percent, probably a sustainable rate under full employment conditions, indicates a GNP of about 4,686 billion (1954 dollars) in 2020 compared with 550 billion (1954 dollars) in 1965. This development by 2020 would represent roughly, a threefold increase in per capita national income. On the basis of their records to date, many countries of the world would not achieve such an increase in the level of their material living, but some countries might do even better.

Man's environment on this earth involves finite, space composed of finite environmental areas of differing natural capability in support of man and other life. Thus, clearly, infinite expansion of population and material production is incompatible with man's situation here. At some point growth in population and material production are going to have to stop. This may not be done to "an early running out of resources" in the way leaders of our Traditional Conservation Movement and Malthus feared. Scientific and technologic advance may continue for many years to enable use of lower quality resources and substitute materials without increasing real cost, as the work of Resources for the Future, Inc., suggests.<sup>4</sup> But what of the quality of life, the livability of the earth?

The President's new Council on Environmental Quality, logically, cannot avoid these issues. Hopefully, it will not try to do so indefinitely. Without policies calling for stabilization of population and per capita national income some time in the next century, detailed efforts to plan now and in the future for environmental quality at Federal, State, and local levels of government with the help of an alert and informed citizenry will be, in my judgment, to no avail. The first national environmental assessment should recognize these fundamental issues and begin to discuss them. Incidentally, the President's Council of Economic Advisers—on the basis present theory and methods of managing our economic life at full employment and with large areas of freedom of private decision making—may have more difficulty confronting these issues than his Council on Environmental Quality.

The Council on Environmental Quality is plagued by another problem which it will find difficult to solve but which it must solve as soon as possible. It will find, however, that it will only be able to lend its support to a solution which will take others many years to realize. In the meantime, its work will suffer greatly. I have reference to our poverty, and the world's poverty, of solid scientific detailed knowledge of ecological relationships and their tolerances to external intrusions. Ecology today, as many ecologists will admit, is strong on concept but weak on solid knowledge. This knowledge is basic to the preparation of practical plans for environmental quality. A very substantial national and worldwide program of ecological research and survey involving universities, other research institutions and government is vitally needed.<sup>5</sup>

"Planning the Earth's Surface" with "A View Toward Survival of Man and His Environment," as a first step as I see it, involves facing up to these three major issues: population growth, ever expanding material production, and the present poverty of both scientific detailed ecological knowledge solid in the United States and in the rest of the world. In addition, I need hardly add, a cul-

Footnotes at end of article.

tural revolution, worldwide, is implicit in all of this.

The U.N. Conference on Environment scheduled for 1972 will need to confront these issues, as will the nations of the earth besides the United States. A periodic World Environmental Assessment prepared under the aegis of the United Nations for consideration within its framework, I should think, is a most useful recommendation which might come out of the deliberations of the Conference in 1972. Continuation of present specific efforts at international environmental planning and action, as well as new specific initiatives, should be encouraged. But a more elaborate approach to comprehensive environmental planning on a worldwide basis appears to me to be premature at this time.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> "The Nation's Water Resources, the First National Assessment of the Water Resources Council," for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402; full report, \$4.25; summary, 65 cents. Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 68-62779.

<sup>2</sup> See "Environmental Management: Water and Related Land" by the author when Executive Director of the Water Resources Council, Washington, D.C., *Public Administrative Review*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 4, July-August 1968, pp. 306-311.

<sup>3</sup> Stewart L. Udall, "1976—Agenda for Tomorrow," Harcourt, Brace and World, New York, 1968; p. 124. Library of Congress Card Number: 68-28819.

<sup>4</sup> Han H. Landsberg, Leonard L. Fischman and Joseph L. Fisher, Editors, "Resources in America's Future—Patterns of Requirements and Availabilities, 1960-2000"; published for Resources for the Future, Inc., by The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore; 1963. Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 63-7233.

<sup>5</sup> F. Fraser Darling and John Milton, Editors, "Future Environments of North America—Being the record of a Conference convened by the Conservation Foundation in April 1965, at Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia: The Natural History Press, Garden City, 1966, pp. 704-716. Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 66-20989.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, throughout our Nation and elsewhere in the free world people of Lithuanian descent are celebrating the 52d anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania, which declared its sovereignty on February 16, 1918. It is my privilege to join the observance of this anniversary along with all freedom-loving Americans. The gallant efforts of the Lithuanian people as they fought for independence under czarist rule in Russia and later under Communist oppression serves as a stirring example of freedom's preciousness. Though the Lithuanian Republic suffered dearly under Stalin's purges—even when 6 million Ukrainian farmers were starved to death during collectivization moves by Russia in 1932—they did not give up the fight for freedom. Active guerrilla warfare against the Red Army was waged by Lithuanian nationals until 1952, testimony to freedom's great cause. Now Lithuania lies a captive nation. We can but hope for the day when freedom will once again reach her people.

In this observance of the 52d anniversary

of the birth of the Lithuanian Republic, let us reaffirm our belief in the right of self-determination for all people everywhere. The United States recognized Lithuania as a sovereign nation in 1922 and has continued to recognize that sovereignty despite Russian claims to all the Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Congress, fully committed to the principles of self-determination, has authored a resolution urging the President to direct the attention of the United Nations to Russia's subjugation of the Baltic States and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of freedom for all Ukrainian people. In the spirit of this commitment, I take pride in recognizing Lithuania's independence day, the 52d anniversary of the birth of the Lithuanian Republic.

#### E. CLINTON TOWL

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, part of the greatness of this country is the opportunity our citizens have to begin with little more than an idea and some aspiration and to eventually rise to be a leader among men.

E. Clinton Towl, a resident of Syosset, which is part of the Third Congressional District which I am proud to represent, is one man who typifies the opportunities we provide hard-working, creative persons.

This outstanding citizen, whom I have had the good fortune of knowing for a number of years, in the thirties, nursed a small garage-based engineering firm into a giant industry—a giant which helped us land on the moon. E. Clinton Towl helped raise Grumman Aircraft Engineering into the highly laudable Grumman Aerospace Corp. and her subsidiaries all of which hold records for a vast range of records and achievements.

The success of this engineering firm, is not too difficult to understand if one knows Clinton Towl. A native of Brooklyn, and a graduate of St. Paul's in Garden City, N.J., and Cornell University, he is a man of intelligence, courage, sensitivity, business acumen, and charm. All of these qualities have helped to make Grumman what it is today.

Now serving as chairman of the board and chief executive officer of both Grumman Corp. and Grumman Aerospace, as well as being chairman of several Grumman subsidiaries, Clinton Towl, I am proud to say, is entering his 40th year in service to Grumman. In light of his contributions to industry and technological development, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my remarks to include excerpts from a recent newspaper article on this fine gentleman:

#### E. CLINTON TOWL

When the Grumman Company was getting started, it was not in the least unusual to see Clint Towl with paint brush or hammer in hand, doing whatever needed to be done. He was Grumman's first paymaster, and the first to have an inspector's stamp. He became assistant treasurer of the company in

1937, and in 1940 he was elected Vice President and Assistant Corporate Secretary. In 1954, he was elected Administrative Vice President.

From 1960 to 1966 Clint Towl was President of Grumman Aircraft, and since that time has been Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer.

Adelphi University conferred on him a Doctor of Laws degree in 1967 for playing "so vital a role in the progress of Long Island and the University." For the United Fund of Long Island he has served successfully as the first Campaign Fund chairman, President, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, and, at present, Trustee and member of the Executive Committee. He also is active on behalf of the Boy Scouts, having served as Leadership Gifts Chairman for the Nassau Council and was Chairman of the Century Club.

In 1966 Mr. Towl received the Adelphi Suffolk (now Dowling) College Distinguished Citizen Award, the Long Island Press Distinguished Service Award, and the annual Award of the Society for the Advancement of Management, Long Island University.

He is a member of the Board of Governors of the Aerospace Industries Association, and for some years has been a director of Bankers Trust and of the Long Island Lighting Company. He is also an honorary trustee of Adelphi University.

Clint Towl is a native of Brooklyn and attended St. Paul's School, Garden City, and Cornell University. He and his wife, Christine, live in Syosset. They have a married daughter and son.

As Grumman saluted members of the "Quarter Century Club" last month at the annual luncheon honoring all who have had 25 years of association with the Company, he received a special gem-studded Grumman insignia pin in recognition of his 40 years of service.

#### LITHUANIAN RECOGNITION

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, among the important dates which deserve recognition this month are February 14th and today, February 16. These are days which no Lithuanian will ever forget. For on these 2 days important tenets, which maintain this captive nation's free spirit, were established.

On February 14, we observed the 719th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state which unified all Lithuanian principalities, and on February 16, we mark the 52d anniversary of the restoration of the Republic of Lithuania.

Yet, celebrating great events in this courageous nation's past is certainly not enough. Each one of us here, Mr. Speaker, has an obligation to insure that Lithuania and other captive nations will be able to celebrate a free and independent tomorrow; a future marked with the riches of accomplishments and successes that only a democracy can foster. For this reason, I would like to take leave to extend my remarks to call on all of us here and the entire administration to implement House Concurrent Resolution 416, which calls for freedom for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. If we are committed to freedom of thought and being for all mankind, we should



support every possible effort for self-termination for these valiant lands and people, who live under Communist aggression. If we join together and actively reaffirm this commitment, we will be able to maintain the fires of hope and spirit which will insure a brighter future for all persons who live under the shadows of intimidation.

THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO—A  
WORTHY EXAMPLE

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on the 224th anniversary of Thaddeus Koscius-

zko's birth, it is most fitting that we remember this great Polish patriot. Kosciuszko was born on February 12, 1746, in the Polish village of Merezowscyzyzna. After being exiled from his native land for his valor and fortitude in behalf of his countrymen, he came to the United States.

Kosciuszko offered to fight for the American cause in the Revolutionary War, and was appointed the colonel of engineers. His engineering skill in erecting the fortifications at West Point was memorable, and he is noted for having recommended the present location of the U.S. Military Academy. At West Point Academy today there is a commemorative statue in Kosciuszko's honor, inscribed to a "hero of two worlds." This talented young man also published the first effective system for the organization of the American artillery. He was

friendly with such American notables as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson.

After the Revolutionary cause was won Kosciuszko was awarded a pension with land in Ohio, received American citizenship and the rank of brigadier general from the Continental Congress. He later returned to his native Poland, where he was captured and imprisoned in Russia for his involvement with the Polish insurrection of 1794. He was freed after the death of Catherine the Great.

Kosciuszko died in Switzerland in 1817, whereupon his body was laid to rest among Poland's outstanding men in Wawel Cathedral in Krakow.

His strict adherence to high principle makes him a worthy hero in the true sense; a man honored after death because of exceptional service to mankind. He set a worthy example.

SENATE—Tuesday, February 17, 1970

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

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

O God, the source of our being and the goal of all our striving, as we assemble to seek Thee afresh may all our doubts be banished. In this hushed moment may we find Thee moving upon the higher ranges of our minds, intruding upon our noblest thoughts, moving in the depths of our inmost being, satisfying the hunger for the truth which sets us free and gives us power. Behind the tangle of human affairs, beyond our clouded vision, and despite our groping ways may we behold some mighty purpose at work in our times and beyond. Work Thy holy will in us and through us, O God, our life, our hope, and our strength.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read a communication to the Senate. The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., February 17, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia 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 Monday, February 16, 1970, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of measures on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 694.

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

ADJUSTMENTS IN FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

The bill (H.R. 14789) to amend title VIII of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, relating to the foreign service retirement and disability system, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVENTION ON THE RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT OF FOREIGN ARBITRAL AWARDS

The bill (S. 3274) to implement the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3274

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 9, United States Code, is amended by adding:

"Chapter 2.—CONVENTION ON RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT OF FOREIGN ARBITRAL AWARDS

"Sec.

"201. Enforcement of Convention.

"202. Agreement or award falling under the Convention.

"203. Jurisdiction; amount in controversy.

"204. Venue.

"205. Removal of cases from State courts.

"206. Order to compel arbitration; appointment of arbitrators.

"207. Award of arbitrators; confirmation; jurisdiction; proceeding.

"208. Chapter 1; residual application.

"§ 201. ENFORCEMENT OF CONVENTION

"The Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards of June 10, 1958, shall be enforced in United States courts in accordance with this chapter.

"§ 202. AGREEMENT OR AWARD FALLING UNDER THE CONVENTION

"An arbitration agreement or arbitral award arising out of a legal relationship, whether contractual or not, which is considered as commercial, including a transaction, contract, or agreement described in section 2 of this title, falls under the Convention. An agreement or award arising out of such a relationship which is entirely between citizens of the United States shall be deemed not to fall under the Convention unless that relationship involves property located abroad, envisages performance or enforcement abroad, or has some other reasonable relation with one or more foreign states. For the purpose of this section a corporation is a citizen of the United States if it is incorporated or has its principal place of business in the United States.

"§ 203. JURISDICTION; AMOUNT IN CONTROVERSY

"An action or proceeding falling under the Convention shall be deemed to arise under the laws and treaties of the United States. The district courts of the United States (including the courts enumerated in section 460 of title 28) shall have original jurisdiction over such an action or proceeding, regardless of the amount in controversy.

"§ 204. VENUE

"An action or proceeding over which the district courts have jurisdiction pursuant to section 203 of this title may be brought in any such court in which save for the arbitration agreement an action or proceeding with respect to the controversy between the parties could be brought, or in such court for the district and division which embraces the place designated in the agreement as the place of arbitration if such place is within the United States.

"§ 205. REMOVAL OF CASES FROM STATE COURTS