

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CLAUDE BERNARD SCIENCE JOURNALISM AWARDS

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the National Society for Medical Research has honored an Arizona writer for "responsible science reporting which has made a significant contribution to public understanding of basic research in the life sciences, including medicine."

Mr. Julian DeVries of the Arizona Republic received an award for his medical column entitled, "New Book's Claims to Science Invalid."

His work was judged by a distinguished panel of judges from the medical and medical-journalism world. A spokesman for the society congratulated all the award winners on the high caliber of science writing evident in their work.

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

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

MEDICAL SPOTLIGHT: NEW BOOK'S CLAIMS TO SCIENCE INVALID

(By Julian DeVries)

A book entitled "Ordeal of the Animals," by Mel Morse has been published by Prentice-Hall of Englewood Cliffs, N.J. The 212-page, indexed volume sells for \$5.95.

The blurb on the back of the dust jacket states in part: "Mr. Morse has carefully discriminated between valid and invalid experimentation methods . . ."

The writer of the blurb and the author of the book should have synchronized their typewriters on that one. A reading of the book will show that the only discrimination exhibited by the author is against scientific research.

Morse's allegations regarding the use of animals in medical research are without foundation, as anyone who would take the trouble to check could establish.

For example, the author writes that most animals used in research are stolen pets. This is untrue.

Scientists use especially bred animals of known genetic background in their research. Randomly chosen animals, such as pets, stolen or otherwise, make poor—in fact worthless—experimental material.

Also, the book charges that animal experiments often are unnecessarily repeated.

Experiments are, in fact, repeated but not unnecessarily. Checking and rechecking is the backbone of scientific method. Researchers must be absolutely certain that sought-after results will be uniform always.

Further, Morse alleges that animal experiments involving pain are carried out without benefit of anesthesia. He charges also that housing, feeding and postoperative care of experimental animals are grossly cruel and inadequate.

Obviously, Morse has failed to look in on some of the modern experimental laboratories or to check with any of the reputable scientific journals or those who write for them.

Inquiry would have brought forth the fact that no established medical journal in the

United States will accept for publication any manuscript containing data derived from animal experiments if the editors have reason to believe, or even suspect, that the animals in question were mishandled in any way.

Further, Morse, had he wished to do so, could have discovered that positively no federal research grants are awarded to any scientist or institution without an on-site inspection of laboratory and animal facilities and methods, plus a careful screening of the scientists themselves.

Federal laws governing animal research are extremely rigid and detailed, and are strictly enforced.

Another indication of the author's lack of scientific knowledge is shown in his suggestion that scientists use tissue cultures instead of live animals in their experiments. Tissue cultures, of course, have their place in the laboratory, but they cannot by any stretch of the imagination substitute for the living animal itself.

Antivivisectionism, the case Morse's book pleads, may have been a valid cause in the experimental era before the turn of the century, but today modern methods and laws have rendered it obsolete.

REBELLION, SURE—TO SLAP DOWN THE SLOBS

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Donald Johnson, the Administrator for the Veterans' Administration, has brought my attention to an outstanding article published March 22, 1970, in the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Gazette.

I found this article by Prof. K. Ross Toole one of the most enlightening and commonsense observations of the contemporary scene that has come to my attention in recent months.

I commend the following article to all Members of Congress:

REBELLION, SURE—TO SLAP DOWN THE SLOBS
(By K. Ross Toole)

(NOTE.—The author is a faculty member at the University of Montana, holds a Ph.D. from UCLA and formerly was director of the Montana Historical Society, director of the Museum of the City of New York, director of the Museum of New Mexico and a rancher in Montana. His treatise, written originally as a letter to a brother, is reprinted from the Billings Gazette.)

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.

SOFT TOUCH

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.

It's 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 Vietnam; it is the abdication of its first responsibility, its pusillanimous capitulation to its youth, and its sick preoccupation with the problems, the mind, the psyche, the *raison d'être* of the young.

Since when have children ruled this country? By virtue of what is 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.

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.

TOLERANT

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 bores. 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; it is also destructive. Society has classically ostracized arrogance without the backing of demonstrable accomplishment.

Why, then, do we tolerate arrogant slobes 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 minds, the final fulfillment. It is one of the oldest, sweetest and most bitter experiences of mankind.

UNORIGINAL

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? 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.

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 up 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 inexcusably 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 wonderous struggle of the NAACP and the genius of Martin Luther King—whose name they invariably take in vain.

INCOMPETENT

An old and scarred member of the wars of organized labor in the U.S. in the 1930s, 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 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.

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, business men, 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 the 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 belligerently but forthrightly.

BOOT 'EM OUT

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.

This is neither new nor revolutionary. 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 awful 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 orgiastic 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.

AIR WAVE POLLUTION

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, few aspects of American life have become more alarming than the growing trend toward permissiveness, pornography, and pollution.

In the case of one licensee before the Federal Communications Commission, all these elements are wrapped in one.

I am referring specifically to the Pacifica Foundation and the stations which it operates around the Nation.

Mrs. Shirley Scheibla, Washington editor for Barron's magazine, has detailed some of the actions of this group and the apparent difficulty the FCC staff has encountered in keeping track of the financial "angels" who are behind this river of filth which is allowed on the public airways.

I note that hearings will begin on April 21 to determine the fitness of this applicant in relation to Washington, D.C., remaining as an available educational FM radio channel. I hope that in the hearings it will be possible to develop the pertinent information as to who supplies the finances for this operation and to examine closely the motives behind the perpetration of this verbal pornography.

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

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

[From Barron's, Apr. 6, 1970]

AIR WAVE POLLUTION—THE PACIFICA FOUNDATION HAS BROADCAST IT FOR YEARS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—On April 21 the Federal Communications Commission will open hearings on competing applications for this city's last available educational FM radio station. The proceedings should attract nationwide attention, if only because one of the applicants is the ultra-leftist Pacifica Foundation. Though Pacifica has been highly controversial ever since FCC licensed it to operate its initial radio station 20 years ago, this will be the Commission's first hearing involving the Foundation, which now has five. It began launching its fifth, in Houston, early this month, and its right to continue to operate hangs upon the outcome of the Washington case.

According to FCC files and the Congressional Record, programs broadcast recently over wholly-owned Pacifica stations have featured regular news commentaries by identified Communists and Black Panthers, tapes made by Radio Hanoi, Red Chinese propaganda and advocacy of blowing up police stations and fire houses. Hence the case willy-nilly involves official clarification of fundamental issues of public policy. For one thing, it raises the question of whether such programming is in the public interest, which the Commission, in the licensing of broadcasters, is supposed to serve. Is it proper to ban cigaret advertising because smoking might be detrimental to health, but continue to license Pacifica stations which time and again have allegedly advocated mass violence and murder? Is such programming protected by the Constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech and/or the legislative ban on censorship?

The hearings may result in a tightened FCC definition of an educational broadcaster. They also may focus public attention on the failure of the Commission to investigate the financial backing of applicants once they qualify as "educational."

The case already has shown how little the agency does to keep track of over 7,600 stations now operating under license. The FCC has no monitoring staff; a complaints branch of exactly five full-time people handles complaints involving all of them. It also has revealed how matters of great import referred to the Justice Department sometimes fail to reach the top authorities. Thus, while the Pacifica case involves allegations of subversion and incitement to riot, Deputy Attorney

General Richard R. Kleindienst told Barron's that nothing involving Pacifica has been brought to his attention.

By the time the Pacifica case proceeds from the hearings before a trial examiner and reaches the full Commission, the term of one of its most liberal members, Kenneth Cox, will have expired. Thus, Pacifica also is likely to supply an indication of whether a new Republican majority will reverse the liberal bias which the agency has displayed to date in broadcasting licensing. The case also will indicate how far FCC's ultra-liberal commissioner, Nicholas Johnson, can go without disqualification.

The record indicates that the FCC should have considered most of these questions in a public hearing and acted on them long ago. FCC's complaint files bulge with letters and telegrams—some dating back years—from citizens voicing alarm over Pacifica's programs and beseeching the Commission to act. On June 2, 1969, Mrs. Hans K. Ury of Berkeley wrote the FCC about the role she said KPFA played in the so-called People's Park riot. According to her letter, KPFA broadcast appeals by Max Scheer, editor of the underground publication, Berkeley Barb, for reinforcements to go to the site to battle the police.

The complaint prompted an FCC letter of inquiry to the station, which drew this response from station manager Alfred Silbowitz: "Mrs. Ury's allegations are without foundation. Station personnel at no time encouraged listeners to oppose the police or to go to the scene of the news event that was being covered." The files indicate no further action by the Commission, although a wire from Martin Rabkin to the FCC indicated that KPFA was ordered by the Berkeley police to stop its live, on-the-scene broadcasting of the riot.

A letter to the Commission from David Bolender of Long Beach alleges that on March 7, 1969, a member of the Black Panthers said over KPFA that Los Angeles police kill black babies and exhorted his audience to kill the Los Angeles police. Again, Harvey S. Frey, M.D., of Los Angeles wired the Commission, "I request that you obtain and save a tape of the program, 'Black Is Beautiful,' broadcast by KPFA on February 16, 1969. The statements made by the host of the program at about 5:50 p.m. constitute in my mind a direct incitement to riot, murder and robbery."

Complaint files on Pacifica's New York station, WBAI, are even thicker. On April 7, 1968, Robert Potter of Clifton, N.J., wrote that after the death of Martin Luther King, WBAI carried a speech which urged listeners "to blow up power plants, police stations and water stations in retribution for the death of our leader." That same month, Herman H. Kahn of New York expressed concern about a WBAI broadcast of a news report from Moscow consisting of verbatim quotations of Pravda and Izvestia concerning the assassination of Dr. King. Mr. Kahn said it was "a thinly veiled call to arms, riot and revolution. . . . I was told in advance about this broadcast by Negro friends who advised that a telephone chain squad was formed to urge Negroes throughout the metropolitan area to tune to this station. . . . If ever there was a call to riot, this was it. If ever there was a shout of fire in a crowded theater, this was it."

William B. Ray, Chief of the FCC Complaints and Compliance Division, replied to Mr. Kahn that the Commission must not censor, and that expressions of views which involve no clear and present danger of serious substantive evil come under the protection of Constitutional guarantees of free speech.

Senator Jacob K. Javits (R., N.Y.) forwarded to the Commission a letter from M.I. Thomas, president of Temco of Passaic,

N.J., which said that on January 10, 1969, WBAI broadcast programs of Black Panthers, including Mrs. Eldridge Cleaver, in which "they spoke at length on the reasons for eliminating certain members of the Negro community who did not conform to their standards of militancy. The elimination in the context of the discussion was a clear synonym for murder, and I cannot help but be concerned about its effect upon a large and perhaps unsophisticated radio audience. I note that the station Folio (program guide) presents these Black Panther programs on a regular basis, and it is possible that this poison is being broadcast with alarming frequency."

Robert V. Cahill, legislative assistant to the FCC chairman, wrote Senator Javits: "If Mr. Thomas has reason to believe that station WBAI has failed on an overall basis to present opposing viewpoints on any such issue and will furnish specific factual evidence, the Commission will make appropriate inquiries."

All Pacifica stations, including WBAI, readily acknowledge that they regularly broadcast programs by homosexuals for homosexuals. When one listener requested time under the fairness doctrine to present his case against homosexuality, WBAI responded to FCC that "the tone and content of his literature has not indicated to us that he would be able to contribute constructively to a discussion of the general issues." FCC apparently let the matter drop.

On December 26, 1968, Lester Campbell, a former teacher of Afro-American History at a junior high school in New York, read a blatantly anti-Semitic poem over WBAI. Over the same station on January 23, 1969, Tyrone Woods, representing Concerned Parents and Students of Bedford-Stuyvesant, said, in part: "What Hitler did to six million Jews is nothing in terms of what has been done to black folks over hundreds of years. . . . As far as I am concerned, more power to Hitler. Hitler didn't make enough lampshades out of them."

The poem was dedicated to Albert Shanker head of the United Federation of Teachers, and brought a prompt protest to FCC from the Federation's director of public relations, Dan Sanders. Representative Emanuel Celler (D., N.Y.), himself Jewish and chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, said the Constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech does not allow WBAI to ignore "the clear and present danger in permitting anti-Semitic views to be sent over the air."

Swamped with other complaints, FCC investigated and found that WBAI afforded adequate opportunity for the presentation of opposite viewpoints, though there is no evidence in the public files that such viewpoints actually were broadcast. The Commission took no further action in the case.

Francis X. Worthington, chief of the Civil Section of the Internal Security Division of the Justice Department, told Barron's that in his opinion, incitement to riot is not actionable unless a broadcast advocates a specific time and place for a riot. Asked if he believed the Department could prosecute for a broadcast advocating blowing up police stations, he said he did not believe so unless it said which police station and when. He explained that he based his opinion on the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Yates case. In that case the high tribunal ruled advocacy of violence legal if it is "divorced from any effort to instigate action toward that end."

FCC's new chairman, Dean Burch, asked if he felt FCC could move against broadcasters who carry programs advocating blowing up police and fire stations, replied, "Of course we can; that's against the law."

FCC need not rely on complaints to realize that Pacifica presents highly controversial programs. The Foundation has filed with the Commission examples of its programming,

which include the following: "From the Center: On China. Although the People's Republic of China refused to send a representative to the Pacem in Terris II Convocation in Geneva, their view was forcefully expressed by Paul T. K. Lin, associate professor of history at McGill University in Canada. This tape is one in the series produced by the Fund for the Republic project, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, Calif. . . .

"Washington Confrontation. A weekly series in which a panel of journalists interview politicians, political figures, civil servants and other Washingtonians. Panelists are Seymour Hirsch, author of *Chemical and Biological Warfare*; Andrew Kopkind, U.S. correspondent for the *New Statesman* and a contributing editor of *Mayday* (Barron's, January 12); James Ridgeway, also of *Mayday*, and Lee Webb, Washington correspondent of *Ramparts*. . . .

"Colin Wilson: Human Evolution and the New Psychology. Mr. Wilson discusses the natural sciences and their effect on psychology, touching on LSD and other mind-changing drugs. The talk was delivered in San Francisco at the Esalen Institute lecture series."

According to the Congressional Record of February 8, 1966, Pacifica stations broadcast parts of tapes produced by Radio Hanoi, made copies and then turned them over to the FBI. They reportedly urged the United States to withdraw from Vietnam and suggested ways for American soldiers to avoid serving there.

A broadcast of Radio Hanoi monitored by the U.S. government reported on an interview North Vietnamese Minister of State, Xuan Thuy, gave to Robert Rinaldo of Pacifica in Paris in 1968. According to the monitored version of August 14, 1968, the interview carried this statement by Minister Thuy: "In South Vietnam under the leadership of the NLFV, the Liberation armed forces and people have won ever greater victories in their fight against the U.S. aggressors and their lackeys. At present, they are stepping up the People's War and launching continuous attacks to annihilate a great number of puppet troops and to wrest back real power to the people so that the United States will find it impossible to continue its war of aggression and materialize its neo-colonialism in South Vietnam."

Some Congressmen who have told the Commission they do not believe it is in the public interest to license Pacifica stations have received scorching letters from Max D. Paglin, FCC executive director, telling them that it is not appropriate to comment on "pending adjudicatory matters."

Commissioner Nicholas Johnson refers to Pacifica in a new book he has written, *How to Talk Back to Your TV Set*. On pages 212-213, he says: "Many communities have the blessing of community-supported non-commercial stations. The Pacifica Foundation operates radio stations WBAI in New York, KPFA in Berkeley and KPRK (sic) in Los Angeles. It has recently begun a new station in Houston."

Last December Commissioner Johnson told the Senate Communications Subcommittee, "I have never received in my office, to my knowledge, a letter from anyone complaining about a Pacifica program." However, FCC files contain a letter dated August 19, 1968, addressed to Mr. Johnson from Michael I. Neidich of 302 McCall Avenue, West Islip, N.Y., who identifies himself as "Electronic Engineer, MIT '60." Mr. Neidich wrote in part, "I would like to register a complaint concerning FM radio station WBAI in New York City . . . My children of impressionable age have access to my FM receiver, and at 7 a.m., they should not be subjected to the vocabulary which so often emanates from this station. . . . I can only interpret the programming of WBAI a direct affront to the

good people who are the lifeblood of our nation, and I cannot see how you can allow them to continue."

The files also contain a letter of September 16, 1968, addressed to Mr. Neidich and signed by Mr. Johnson, in which the Commissioner said, in part, "One problem in dealing with this type of concern is that the Commission may not censor programs unless they are clearly obscene. And as you know the legal standards for obscenity are not completely clear."

Several members of Congress have asked for an exhaustive FCC investigation of Pacifica and for an opportunity to present their information on the foundation to the Commission during a hearing. They have been curtly told that they should have filed a formal petition within a stated time period. Though the Commission has not so informed them, they could appear as witnesses (for the competing applicants) at the April hearing.

A former FCC member flatly states: "Pacifica is the most outstanding case in point demonstrating the Commission's liberal bias in licensing." The foundation's first license was for KPFA in Berkeley back in 1949. At that time the station was affiliated with a university and won an "educational" rating. Thereafter, according to Congressional testimony, all new Pacifica stations automatically were classified as "educational" without the need for a university affiliation or other qualification for such status. The classification meant that Pacifica stations did not have to disclose their financial backing to the FCC.

In 1954 Pacifica acquired a license for a second Berkeley station, KPFB. According to Commissioner Cox: "When Pacifica sought a second station in the Berkeley area to fill a gap in its coverage the Commission itself suggested . . . that the Foundation could perhaps qualify for an educational FM channel In many cases the only aspect of the station's operations which has educational overtones is that the facility is used to train students in broadcast techniques."

In 1954 the Commission also announced a proposed rule which would have denied a radio license to anyone who was a Communist or not of good moral character. Pacifica blasted the proposal as an unconstitutional extension of regulatory power. In 1960, with the rule-making proceeding still pending, FCC awarded Pacifica still another station, WBAI in New York City.

By 1962 FCC dropped the proceeding, without adopting the anti-Communist rule. The following year the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee held extensive hearings on alleged Communist influence in Pacifica. Despite many startling disclosures, the subcommittee never issued a report, and no action resulted.

On January 22, 1964, FCC renewed Pacifica's licenses for its stations in Berkeley and New York and, without a hearing, gave it a new license for an educational station in Los Angeles. The decision said nothing about how any of the stations happened to qualify for educational status. It did say, in part, however: "Under the public interest standard, it is relevant and important for the Commission to determine in certain cases whether its applicants, or the principals or its applicants, for broadcast licenses or radio operator licenses, are members of the Communist Party or of organizations which advocate or teach overthrow of the Government by force or violence. . . . The Commission therefore has followed a policy of inquiring as to Communist Party membership in these radio licensing situations where it has information making such inquiry appropriate. Because of information coming to the Commission's attention from several sources, the Commission requested information from Pacifica Foundation on this score.

On the basis of information obtained from Government sources, the Foundation, and our own inquiry, we do not find any evidence warranting further inquiry into the qualifications in this respect of Pacifica Foundation."

Though FCC today still quotes from that portion of the decision in answering complaints on Pacifica, there is nothing to show the findings of that inquiry in the public files of the agency. At the request of Barron's an FCC official looked into FCC's confidential files and said they also contained nothing on the matter. Several officials who were with FCC at the time of the inquiry said they received no report on it.

On November 11, 1963, *The New York Times* reported, "Directors of the Pacifica Foundation decided yesterday against filling out questionnaires submitted by the Federal Communications Commission on possible Communist affiliations. . . . The FCC had called for sworn answers from the foundation's executive members, directors, officers and general managers on whether they had ever belonged to the Communist party or any organization teaching or advocating forcible overthrow of the Government."

But still the complaints about Pacifica programs poured into the Commission. When the foundation applied for renewal of its California licenses, FCC wrote it that the complaints raised questions as to whether "you have conformed to your own program supervisory policies and procedures on which FCC relied in granting your prior renewals."

Pacifica replied that because of some changes in personnel there had been deviations from Pacifica policies and procedures, but that it had sent a memorandum to all personnel and volunteers to make sure they did not recur. An FCC official says the agency failed to check up on whether the memorandum was enforced, and there is nothing in the public files of the Commission to indicate such a check. Pacifica continued to win license renewals without hearings.

Pacifica was discussed at a one-day hearing last December, chiefly on the subject of obscenity, before the Senate Communications Subcommittee. Commissioner Cox testified that FCC doesn't know where Pacifica gets its funds. At this point, Senator Edward J. Gurney (R., Fla.) asked, "Don't you think it would be a good idea if you found out the sources of funds for the Pacifica stations, particularly in view of your testimony that Pacifica broadcasts Communistic material as well as other stuff?"

Commissioner Johnson seems to know more about Pacifica's finances than Commissioner Cox. In March 1969 he said that Pacifica stations are not primarily supported by public grants or private foundations. "The stations are sustained by contributions from the listeners in their respective communities." Their ability to survive, according to Mr. Johnson, proves they are serving the public.

However, information on file with the FCC in connection with Pacifica's Houston application, and stamped, "Received September 30, 1969," indicates that J. R. Parten pledged \$10,000 to Pacifica for construction of its Houston station. According to information on file with the Internal Revenue Service, Jubal R. Parten is a director of the Fund for the Republic.

The Fund initially was created with a contribution of \$15 million from the Ford Foundation. At the 1963 Senate hearings, Catherine Cory Gumpert, then a Pacifica vice president, testified that Pacifica's KPFA had received support from the Ford Foundation. (She also acknowledged having been a Communist.) She disclosed that Pacifica had received a contribution from Consumers' Union Foundation.

IRS information also shows that the term of Hallock Hoffman as the Fund's secretary-

treasurer expired in November 1969. According to Pacifica's application for the Washington station, Mr. Hoffman is chairman of the board of Pacifica. It also lists him as a senior fellow of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. (Though the application doesn't show it, the Center was set up by the Fund for the Republic.)

Recent newspaper reports indicate that the Center asked for the resignations of five of its most liberal fellows, including Mr. Hoffman, in the wake of continuing criticism of its board chairman, U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

Despite the evidence that Pacifica broadcasts propaganda, its tax-exempt status rests upon its articles of incorporation which state, "The purposes of this corporation shall be:

"(a) To establish a Foundation organized and operated exclusively for educational purposes . . . and no substantial part of the activities of which is designed to carry on propaganda. . . .

"(e) In radio broadcasting operations to promote the . . . public presentation of accurate objective, comprehensive news on all matters vitally affecting the community. . . ."

Among those charged with carrying out those lofty obligations are some of the stars of the 1963 Senate hearings on Pacifica. In 1963 Dorothy Healey was identified as both a Communist and a regular commentator for Pacifica, and the foundation still lists her as both in its program guide. An appendix to the Senate hearings noted a sharp contrast between KPFFK's glamorous description of her and the facts as revealed in public records, which show she "has dedicated her lifetime to the furtherance of the international Communist conspiracy . . . dedicated to the overthrow of the United States by force and violence."

In Congressional testimony, Stephen M. Fischer, current Pacifica vice president (and assistant to the publisher of Scientific American), denied any knowledge that the Communist Party is a conspiracy to overthrow the U.S. government, although he admitted having been a Communist in his youth.

At the time of the 1963 hearings, Steve Murdock was acting editor of People's World, West Coast organ of the Communist Party, U.S.A. In testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee 10 years earlier, he had been identified as a member of the Communist Party. The July 13, 1968, issue of People's World said, "Steve Murdock, political writer for the People's World, will be heard in a commentary over KPFA at 7 p.m. . . . Murdock will be heard every two weeks during the summer."

During the 1963 hearings, William Mandel was identified as a frequent writer for the Communist Daily Worker who took the Fifth Amendment when asked if he had ever been engaged in sabotage or espionage against the U.S. At the time Pacifica emphasized that he was a regular broadcaster but not a commentator. Today, it lists him as a regular commentator and "authority on the USSR."

Henry Elson, Pacifica secretary, apparently is too young to have figured in the 1963 hearings. People's World has identified him as a former University of California student who was active in the Resistance and later served as attorney for Wayne Greene, a Negro charged with attempted murder, assault on a police officer and possession of a firebomb.

Donald Ray Gardner, development manager for Pacifica in Houston, currently is under indictment for alleged failure to report to the armed forces for induction. Julius Lester, a Pacifica program producer, has stated in an article in the National Guardian that he is trying to follow in the footsteps of Lenin, Mao and Castro.

The program guide for KPFFK lists Elaine Browne as a regular commentator; it identifies her as "Deputy Minister of Information, Black Panther Party of Southern California."

Nevertheless, Commissioners Johnson and Cox, in a joint dissent, have said the decision to hold a hearing on Pacifica (for the first time in 20 years) is "disgusting" and constitutes harassment.

While the Commission refused to order a hearing on Pacifica's application for the Houston station, it said that the grant of the Houston broadcasting permit will be conditioned upon the outcome of Pacifica's Washington application. Meantime, Pacifica has completed construction in Houston and begun broadcasting under "test authority" last February 24. It may continue to do so until final disposition of the Washington case by the FCC, which is expected to take about a year. According to the March 7 issue of The Peace Times, the Pacifica Houston station is giving the (New Left) Moratorium office eight half-hour programs beginning in March.

FCC Chairman Burch, who has been on the job only a few months and still lacks a majority, says he expects the Commission to approach the problem of subversion on a case-by-case basis. But he cautions that in trying to prevent subversion, the agency must guard against harming the very freedom it tries to save. "We can't deny a license just on the basis that an applicant appears to be subversive," he adds. The chairman says he also plans to look into the definition of educational broadcasting. High time.

THE 45 MINUTES MAKE NIXON THE MAN OF THE HOUR

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's mail service now has been restored, and a great deal of the credit for the calm, yet firm handling of this perilous situation must be given to President Nixon.

A crisis of major proportions to the economy and to all U.S. citizens could have occurred had mail been stopped throughout the country. However, the President's firm resolve that the mail must be continued, expressed in both his words to the American people and his actions in New York City, averted this crisis, and an atmosphere much more conducive to a reasonable resolution of the postal employees' grievances, has been restored.

I insert two editorials discussing the President's handling of this situation in the RECORD:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Mar. 24, 1970]

MOVING THE MAIL

Postal employees bound not to strike by constitutional oath, by statutory law, by labor-management contracts and by an *ad hoc* end-the-strike agreement of their freely elected leadership have nevertheless paralyzed the New York city and other post offices. Moving to fulfill the pledge already given in line with what he rightly sees as his constitutional duty, President Nixon is mobilizing supplementary work forces from the military to restore essential services. So far this grave and drastic action is limited to New York, the country's nerve center in key aspects of the national life. It will be extended to other points where mail collapse requires it.

In his brief television message the President took care to emphasize that the majority of postal workers were on the job nationally. The loyal and unflappable Baltimore force has been a model for other postal employees and will certainly be followed even more widely now. Mr. Nixon announced that the Justice Department was obtaining court injunctions against any picket interference with returning workers. He reminded all again of the elaborate procedures available for peaceful settlement and repeated, what has always been clear, that when the strike was over, negotiations could immediately reopen. But he warned that the ultimate authority lay with Congress; and he restated his advocacy of a basic overhaul of the postal system along lines laid out in pending legislation.

Very properly, Mr. Nixon did not stop with the details of this first strike in the 200 years of our postal history. With wholly appropriate solemnity he stated that a strike by a few thousand to coerce the duly chosen executive and legislative representatives of the whole people put at risk "the survival of a government based upon law." It does, and thousands of mailmen will heed their leaders' latest back-to-work plea and so avert further manifestations of the President's clear resolve to defend government and law.

THE 45 MINUTES MAKE NIXON THE MAN OF THE HOUR

(By Jerry Greene)

WASHINGTON, March 21.—President Nixon seized upon the dramatic tension growing from the postal strike to serve notice to the people that he is indeed the nation's leader, calm and confident at the moment of his greatest crisis since inauguration.

The effectiveness of his startling performance cannot be known before Monday—his deadline for striking letter carriers to return to work, or for government delivery of the mail troops.

But in the President's surprise appearance at a press briefing shortly before noon today Nixon let a country disturbed and upset already by increasing mail service stoppages know that as President he was assuming personal responsibility at a point of seeming impasse between union members and a lethargic, hesitant Congress.

Nixon stepped smartly to the end of the plank to face this challenge of economic chaos. He left himself no easy way out, no possibility of backing away. It was something the country had a right to expect of a President in the way of leadership in time of trouble, but never before so clearly demonstrated in this administration.

Today's show at the White House was truly astonishing, for as if to hold the alarming postal stoppage to its proper perspective—a trouble to be taken in stride and without panic—Nixon opened the press conference to unrestricted questions on a global range of subjects.

MANNER AND STYLE POLISHED

The whole thing was weird from beginning to end, yet the President's manner and style were as polished as if he had rehearsed and planned the production days ahead of time.

This almost screwball operation simply wasn't the sort of spur-of-the-moment deal one would expect of Nixon; it was a throwback to the days and methods of Lyndon Johnson—who used the technique frequently and without too much success.

More than the usual number of Saturday morning reporters showed up at the White House today for the scheduled 11 a.m. briefing by Press Secretary Ron Ziegler. There was hope, but no real expectation, that the White House might have something to say about the postal strike. As recently as last

April 7, 1970

night administration spokesmen were indicating that the President would keep out of the mess as long as possible.

Ziegler is late more often than not with his press briefings; few displayed anything more than normal irritation when the hour approached noon and he had not appeared. Then abruptly the press was summoned to the secretary's office to hear the equally abrupt announcement: "Gentlemen, the President will do the briefing today."

About 30 or 40 reporters were present—up to 300 attend the regularly scheduled affairs—and were herded quickly into Nixon's oval office to stand in a semi-circle around the President's desk. He had not held a press conference since Jan. 30; such functions with Nixon have been elaborate, well-placed, televised live.

Five minutes later Nixon strode into the room and took a position back of his desk chair. He said he had a few announcements—another innovation for Nixon—after which he would receive questions.

The announcements came quickly, emphatically like hammer blows on a gong, each a statement of high importance, each a headline in itself, spelling out a program for what must be one of the most critical weeks of his presidency.

Neither by voice nor manner did he appear to attach more importance to one announcement than another. He banged them out: We have means to deliver the mail. We will use the means to deliver the mail. At his press conference tomorrow, Secretary of State William Rogers will tell Israel the U.S. won't sell more jet planes now but will when and if Russia beefs up arms shipments to the Arabs. On Tuesday the President will seek to spell out clear school integration guidelines. On Wednesday he will ask legislation to permit federal help in a drive against terror bombing.

SESSION LASTS 45 MINUTES

These were his announcements; he had a lot to say about them and he allowed substantial time for questions. This session lasted 45 minutes, a full 15 minutes longer than any of his previous press conferences.

Oddly enough, Nixon's penchant for orderliness was showing even in this impromptu staging. He rattled off first what he would do Monday, what would come Tuesday and, finally, he spoke of the antibomb message to be sent to Congress on Wednesday.

Then the President bounced from topic to topic in this anything-goes act, dropping a plug for Judge G. Harrold Carswell in the Supreme Court confirmation fight, expressing belief the increased fighting in Laos wouldn't interfere with his schedule for troop cutbacks in Vietnam, predicting reelection of Sen. George Murphy (R.) in California.

HE SEES INFLATION WANING

Nixon proclaimed there would be no recession because he wouldn't let one happen; he is confident the fire has been taken out of inflation. If the Russians are in the mood, agreement can be reached on arms limitation at the Salt talks.

The President will work a near-miracle if the 10,000-word integration position paper on Tuesday can clear out confusion, set a firm, one-voice course for the administration and please anybody, black or white, North or South. But he is going to try. We are advised that the racial policy pronouncement has undergone more agonizing reappraisal in the White House than any document yet to bear the Nixon signature.

Such attention is entirely proper, for in no other area has the administration been under such heavy fire—and no other domestic problem can match the racial issue in potency and in importance.

This was an impressive exhibition of leadership at the White House today at a time when it was never needed more.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MINI-MILLS PROVIDE SERVICE

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, one of the current environmental problems facing the Nation is what to do about scrap autos.

Presently there are many areas of the Nation in which the economics of the freight business does not permit the shipping of junked autos to recycling mills for processing.

I would like to call attention to the valuable work being done by many mills in the Nation engaged primarily in the recovery of value from automotive scrap.

One of these mini-mills, the Allison Steel Manufacturing Co., is located in the Phoenix, Ariz., area and is able to process some 6,000 automobiles per month. I am informed that there are some 40 similar operations across the Nation.

Mr. President, I would like to commend these businesses for the work they are doing and insert in the RECORD an article from Iron Age magazine describing their service.

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

DON'T PUT UNITED STATES IN THE SCRAP BUSINESS, SENATE GROUP URGED

(By K. A. Kaufman)

Scrap dealers and the secondary metals industry are concerned that a proposed law to encourage recovery and recycling of waste products may put the U.S. in competition with them.

Representatives of both industries endorsed objectives of the bill in testimony before a Senate public works subcommittee. But both also expressed some reservations.

Leon J. Coslov, president of Tube City Iron and Metal Co. and president of the Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc. said, "Our association supports the basic goals of S2005, although we differ on some specific portions of the bill itself."

He expressed concern over a provision giving the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare the authority to make grants to states or municipalities for construction of solid waste disposal and resource recovery facilities.

"We see in this the possibility of Federal and state funds being used to construct scrap processing facilities, thereby bringing government entities into competition with private industry," Coslov said.

As an alternative, he suggested the government provide incentives to the private sector to promote recycling. This would be much more effective and less costly, he maintained.

M. J. Mighdoll, executive vice president, National Association of Secondary Material Industries, also indicated concern over that section.

He told the subcommittee the phrase "construction of . . . resource recovery facilities" opens the door to possible local government competition. Therefore, it is "fraught with dangers," he said.

He urged placing safeguards in the bill protecting industry from harmful competitive and duplicative practices.

The association "vigorously supports" the basic objectives of the legislation, particularly the provision relating to improvement of research in the field of solid waste reutilization, he concluded.

10663

SOME SENSIBLE LIMITS NEEDED

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, no one will question that the crime rate, the easy availability of pornographic material, and the growing use of drugs by our young people are three of the major problems facing us on the domestic scene. A literal floodtide of words have been written and spoken on these problems, a good portion of those words setting forth what many observers consider to be the responsibility of society in seeking to find some answers.

An editorial appearing in the March 30, 1970, edition of the Peoria Journal Star raises some thought-provoking points about the limits of society's obligations to adults and about adults' obligations to society. I recommend it to my colleagues and place it in the RECORD at this point:

SOME SENSIBLE LIMITS NEEDED

(By C. L. Dancy)

Popular "progressive" doctrine in America today seems to be flying at full speed in two completely opposite directions—and on a collision course.

One of these doctrines is that it is none of society's business what "consenting adults" do to themselves, so long as they do not inflict their abuses, forcefully, on others.

By this doctrine, the use of drugs is a private matter and none of society's business. Pornography, perversion, and rampant moral abuses are simply nobody's business, and certainly not the business of government or society, so long as the actors are "adults" doing their "own thing."

The surprising thing is that the proponents of this philosophy, simultaneously, seem to be the people who also promote the philosophy that if and when such "adults" become basket cases, hopeless wrecks, or just plain total losses in caring for themselves, it is society's duty to look after them. Society has an ever-present obligation to "pick up the pieces."

Society is supposed to finance the expanding mental hospital facilities for those who have thus disintegrated their nervous systems. Society is supposed to provide the drug cure centers. Society is supposed to take care of their illegitimate offspring. Society is supposed to feed and clothe them as total parasites when they fail to make any contribution of their own that brings in food and shelter.

TWO NOBLE IDEAS

Both are "noble" ideas, but they don't go together.

If the status of adulthood involves total personal responsibility, and what one does is no longer society's business as long as it is a private and personal situation—there is no claim either way. This is total freedom, including the freedom to starve to death, so to speak, or otherwise destroy yourself.

If on the other hand, the ultimate responsibility for the mental health and physical well being of adults is the responsibility of society, society must have an interest in prevention.

In no other way can such a responsibility be met.

Prevention is the only broadly effective approach to the major problems of health, and it is where we have had preventive medicine that we have made the greatest strides against disease.

Prevention is the only really broadly effective approach to the major catastrophes such

as fire, and it is where we have had extensive controls and doctrines for fire prevention that we have made the greatest strides against such disasters.

Prevention is the only really broadly effective approach to the problems of crime, and it was by crime prevention practices that the broadest of social changes came to society—and by the rising up of the principle that prevention is forbidden and one can only act after the disaster has occurred that crime has again begun to sky-rocket year by year.

DOUBLE STANDARD

Ultimately, the pursuit of this double standard of "freedom" until you've become helpless or in need and then a right to a parasitic status can only end in one thing. It already represents in practice the massive subsidization by the public of immorality, etc., at an ever expanding cost both in social values and in money.

In the end, we are going to wind up facing the problem of this paradox so harshly, that we will be obliged to go one way or the other.

We shall either decide "to hell with them" and the consequences be on their own heads, as a doctrine of total adult independence. Or we shall decide on a scientific government with broad powers, indeed, over its citizens "for their own good."

The twin doctrines of a total individual freedom to abuse oneself as an adult and the right to become a permanent parasite on your fellowman in the process while continuing to perform the abuses that render you such cannot live forever side by side.

Not unless we recognize them as general principles within a same area of conduct while society does have the right and obligation to step in where the excess becomes beyond all reason.

Reasonable limits could be maintained as to both the individual's freedoms and his claims on society. But absolutes as to his independence of society and yet of society's total obligations to care for him won't work.

If we are going to deal in absolutes, it is going to have to be one or the other—not both.

The present popular, if somewhat primitive, penchant for dealing in absolutes is what really ought to go by the board.

We ought, instead, to get sensible about the limits of society's obligations to "adults" and about adults' obligations to society.

We ought to recognize that there are limits to both.

The trick is to make those limits as reasonable as possible.

NETWORK NEWS BIAS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, now that the initial furor raised by Vice President AGNEW's assertions of bias in the news media has died down, we hear one after another quiet voice of reason coming out in support of what the Vice President said.

The recent interview of Howard K. Smith of ABC-TV was most significant, because here a person directly involved with network newscasting admitted candidly that there is a liberal bias to much news reporting, both on television and in the press. Now we see newspapers from many different parts of the country supporting editorially Mr. Smith's state-

ments—all lending further credence to what the Vice President was telling us last fall.

I insert one of these editorials from the Arizona Republic, in the RECORD:

NETWORK NEWS BIAS

Commentator Howard K. Smith's candid admission that there is a pro-liberal network news bias, resolves the argument raised by Vice President Spiro Agnew in his widely quoted speech several months ago.

Agnew cited the bias, said that it distorted the political debate necessary in a democracy, and criticized the "unelected elite" which day after day presents its own narrow interpretations as the only ones with merit.

The network newscasters and officials—in short, that "unelected elite"—protested vehemently.

They accused the vice president of advocating censorship . . . even though he went out of his way to say that he opposed censorship. They warned that the entire free press was under assault from the government (but they neglected to make the vital distinction between the press and a government-regulated monopoly). And they piously denied every allegation of bias.

And then came along Howard K. Smith . . . Smith, for many years one of TV's most prominent commentators, is by his own admission left-of-center—a "semi-Socialist." He supports the liberal position on most major issues.

But Mr. Smith is also deeply concerned that the preponderance of a uniform dogmatic liberal bias on network radio and TV is bad for television and for the nation. And so, in a remarkable recent article in TV Guide, he spoke out in protest.

This strong bias, he said, conforms to a rigid liberal "party line" in which network newsmen are primarily interested in pleasing each other and the editors of the New York Times and the Washington Post. This leads network newsmen to oversimplify the news. It leads them to take knee-jerk positions on the Vietnam war, racial conflicts, and the policies of LBJ and Richard Nixon.

These newsmen, many of whom are intellectually shallow, "cling to the tag 'liberal' . . . even though they've forgotten its content," Smith said. They concentrate on militant blacks and New Left zanies. They depict irrational radicals as perfectly normal protesters. And, in their own irrational hatred of Richard Nixon, they are trying to assassinate him politically the way they helped assassinate LBJ politically.

Smith's confession is of enormous significance.

It required rare intellectual honesty and courage.

Network rebuttals, to both Vice President Agnew and newscaster Smith, have been singularly weak and inapposite. Basically, they boil down to the assertion that network newsmen are not all liberals because they represent a variety of geographical backgrounds, and they don't conspire with one another to predetermine what news should be emphasized and how.

What a pitiful rationale!

Liberalism, like conservatism, anarchism, communism, fascism, and any other ism, is not a geographical setting, but a doctrine, a series of positions or policies to which one subscribes to a greater or lesser degree. And there is no need for liberals to conspire when what Howard K. Smith calls their "set of automatic reactions" tells them intuitively the doctrinally "correct" position to take on every given issue from Red China to Rhodesia to the Black Panthers.

Indeed, William F. Buckley once amusingly described these reactions by saying: "Drop a little itching powder in Jimmy Wechsler's bath and, before he has scratched himself the third time, Arthur Schlesinger will have denounced you in a dozen books

and speeches, Archibald MacLeish will have written 10 heroic cantos about our age of terror, Harper's will have published them, and everyone in sight will have been nominated for a freedom award."

The issue is not whether there is a network news bias. There is, emphatically. And as Sen. Barry Goldwater (an early victim of that bias) noted, it—not Vice President Agnew's speeches—constitutes the most serious threat to freedom of the press. The question now is what the networks intend to do to rectify an imbalance that gives a distorted picture of world and national events.

TESTIMONY OF MR. A. K. McCALLA BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on March 18 my lifelong friend, Mr. A. K. McCalla, testified before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. The purpose of his testimony was to urge an increased appropriation for Watershed Development and River Basin Planning.

As youngsters Mr. McCalla and I were members of the 4-H Club together, and a generation later our children were also in 4-H together. He lives in Millington, Tenn., in my district, and he is one of our outstanding farmers.

At present Mr. McCalla serves as chairman of the Shelby County Conservation District. He is the immediate past president of the Tennessee Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts. In 1968 the Progressive Farmer named him as Tennessee's Man of the Year in service to agriculture, and last year the Tennessee Conservation League named him Conservationist of the Year.

His testimony before the subcommittee was presented in behalf of the Shelby County, Tenn., Conservation Board of which he is an outstanding member. Because the information he cites is of importance to all Americans, I insert his testimony in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF A. K. McCALLA

A growing concern with problems of land, water and environmental quality as they affect development in the merging rural and urban areas of Shelby County, Tennessee, has prompted the Shelby County Conservation Board to urge your continued support of adequate funds for watershed development and river basin planning. The people of Memphis and Shelby County, and the adjoining counties of Tennessee and Mississippi, are becoming acutely aware of water and air pollution, mushrooming residential and industrial building patterns, exodus of people from the farm, and the social problems of race and poverty stemming from unwise and unplanned exploitation of natural resources.

We believe the drainage pattern which has four separate streams that rise in the surrounding upstream rural areas and flow through the rapidly developing urban areas of Memphis and Shelby County typify the interrelationship of rural and urban resource problems.

Erosion and flooding in the upstream rural areas cause crop, pasture, and other dam-

ages that impair personal incomes of farm families. Sediment entering the streams fills channels, silts up reservoirs and spews out and destroys crops along the flood plains.

The streams cross State lines, county boundaries, and flow through city limits with their burden of pollution and constant threat of flooding. These problems of the surface waters become worse as they enter the city, threatening the health of people, their homes, stores, churches, schools and trailer parks.

Looking backward it is plain that these problems have been creeping up on us for many years. But people in the downstream areas are only now beginning to realize and understand how their future is tied directly to decisions being made in Fayette, Hardeman and Tipton Counties in Tennessee, as well as DeSoto, Marshall and Benton Counties in Mississippi.

The Shelby County Conservation Board has recognized the interlocking nature of erosion, land abuse and sediment production in the rural upstream areas with pollution, floods and idle flood plain lands of the downstream urban areas. It is presently sponsoring a river basin type study by the United States Department of Agriculture. This Chickasaw-Metropolitan Surface Water Management Survey will be completed this year. It involves the Wolf and Loosahatchie Rivers, Nonconah and Horn Lake Creeks. The study covers parts of Shelby, Fayette, Hardeman and Tipton Counties in Tennessee, and DeSoto, Marshall, Benton and Tipton Counties in Mississippi. Shelby County is bearing \$75,000 of the cost of the study.

As one result of the study Memphis now has, for the first time since its founding 150 years ago, positive flood data including predictions of future floods to guide its development on the Wolf and Loosahatchie Rivers and Nonconah Creek. This data from the Chickasaw Survey is being used by the Memphis and Shelby County Planning Commission, the city engineer, county engineer, and real estate and development firms. It is warning away those who otherwise would have dared to build in the path of floods. The county is acquiring the floodways along the streams for parks and greenways.

Located at the focal point of these surface water problems, urbanization at Memphis becomes their magnifier. Nearly every kind of land and water conservation problem is concentrated, intensified and extremely expensive to solve. They can only be solved by starting in the rural areas at the head of streams. This is the last glimmer of a chance the city has to cure its resource problems. It calls for rural community development, small watershed planning and implementation, erosion and sediment control measures on individual farms, better disposal systems for garbage and solid waste, improvement of the rural landscape and better economic conditions to allow opportunities for rural people to share in the cultural and recreational assets of the nation.

These problems and needs must be met quickly and forcefully before further development multiplies their cost beyond the financial ability of local, state and Federal governments.

The Nonconah Creek Watershed project, an outgrowth of the Chickasaw study, is also being sponsored by the Shelby County Conservation Board, the city of Memphis and soil conservation districts in Tennessee and Mississippi counties. It is now being planned by the Soil Conservation Service. Eighty thousand dollars (\$80,000) of the planning costs are being borne by Shelby County, Memphis and the Tennessee State government. Nonconah Creek Watershed lies between the older part of Memphis on the north and the expanding Whitehaven and International Airport area on the south. Its flood plain lies along Interstate 40 expressway in an area bursting at the seams with industrial and commercial development. The city and

county have given it priority because of the crucial flooding, pollution and erosion problems.

There are at least six other watershed projects in the Wolf and Loosahatchie drainage basins that need to be planned and implemented. Development of these projects would not only solve most of the most prominent rural conservation problems, but are prerequisite to future downstream improvements that may be recommended.

Shelby County has already indicated firmly its willingness to share in watershed planning and water resource development costs. Within the past four years it has spent nearly a million dollars on the projects above, and on a water-based recreation project centered around a new lake at Casper Creek. The state of Tennessee and the city of Memphis are helping out with the job.

But we cannot do the whole job by ourselves, especially in the upstream rural areas with low financial capability. We must have the continued and accelerated commitment of the Federal government. So we are asking this committee to give strong support by making substantial increases in the U.S. Department of Agriculture budget. We especially need increased support for river basin planning, watershed planning and implementation, and technical assistance to soil conservation districts. This kind of support will benefit directly the Mid-South areas of west Tennessee and north Mississippi, and indirectly the national welfare.

We appreciate very much the privilege of testifying before your Committee.

CAPITOL HILL TOASTMASTERS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most relevant organizations in America today is Toastmasters International. In an era when the ability to communicate with clarity is a vital ingredient for success in almost every field of endeavor, thousands of men and women are receiving valuable speech training in a nationwide network of more than 3,000 Toastmasters chapters.

The first Toastmasters Club was organized 46 years ago in Santa Ana, Calif. From a humble beginning in the basement of the local YMCA, Toastmasters has grown to international prominence with more than 70,000 members throughout the world.

Capitol Hill is home base for one of its most active and respected local chapters. Founded less than 3 years ago, Capitol Hill Toastmasters quickly established a unique national reputation. With this in mind, I take special pleasure in calling attention to a recent article from Changing Times magazine lauding the distinctive contributions Toastmasters International continues to make toward the improvement of the spoken arts in America.

The article follows:

[From the Changing Times, April 1970]
TOASTMASTERS CLUBS TAKE THE TERROR OUT OF SPEECHMAKING

The thought of speaking before an audience throws you into a panic. When the boss asks your opinion, you become tongue-tied and embarrassed. You find it hard to present your ideas clearly and cogently.

If this description fits you, maybe you should get acquainted with Toastmasters International, an organization that seeks to develop the speaking and leadership skills of its members in a relaxed, clublike setting.

Toastmasters clubs are far from new. The first one was organized in 1924 and for many years met in the basement of the Santa Ana, Cal., YMCA. Today, there are more than 3,400 clubs in 47 countries. All told, there are about 70,000 members at any given time, and, through the years, approximately 1,000,000 men have joined Toastmaster clubs and participated in the programs.

AN EVENING OF TALK

An individual Toastmasters club is likely to have 20 to 40 members who meet every week or every other week, usually in a restaurant or hotel with both dining and meeting facilities. Most meetings are held in the evening, around 6:30 or 7 o'clock, although some clubs hold breakfast or luncheon meetings. A typical meeting runs something like this:

Before the meal guests and prospective members are introduced to members of the club. After dinner the meeting is called to order and a short business session takes place. Although the meeting itself is presided over by the club president, members take turns chairing the business sessions. This is to help develop their knowledge of parliamentary procedure. The business session may be played straight, or from time to time, hecklers may try to disrupt the proceedings.

Next comes Table Topics—informal off-the-cuff talks that take about two minutes apiece. Members may speak on subjects of their own choosing; or topics, generally involving current events, may be assigned on the spot. The idea is for a man to learn to think on his feet with minimal preparation. Guests and prospective members are not required to take part in any of the speaking exercises unless they would like to.

After the Table Topics, members settle back to listen to four or five prepared talks on subjects selected by the speakers. Each speaker is introduced by the Toastmaster of the meeting, and an evaluator is assigned to assess his efforts. The talks are timed and last five to seven minutes. An "ah counter" keeps separate tabs on the number of "ahs," "uhs," gasps, gurgles and other oratorical lapses committed by each speaker.

An evaluation session is held after all the speakers are finished, and prizes or trophies are awarded to the best speakers as determined by a vote of the members (a booby prize may be given, too). A typical meeting lasts about two hours.

The basic Toastmasters "course" for each member is a carefully-thought-out series of 15 required speaking projects and three optional ones. His assignments become progressively more difficult, following a program outlined in the basic Toastmasters manual.

After his maiden Ice Breaker speech a member learns such things as how to organize a speech; how to make it challenging, persuasive and interesting; how to use the voice and body to the best advantage; how to clarify meaning and weed out verbiage; how to respond to various kinds of audiences; how to be a better listener.

More advanced speakers tackle projects that deal with the judicious use of humor, organizing and running different kinds of meetings, and coping with noisy waiters, balking public address systems, collapsed lecterns, hecklers, missing speakers and other adversities.

Members work at their own pace, although they are expected to attend all meetings. When they feel they have mastered one assignment, they are scheduled for the next available speaking slot. It takes most members from two to three years to go through the two-part Communication and Leadership programs. Once he has completed them, a

member receives his Able Toastmaster certificate.

THE CLUBS & THE MEN

MEMBERS of Toastmasters clubs are encouraged to take part in various public-service activities, such as speakers' bureaus and public speaking programs for youngsters.

Each Toastmasters club operates independently along guidelines set by Toastmasters International. The clubs are nonprofit and are open to any man who has reached 18.

A recent profile of the "typical" member of a Toastmasters club indicates that he is 39 years old and has attended college. He's probably a professional man, such as a doctor or a lawyer, or a manager or supervisor, the owner of a business or a salesman.

Dozens of large companies, conscious of the value of articulate leaders, encourage men at all levels to take part in Toastmasters programs. Some companies include the program in their training courses, pay membership costs and provide facilities for meetings.

Dues and initiation fees vary from club to club but average about \$25 a year, approximately half of which is used by the parent organization to develop training programs and publish texts and monthly copies of the *Toastmaster* magazine. Costs for meals or rental of meeting facilities are shared by the members.

District and regional speaking contests are held, and winners compete in an annual national contest that meets every year in a different city.

If you think a Toastmasters program could help you become a better speaker, attend two or three sessions as a guest before you apply for membership. To get information about the nearest club, call your chamber of commerce or write to Toastmasters International, 2200 N. Grand St., Santa Ana, Cal. 92711.

A BILL TO ALLOW A DEDUCTION FOR ADOPTION FEES

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to allow a deduction for adoption fees so that they may be treated in the same fashion for income tax purposes as are medical expenses for childbirth.

In many cases, adoptive parents incur the same expenses as do natural parents but our present tax law makes no provision for those adoptive parents even though they are assuming a responsibility equal to that of a natural parent. It may be that approval of my bill would encourage parents to adopt children when they might otherwise be reluctant to do so because of the adoption fees, which vary widely in all sections of the country.

The legislation follows:

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat adoption fees in the same manner as medical expenses for income tax purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 213(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to allowance of de-

duction for medical, dental, etc., expenses) is amended by inserting "plus any adoption fees (as defined in subsection (e)(5)) paid during the taxable year" before "exceeds 3 percent".

(b) Section 213(e) of such Code (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(5) The term 'adoption fee' means an amount (not otherwise deductible) paid by the taxpayer to an agency or organization in connection with, and for the purpose of, the adoption of a child by the taxpayer."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1970.

JEFFERSON DAVIS BELONGS IN HALL OF FAME

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, nearly 11 decades have passed since our Nation was torn apart by the horrors of a Civil War.

Exactly 109 years ago this month, April, the first shot in that grim and bloody struggle was fired on Fort Sumter.

It was a war that pitted brother against brother, divided families in their loyalty, and took a toll of lives which have never been matched in all our other wars.

The reconstruction years that followed the close of the Civil War left seeds of bitterness which are still evident today. However, as President Nixon said during his successful campaign for the Presidency, "Let us join together." Once every 5 years nominations are made to the Hall of Fame at New York University. In 1970 such nominations will be made.

The President of the Confederacy, Jefferson Davis, was not only a leader in a cause—even a lost cause—but his accomplishments to our Nation and to the history of our country are unquestioned. Jefferson Davis was not only a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, but he served with distinction in our military service. As a Member of Congress, a U.S. Senator, and a Secretary of War, he distinguished himself. All of us are indebted to him for his role in the establishment of the Smithsonian Institution here in Washington.

His qualities of leadership and dedication have been praised by the late President, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, and by President Woodrow Wilson.

It is my hope that this outstanding figure in our Nation's history will be honored and that Jefferson Davis will be named to the Hall of Fame. It is long since passed that the bitterness and division brought about by Civil War be erased. Such a move would, in my opinion, help bring about our President's appeal, "Bring us together."

An editorial in the Nashville Banner on March 27 effectively presents the reasons why Jefferson Davis warrants a place in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans:

[From the Nashville Banner, Mar. 27, 1970]

OPPORTUNITY IS NOW: JEFFERSON DAVIS BELONGS IN HALL OF FAME

Qualifications considered—among them love for and service to his country—justice no less than affection and admiration on the part of those acquainted with his story seconds the nomination of Jefferson Davis to the Hall of Fame. Elections to that institution at New York University are made once every five years, and this is the year.

Long before he was president of the Confederacy, Jefferson Davis was a great American in achievements redounding to the national good. A graduate of the Military Academy, he was an army officer of brilliant stature. He became a member of Congress, a distinguished Senator, a Secretary of War. A designer and builder of great structures, he was a leading factor in establishment of the Smithsonian Institution.

He strived to hold his country together, but gave courageously of himself and his genius of leadership when duty called in behalf of the Southland and a conviction in which he believed. Of his character in that crisis and subsequent to Appomattox, history says of him:

"With constance and courage unsurpassed he sustained the heavy burden laid upon him by his people. When their Cause was lost—with dignity he met defeat, with fortitude he met imprisonment and suffering, with entire devotion he kept the faith. In nobility of thought and in grandeur of spirit he endeavored to direct the sentiments of his stricken people with the words: 'Let me beseech you to lay aside all rancor, all bitter sectional feeling, and take your places in the ranks of those who will bring a consummation devoutly to be wished—A reunited country.'" Then he added the meaningful prophecy, "The past is dead, its hopes and aspirations; before you lies the future, a future of expanding national glory, before which all the world will stand amazed."

Two great American Presidents have paid special tribute to his memory. Said Dwight D. Eisenhower: "Having long held the conviction, a conviction reinforced by my reading of Hudson Strode's biography of Jefferson Davis, that the President of the Confederacy was one of our outstanding antebellum Americans, I have been impressed by the worth of both his military and civil service to the nation, and have admired his selflessness, courage and dedication to America . . . He nobly tried to do what he thought right."

Said Woodrow Wilson: "He (Davis) had the pride, the spirit of initiative, the capacity in business which qualify men for leadership, and lacked nothing of the indomitable will and impervious purpose to make his leadership effective. He moved direct, undaunted by and peril, and heartened a whole people."

At his passing in 1889, the New York World said of him editorially, "He was a man of commanding ability, spotless integrity, and controlling conscience. He was proud, sensitive and honorable in all his dealings and in every relation of life. A great soul has passed."

A great soul deserves remembrance—both in history, and in those public places where citizens congregate to note the figures and events deemed noteworthy in the national annals. Certainly Jefferson Davis was one of these.

He warrants a place in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans.

H.R. 16488

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 16488 with three cosponsoring members of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission to amend the joint resolution establishing the Commission. The bill will enlarge ex officio membership in the Commission, authorize hiring experts or consultants, and provide for control and protection of logos and symbols certified by the Commission. The bill has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to express my appreciation and admiration of the fine leadership Dr. J. E. Wallace Sterling has been providing as ARBC chairman. Dr. Sterling, Executive Director M. L. Spector, and the entire ARBC staff have noticeably moved forward the efforts of the Commission.

The celebration 6 years from now of the 200th anniversary of this great Nation is no small task. The initial planning decisions of the Commission will have a profound effect on the event's success. Congress can help. This Commission has seen the results of past inactions. I urge Congress give full cooperation in passing this bill.

MONEY FOR HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION STILL TOO LITTLE

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, during debate on the postveto HEW-Labor appropriation bill, I spoke on the House floor regarding the crisis which our States face because the final appropriation bill which passed on the recommendation of the President con-

tained insufficient funds for hospital construction and modernization.

At that time I inserted in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues a comparison, based on tentative figures, of the funds each State would receive under the \$254.4 million originally appropriated by the Congress for hospital construction and the \$172.7 million appropriation passed after the President's veto.

I have been informed that State officials have just been told by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the exact amount of money which they will receive under the postveto bill.

In some cases there are relatively minor changes in the amount of money each State will receive from the figures released earlier. Unfortunately, the final totals have not changed, and I am sure many of you have already been contacted by hospital officials in your districts who had been expecting but will not now receive badly needed Hill-Burton funds for the 1970 fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the final State figures below:

FISCAL YEAR 1970 ALLOCATIONS TO STATES FOR CONSTRUCTION AND MODERNIZATION OF HOSPITALS AND RELATED HEALTH FACILITIES

State	Total	Modernization	Hospitals and public health centers	Long-term care facilities	Diagnostic or treatment centers	Rehabilitation facilities
Total	\$172,200,000	\$27,100,000	\$54,200,000	\$63,600,000	\$18,200,000	\$9,100,000
Alabama	4,350,943	317,305	1,510,750	1,780,497	494,927	247,464
Alaska	750,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	100,000	50,000
Arizona	1,656,199	200,000	545,401	642,784	178,676	89,338
Arkansas	2,554,781	206,354	879,575	1,036,624	288,152	144,076
California	10,238,841	1,297,308	3,348,943	3,946,903	1,097,125	548,562
Colorado	1,755,543	317,455	538,619	634,790	176,453	88,226
Connecticut	1,497,679	383,570	417,276	491,782	136,701	68,350
Delaware	750,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	100,000	50,000
District of Columbia	750,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	100,000	50,000
Florida	5,796,957	610,853	1,942,393	2,289,210	636,334	318,167
Georgia	4,903,527	420,996	1,678,878	1,978,644	550,006	275,003
Hawaii	762,436	200,000	200,000	212,436	100,000	50,000
Idaho	883,241	200,000	244,769	288,472	100,000	50,000
Illinois	6,123,740	1,316,083	1,808,848	2,122,161	589,898	294,950
Indiana	3,988,147	737,224	1,217,594	1,434,987	398,888	199,444
Iowa	2,350,760	486,734	698,149	822,804	228,715	114,358
Kansas	2,030,019	385,022	616,114	726,121	201,841	100,921
Kentucky	3,665,450	330,824	1,248,944	1,471,945	409,158	204,579
Louisiana	4,250,683	453,614	1,422,146	1,676,073	465,900	232,950
Maine	1,078,682	200,000	329,100	387,861	107,814	53,907
Maryland	2,358,744	272,269	781,464	920,996	256,010	128,005
Massachusetts	3,966,314	1,097,837	1,074,353	1,266,181	351,962	175,981
Michigan	5,785,780	980,980	1,799,580	2,120,898	589,548	294,774
Minnesota	3,101,058	526,188	964,386	1,136,580	315,936	157,968
Mississippi	3,315,171	200,572	1,166,535	1,374,823	382,161	191,080
Missouri	4,094,288	685,654	1,276,663	1,504,613	418,239	209,119
Montana	818,782	200,000	215,181	253,601	100,000	50,000
Nebraska	1,214,719	200,000	380,051	447,909	124,506	62,253
Nevada	750,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	100,000	50,000
New Hampshire	781,445	200,000	200,000	231,445	100,000	50,000
New Jersey	4,311,839	1,013,574	1,234,325	1,455,895	404,697	202,348
New Mexico	1,160,105	200,000	359,596	423,802	117,805	58,902
New York	10,603,987	2,555,538	3,014,449	3,552,685	987,543	493,772
North Carolina	5,972,147	646,726	1,994,572	2,350,707	653,428	326,714
North Dakota	823,436	200,000	217,317	256,119	100,000	50,000
Ohio	7,684,355	929,259	2,530,039	2,981,783	828,849	414,425
Oklahoma	2,643,383	310,071	873,914	1,029,953	286,297	143,148
Oregon	1,624,095	228,785	522,596	615,907	171,204	85,603
Pennsylvania	9,807,233	2,012,177	2,919,544	3,440,834	956,452	478,226
Rhode Island	810,289	200,000	211,282	249,007	100,000	50,000
South Carolina	3,420,560	334,052	1,156,014	1,362,423	378,714	189,357
South Dakota	850,895	200,000	229,921	270,974	100,000	50,000
Tennessee	4,757,268	615,259	1,551,339	1,828,334	508,224	254,112
Texas	10,972,317	1,299,261	3,622,926	4,269,806	1,186,883	593,441
Utah	1,136,577	200,000	350,784	413,416	114,918	57,459
Vermont	750,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	100,000	50,000
Virginia	4,498,586	606,121	1,457,875	1,718,182	477,605	238,803
Washington	2,267,889	392,457	702,420	827,839	230,115	115,058
West Virginia	2,290,219	349,048	727,042	856,857	238,182	119,090
Wisconsin	3,362,670	528,842	1,061,376	1,250,886	347,711	173,855
Wyoming	750,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	100,000	50,000
American Samoa	51,175	1,978	18,426	21,716	6,036	3,019
Guam	375,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	50,000	25,000
Puerto Rico	4,577,046	450,010	1,545,731	1,821,725	506,387	253,193
Virgin Islands	375,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	50,000	25,000

Note: Basis of Allocations, per Statutory Formula: Total population, as estimated by the Bureau of the Census: (1) Provisional Estimates of the United States, July 1, 1969 (series P-25, No. 430, Aug. 29, 1969); (2) American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands, Provisional Estimates as of July 1, 1968, (unpublished data). Allotment percentages for fiscal year 1970, as determined by the Surgeon General Sept. 30 1968.

TEST FOR THE NATION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the real issue of the postal strike extends far beyond the postal employee's just demand for better pay and attention to their legitimate grievances.

The question comes down to the right of any group of persons to disregard laws designed to safeguard this Nation, at the risk of disastrous consequences to the lives of all its citizens.

As a perceptive editorial from the New York Times points out, this "test for the Nation" had to be met forcefully, to demonstrate that "Government cannot and will not surrender to the exercise of outlaw force by civil service employees or any other group."

I commend President Nixon's actions in meeting this test, and insert this editorial in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 22, 1970]

TEST FOR THE NATION

The outrageous repudiation by striking postal employes in New York and other major cities from coast to coast of the back-to-work agreement made by their union leaders confronts the nation with a test from which it cannot shrink. President Nixon gave the only right response by announcing at once that he would meet his constitutional responsibility to see that the mails go through.

The United States cannot do without mail service; this communications network is indispensable to the efficient functioning of the total economy and to the lives of 200-million Americans. But even more important than the damage a continuation of the illegal postal tie-up would inflict on every citizen is the necessity for a demonstration, once and for all, that the Government cannot and will not surrender to the exercise of outlaw force by civil service employes or any other group.

The fabric of community has worn exceedingly thin under the hammer blows inflicted on society by organized groups and by individual terrorists, united only in a belief that the abuse of power will enable them to bend the majority to their will. The postal employes do not belong in that company. This is their first strike in nearly two centuries, and it would not have come now without a full share of blundering by the Administration and Congress.

Yet the irresponsibility of their actions after the elected officers of their unions had entered into a compact with Secretary of Labor Shultz—one that assured responsible consideration of their grievances in an atmosphere free of coercion—makes it plain that these postal workers have become captives of the suicidal notion that any group in control of a vital service can bring the public to heel by misusing that control.

That notion has received too much support already through the long appeasement of municipal workers engaged in illegal strikes in New York and other metropolitan centers. It must not get a foothold in the Federal service if either orderly government or the rule of law is to prevail anywhere in America. The President showed a proper recognition of that reality with his firm declaration yesterday that there would be neither negotiations nor concessions in a "climate of intimidation."

The problem for the nation created by the postal workers' defiance is one that menaces all of organized labor. It symbolizes in most

acute form the flight from authority that has caused rank-and-file rebels to upset one out of every eight agreements negotiated in good faith by their leaders—a development that strikes at the integrity of the bargaining process.

Less than three weeks ago Congress had to jam through a stopgap law to prevent a nationwide railroad strike resulting from a similar exercise of membership intransigence in private industry. Now President Nixon is left with no choice except to mobilize Army or National Guard units to deliver the mail, a course that would have been made unnecessary if the postal employes had followed their leaders and ratified the Shultz truce formula.

It is still not too late for George Meany, as president of the A.F.L.-C.I.O., with which most of the postal employes are affiliated, to address a personal plea to the strikers in the name of the entire labor movement. Given the mood of the postal employes, such an appeal might prove as fruitless as those already made by the chiefs of the postal unions. But Mr. Meany is a man of courage and the stakes are enormous for labor as well as the country.

The policy of wisdom and of sanity for the postal workers is to return to work by tomorrow and thus clear the way for immediate action by the White House and Congress on all the issues of wages and future security that concern them. But, if they persist in their folly, the President cannot delay in making good his commitment to get the mail through. More than the mail depends on that; the future of a government based on law is in the balance.

TASK FORCE STORY WINS SODA AWARD

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the authors selected for writing "Task Force '70" stories on the major problems facing New Jersey, was Ralph Soda, legislative correspondent of the Home News, of New Brunswick, N.J.

One of the most respected and talented newspapermen in the entire Nation, Mr. Soda will receive a citation of merit for his outstanding work in the "Task Force '70" project.

I am proud and happy to insert an article announcing the award, which appeared in the Home News on April 3, 1970:

TASK FORCE STORY WINS SODA AWARD

Citations of Merit will be awarded by the N.J. Conference of Mayors, to Ralph Soda of The Home News, and members of the Associated Press and other New Jersey reporters for "outstanding journalism" in the creation of a series of statewide "Task Force '70" stories published earlier this year.

Soda, legislative correspondent for The Home News, did an in-depth report on the garbage crisis in New Jersey for The Task Force '70 project.

The news series, which ran for six weeks in New Jersey and other states, dealt "in searching depth" with many problems confronting the state's 567 municipalities, said Mayor Carmen J. Armenti of Trenton, president of the Conference of Mayors, in announcing the awards.

The awards, to be made at Princeton University May 20 at the annual meeting of the mayors, include citations to those who cooperated "in an outstanding team effort to

produce the series," said George Zuckerman of Asbury Park, executive director of the conference. The awards will cite the individuals for "Outstanding and meritorious service in the advancement of good government."

Taking part in the awards ceremonies will be Gov. William T. Cahill, President Robert Goheen of Princeton University, national and state governmental leaders and some 400 mayors and guests from all parts of New Jersey.

Zuckerman said the series, which marks a unique experience in cooperative journalism, included 19 state newspapers, working with the Associated Press to produce a "comprehensive report on many of the problems plaguing municipal leaders in New Jersey communities, large and small." The subject included a host of problems confronting mayors of the state.

The series was described by one state leader as "a liberal education not only for elected officials, but for the general public as well."

THE PRESIDENT'S SCHOOL DESEGREGATION POLICIES RECEIVE ACCLAIM

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's recent statement on school desegregation policies has received wide acclaim from thoughtful Americans who recognize that the pathway to achieving truly equal education for all American children is not easy.

The Baltimore Sun is one of these newspapers that has spoken up in support of the President's message. I wish to call it to the attention of all of my colleagues:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Mar. 25, 1970]

SCHOOL POLICY

President Nixon has set forth in painstaking detail an admirable statement of national policy on racial desegregation in the public schools. He reaffirms basic points that often are lost to sight in the day-to-day discussion of this difficult subject. Thus at the start he reiterates his personal belief that the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court, declaring school segregation unconstitutional, "was right in both constitutional and human terms."

Mr. Nixon acknowledges, moreover, that some men and women have interpreted various statements and actions of his administration as a backing away from the principles of the 1954 decision. "We are not backing away," he says. "The constitutional mandate will be enforced."

All this may seem elementary, 16 years after the court's decision, but its reiteration now helps to underscore the point that there can be no turning back on this issue, and that all the nation must face forward and move ahead, recognizing problems for what they are and conceding that no easy or perfect solutions are in sight.

Good faith, as Mr. Nixon says, is of utmost importance. As he notes, the federal courts have left a substantial degree of latitude within which specific desegregation plans can be designed. But, he says, "this does not mean that the court will tolerate or the administration condone evasion or subterfuge; it does mean that if the essential element of good faith is present, it should ordinarily be possible to achieve legal compliance with a minimum of educational disruption, and

through a plan designed to be responsive to the community's own local circumstances. This matter of good faith is critical."

When there is acceptance of the fact of federal law and when there is good faith effort to comply with it, such questions as busing, de facto segregation arising from housing patterns, and massive educational improvements can be dealt with. Some of Mr. Nixon's proposals are noteworthy, such as greater federal aid to "racially impacted" schools (an advance from the broader "federally impacted" formula), an insistence that racial segregation of teachers must be ended, a wide search for new teaching methods and a candid recognition that school desegregation is a problem for the East, North and West as well as the South.

The important thing is to keep the nation, and the numerous sectors of the federal government, on the right course. Mr. Nixon has laid down a policy for which his administration now can properly be held to account.

RESULTS OF DISTRICTWIDE POLL OF THE 16TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT IN PENNSYLVANIA

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently announced the results of a districtwide poll taken of my 16th Congressional District in Pennsylvania. I include that announcement and the poll results in the RECORD at this point:

RESULTS OF DISTRICTWIDE POLL OF THE 16TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT IN PENNSYLVANIA

WASHINGTON.—Congressman Edwin D. Eshleman today announced the results of the district-wide poll he distributed several weeks ago.

Eshleman mailed approximately 135,000 questionnaires to every household in his 16th Congressional District at the end of January. Since that time he has been receiving and tabulating the returns from his mailing.

In making his announcement, Eshleman made some general comments about the poll.

"I was very much pleased with the response of my constituency on this questionnaire.

"About 30,000 people sent back a completed card which is a return of 22%. When compared to the national average of a 10-15% response, I think that the people of the 16th District showed their concern for and interest in the issues of the day.

"A number of people indicated some question about the use of only 'Yes' and 'No' responses on issues so complex. The reason for limiting the choice was to offer each respondent the same choice on complex subjects as I have on the House floor—either a 'Yes' or a 'No'.

"The results of the poll are for the most part quite well defined which would seem to show that the 16th District has some very definite ideas about the questions asked. I was particularly interested in the overwhelming endorsement given President Nixon's Vietnam policy since two different groups were saying 'No' on that query. Both those people who want an immediate withdrawal and those who want an acceleration of the war effort were responding in the negative to the first question."

The results of the tally done of the Eshleman poll by an independent tabulation service were as follows:

[In percent]

(1) Do you support President Nixon's Vietnam peace plan?

Yes ----- 83.6
No ----- 13.3
No response----- 3.1

(2) Are you favorably impressed with the overall first year performance of the Nixon Administration?

Yes ----- 75.0
No ----- 22.8
No response----- 2.2

(3) Do you think more tax dollars should be spent to combat air and water pollution?

Yes ----- 81.6
No ----- 15.5
No response----- 2.9

(4) Do you favor returning a percentage of Federal tax money to state and local governments for use as they see fit?

Yes ----- 60.3
No ----- 35.7
No response----- 4.0

(5) Do you believe that the national news media give you a fair and accurate picture of national events and government activities?

Yes ----- 29.9
No ----- 66.2
No response----- 3.9

(6) Do you think that our present welfare system provides enough assurance that those who can work do work?

Yes ----- 11.5
No ----- 86.0
No response----- 2.5

(7) Do you believe that the problem of drug abuse is a serious threat in your community?

Yes ----- 77.1
No ----- 20.7
No response----- 2.2

(8) Would you favor a requirement for all Federal officials, including Congressmen and Senators, to make public all sources of income?

Yes ----- 75.1
No ----- 22.6
No response----- 2.3

(9) Do you agree with the President's assessment that inflation is presently our number one domestic problem?

Yes ----- 78.0
No ----- 19.8
No response----- 2.2

(10) Do you believe there must be stiffer Federal regulations to protect consumer interests?

Yes ----- 79.8
No ----- 17.2
No response----- 3.0

MEDICAL CARE FOR VETERANS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration medical care budget that President Nixon earlier this year submitted to the Congress for fiscal year 1971 is for \$1,702,000,000. This is a record sum, and would have represented

the most money ever appropriated for this purpose. But the President has now gone beyond this unprecedented funding. He has just proposed an additional \$50 million increase in VA's medical care budget for fiscal year 1971. Earlier, he authorized the Veterans' Administration to seek an additional \$15 million for this current fiscal year, and to the \$1,542,000,000 already appropriated for this fiscal year President Nixon added another \$91 million to help cover salary increases for VA's doctors and nurses and hospital personnel.

The veterans' medical care program is one in which we must never economize or sell our disabled veterans short. President Nixon realizes, as do all Americans, that anything we do for our veterans is an investment in human beings, an investment that has always paid dividends to all America.

THE PRESIDENT'S SCHOOL LEADERSHIP WELCOME

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's recent message on school integration is being praised for many reasons and from many quarters—including some who confess to being former skeptics of the administration's school policies.

One of the prominent voices convinced by the President's message is the Denver Post. A recent Post editorial discusses the President's "welcome leadership" in this area, saying that the message shows "a President who has taken more trouble than any of his predecessors to really study all the facets of this complex puzzle, and who is determined to exert Presidential leadership to move the issue off dead center and solve it."

I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Denver Post, Mar. 25, 1970]

NIXON SCHOOL LEADERSHIP WELCOME

Any American concerned with seeing our nation make real progress on solving the problems of school segregation will be heartened—and probably surprised—by the quality of President Nixon's long message on this subject.

It is a first-rate analysis of the realities of the problem. There is also a helpful review of actions of the Supreme Court and lower courts.

But most important, the President outlines an approach to solving the problem which, while it won't satisfy everyone, is balanced, fair-minded and, quite possibly, practically creative.

Despite the questionable past antics of the Justice Department, Nixon insists his administration "won't back off" on enforcing school desegregation in de jure cases like most of those in the South and some in the North. He repeats farther on in the message that he won't tolerate subterfuges and evasions in compliance with court desegregation orders.

But the key to the message is his approach to tackling the far greater problem of de facto (neighborhood) segregation. He insists that the "... alternatives are not limited to perpetuating racial isolation ... (or) mas-

sively disrupting school patterns" (by busing children to schools outside their neighborhood). Nixon opts, instead, for the concept of a student at a segregated school getting "some of his education in his 'home base' school and some outside it."

Denverites will recognize a practical application of this concept in the present "cultural arts" program and Superintendent Robert D. Gilberts' "school complex" proposal. And it just may be that this is an idea whose time has finally come.

All-out integrationists doubt such part-time integration will be effective, but the only way to find out is to give the thing a thorough trial.

And prospects of giving it a thorough trial are much enhanced by Nixon's proposal to divert \$500 million from other domestic programs in fiscal year 1971 to finance such innovative school integration programs and to improve the quality of education in segregated and low-achieving schools.

We're reserving final judgment on the financing proposal until we see where the money would be taken from, but the President's willingness to back his approach with \$500 million next fiscal year and \$1 billion the year after does convince us, at least, that he's serious.

Frankly, we have been highly unimpressed with the President's past performance on school desegregation. We have doubted his dedication to really solving this problem, rather than merely playing politics with it.

The picture that emerges from this message is of a President who has taken more trouble than any of his predecessors to really study all the facets of this complex puzzle, and who is determined to exert presidential leadership to move the issue off dead center and solve it.

He will be judged, of course, by the results he gets. But nothing could be more needed, and welcome, than his effort to lead constructively.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL FOR A NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal for a National Foundation on Higher Education is truly exciting. For too long, the Federal Government's efforts to aid institutions of higher education have been narrowly categorical and unnecessarily fragmented. Creation of a single agency to assist institutions in the attainment of quality can do much to improve higher education across the country.

The unrest of our Nation's campuses tells us there is some disagreement with the way our institutions currently view their function. There is a great need for institutional self-evaluation and institutional reform. The National Foundation on Higher Education can prove the catalyst for institutional innovation in these areas. The result can only be a stronger higher education system.

The President set forth three goals for the foundation:

First. To provide a source of funds for the support of excellence, new ideas, and reform in higher education, which could be given out on the basis of the quality of the institutions and programs concerned.

Second. To strengthen colleges and universities of courses of instruction that play a uniquely valuable role in American higher education or that are faced with special difficulties.

Third. To provide an organization concerned, on the highest level, with the development of national policy in higher education.

These goals are of primary importance to the future of our Nation, for our Nation depends, to a large extent, on its institutions of higher education.

I can only add my voice to the President's in endorsing these goals and stressing their urgency.

IT IS OUR COUNTRY, TOO—IT IS TIME TO RECLAIM IT

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the most aggrieved casualties of the so-called generation gap in today's society is the over-30, educated and concerned American who has believed in and fought for the liberal traditions of his country and wants to see it continue to build on the already considerable progress it has made in the battle against its most threatening problems—poverty, discrimination, injustice. He is often one who has known war and does not like it; he has seen the mistakes of his own society and wants to change it; and he has made an investment in his country and wants to protect it.

Today he is in a quandary. He meets, he knows, or he works with young people and he understands that most of them are good, well-motivated, and concerned citizens who will carry on the causes which his generation has taken up but not yet finished. At the same time, however, he is denounced by a small segment of youth who have arrogated the self-styled responsibility to "purify" the United States and refashion it in their own image. He is assigned the blame and made to feel guilty for all the failures of society—failures which he has long since recognized and fought to change. He is accused of fostering values which are materialistic, reactionary, and bigoted. And he is getting weary and worried and angry.

Recently, one of the "over 30," Dr. Ross Toole, a university professor who teaches history, is the father of seven children, was reared in the depression and fought in the war and who is a self-styled "liberal square," wrote an essay in which he gives eloquent expression to his concern about the younger generation.

He is one of those legitimately worried Americans I have described. He is not reactionary. He is not a bigot. He neither believes in nor advocates police action to suppress campus demonstrations, or tougher laws and police raids to halt the use of drugs. Rather, he has a stake in American society and, perhaps more than anything else, he deeply resents the

wholesale and unthinkingly doctrinaire denunciation of everything American by those who foster anarchy and revolution, usually with an arrogance born of ignorance and a total disregard of the consequences of their actions for themselves as well as for others.

Professor Toole is speaking to all of us—to the others of his generation as well as to the vast majority of young people—who have, in a sense, capitulated to aggressive youth and abdicated their own responsibility to protect both themselves and society from the aggressive and disrupting and often dangerous tactics of a small segment of American youth. He speaks to the many who have been forced to the periphery of a society which is becoming increasingly—not always beneficially—youth-centered. His message is, "It's our country too—it's time to reclaim it."

Professor Toole says simply that he is tired of being blamed, maimed, and contrite, in the face of the arrogant tyranny of some militant children. He argues:

It's time to live in an adult world where we belong . . . 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.

Dr. Toole is taking a chance. By speaking from his heart against those, whatever their age or ideology, whose object is to destroy the basic foundations of our society and undermine the rule of law, which is the cornerstone of this Republic, he runs the risk of alienating an intelligentsia which has often taken up the cause of militant youth without sufficient thought as to the consequences of their support. Too many of us have permitted legitimate and necessary concepts such as law, rules, and order to become code words for suppression. They are not.

Professor Toole's essay is an extraordinarily perceptive comment on contemporary society and I know that it will be welcomed as a reasonable and informed statement, clearly written from the heart as well as the mind, by all of us who want, desperately, to see America survive. We know that constructive change is the only way to guarantee that survival—we know because we have effected that change in our own lifetimes. We must not permit a continuation of such effective and constructive change to succumb to anarchy, violence, or tyranny. We—all of us, young and old—have too much to lose.

Mr. Speaker, I include Dr. Toole's article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Mar. 22, 1970]

A PROFESSOR SPEAKS TO THE "OVER-30's": "IT IS OUR COUNTRY TOO—IT IS TIME TO RECLAIM IT"

(By Dr. K. Ross Toole)

(NOTE.—Prof. Toole, who has been laid up with a heart problem, wrote the accompanying essay as a letter to his brother John, a Missoula, Montana, businessman. John sent copies to friends with children. One of the copies got into the hands of the editor of the Billings Gazette who printed it.)

(That was a month ago. Since then, Prof. Toole has given permission so that it has been reprinted by papers in Denver, Chicago, San Francisco and a lot of other places. Letters have poured in to Prof. Toole—and, says his wife, "he's having a lot of fun reading them in his sick room. He's begun to analyze them, too.")

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 7 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.

"It's 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 Vietnam; it is the abdication of its first responsibility, its pusillanimous capitulation to its youth, and its sick preoccupation with the problems, the mind, the 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 teenager's wet behind the ears and utterly without the ben-

efit 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!

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 3000 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.

THE HEART OF THE PIE

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 the 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, middleaged 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 bores. 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; it is also destructive. Society has drastically obtraced arrogance without the backing of demonstrable accomplishment. Why, then, do we tolerate arrogant slob 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 the world? Again, it is not police raids and tougher laws that we need; it is merely strength. The strength to explain in our potty, middleaged 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.

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.

WIN-OR-BURN MENTALITY

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 inexcusably 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 1930s 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 antideluvian, 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.

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 fall.

What we need is a reappraisal of our own middleclass 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 1 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 most 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 expell (strangely unused) has been the legitimate recourse of universities since 1209.

WE MUST HAVE RULES

More importantly it means that as freshman orientation, whatever form it takes, the administration should set forth the ground rules—not belligerently 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."

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 statement 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 consequences 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.

MAJOR BLAME: FACULTIES

2. The disruption of any class, directly or indirectly, by voice of presence or the destruction of any university property, shall be cause for expulsion.

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 provocatism. 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 permissible 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 prearrange-

ment, publicly stated, should then pass to the courts.

If buildings are occupied, the court enjoins the participating students. It has the awful power to declare them in contempt. If violence ensues, it is violation of the courts' order. Courts are not subject to fears, not part of the action.

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 orgasmic 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 live it. It is time to reclaim it.

"CONSTRUCTIONISM" IS NOT MEDIOCRITY

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, numerous Members of Congress and of the press have had a field day with Senator ROMAN HRUSKA's off-hand remark about "mediocrity" and the Supreme Court. William F. Buckley, in his superb and unmatched style, has written a timely, factual response to these outlandish comments. I heartily recommend it to my colleagues:

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 6, 1970]

"CONSTRUCTIONISM" ISN'T MEDIOCRITY

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Our intelligentsia have had a wonderful time with the offhand remark of Sen. Roman Hruska to the effect that if it is true that Judge Carswell is a "mediocre" legal mind, then maybe he would be especially useful to the Supreme Court.

That of course is a natural for Art Buchwald, who is amusing in his treatment of such matters, and Herblock, who will be savage. It will be wonderful fodder for the next 6 speeches of John Kenneth Galbraith, and the next 600 of Arthur Schlesinger.

Fair enough. But it is worth while to make a couple of points before it becomes settled doctrine that the Nixon administration sees mediocrity as the apogee of the curve.

- 1) What Sen. Hruska obviously intended to say was that the Warren Court got itself a reputation for legal virtuosity among those people who applauded its decisions: which decisions were not popular, for the most part, with the people of the United States.

Therefore, if in order to redress the balance on the court it becomes necessary to name to it someone who does not inhabit the peaks where the air is pure, why maybe we'd be better off stopping half way up the mountain where there is a little more oxygen.

The thinking is the exact equivalent of Lincoln's on hearing that Gen. Grant drank whisky.

- 2) It is true that the Warren Court became extremely popular with American liberals. It is also true that it was popular precisely because the court reached conclusions that were ideologically congenial to these gentlemen.

As a matter of fact, the shrewdest legal minds in the land were utterly appalled by

the quality of a great many of the decisions of Earl Warren and his epigoni.

Altheus Mason of Princeton, for instance, although greatly sympathetic to the decision reached in *Brown vs. Board of Education*, tore his hair at the legal reasoning that led to it. Learned Hand, whose mind was anything but mediocre, went up to Harvard to say of Mr. Warren and his constitutional combo that they appeared to think of themselves as a third legislative chamber.

Edward Corwin was considered probably the top constitutional expert in the land, and his opinion of the Warren Court was that it was inexpressibly slovenly.

And it wasn't only outsiders. A professor from Notre Dame amused himself—and his readers—by publishing a pastiche of comments about the legal reasoning and conclusions of the majority of the Warren Court. It read like calls from the John Birch Society for the impeachment of Earl Warren, and consisted of excerpts from the dissenting opinions of members of the Supreme Court about the work of their honorable colleagues.

At one time or another Earl Warren was accused by his colleagues of historical ignorance, self-contradiction, logical fatuity, a failure to grasp elements of the argument, legal sciolism, and double parking.

In other words, the Warren Court is greatly appreciated by its admirers mostly because it came to the right conclusions, from their point of view.

And inasmuch as people tend to believe that what they believe in is the profoundest achievement of the human mind, they simply deduced that the judges who gave them those conclusions were the most brilliant of men. Of course, it does not follow.

- 3) The meritocratic argument that the brighter you are the better off you are guiding the affairs of state is something the liberals ought to feel just a little uncomfortable about, when they consider their total situation. After all, they do believe—do they not?—that a man should be tried by a jury of his peers? Why not by a jury of Ph.Ds?

They were extremely enthusiastic about Harry Truman, were our friends who are laughing at the idea of putting a mediocre judge into the Supreme Court. Mr. Truman was, by most accounts, a very good president. By no one's account was he ever more than a mediocre mind.

- And 4), if mediocrity means that when you read the Constitution and the Constitution says two plus two equals four, and you therefore rule that two plus two equals four, rather than rule that it depends on whether you had an underprivileged educational background, then precisely what we need is a little more mediocrity; and I for one hope Mr. Carswell overwhelms the court with it.

COVERAGE OF THE WORKING POOR UNDER FAMILY ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most innovative and significant aspects of the Family Assistance Act is the extension of coverage to the working poor. The present welfare system excludes those who work regularly but at low wages. This often creates situations where some who work may have less income than others who do not.

It is estimated that among the population covered by the Family Assistance Act there are 1.1 million family heads

who work fulltime, and still suffer the affliction of poverty.

Today, no State provides assistance under AFDC for a family headed by a father who works fulltime—even though the family may be living in poverty. Only 25 of 54 jurisdictions provide assistance for families headed by unemployed fathers. As a result, a father often finds that he can provide better for his family by not working at all or by only working part time. Often, he finds that he must desert his children so that they can receive the food and clothing necessary to sustain them.

Both as a matter of equity and family stability, the working poor should be included in the welfare system.

A LETTER FROM THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF METROMEDIA, INC.

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter received from Thomas J. Dougherty, assistant secretary of Metromedia, Inc.:

METROMEDIA, INC.,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1970.

HON. SAM STEIGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEIGER: On March 4, 1970, you appeared on the Floor of the House and spoke about the interests of Emprise, Inc. Buffalo, New York, in various enterprises throughout the United States. During the course of your speech, you stated that Emprise owned the Ice Capades. Your statement, as printed in the *Congressional Record*, appeared under the heading "Emprise: A Lesson in Corporate Calumny."

The *Washington Post* edition for Saturday, March 7, 1970, printed portions of your statement, utilizing the title that appeared in the *Congressional Record*. Immediately upon reading the *Post* on Saturday morning, I called your office and spoke to Mr. Paul Rosenblatt, your Administrative Assistant, to advise him that you had made a grievous error in your speech. I advised Mr. Rosenblatt that Ice Capades is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Metromedia, Inc., which is a publicly-held company with in excess of 10,000 stockholders. I might note, parenthetically, that there are included amongst our stockholders a vast number of pension funds established by some of the most respected corporations in America, several well-known mutual funds and various banking institutions of unquestioned integrity. I further informed Mr. Rosenblatt that I see our Company's stock transfer sheets each month and that I knew of my own knowledge that Emprise did not own as much as 1% of the stock of Metromedia. A further investigation of the stock records of our corporation during the following week disclosed that no stock is held in the name of Emprise, Inc. or either Jeremy or Max Jacobs.

I might point out also that The *Washington Post* on March 14, 1970, carried a story quoting Jeremy Jacobs, where he states, "[Neither] Emprise, nor any member of our family, has any connections [sic] with Ice Capades, except for the fact that we may be the concessionaire whenever they appear."

Metromedia, Inc. has owned Ice Capades since May 1963. Ice Capades is recognized as

the largest and most respected ice touring show in the United States. Each show is designed as an attraction for the family group. Obviously, its inclusion in a story of alleged corruption is extremely harmful to the excellent reputation which Ice Capades enjoys and it is exceedingly detrimental to the thousands of stockholders who have invested their money in our Company. We would hope, therefore, that in the interests of fairness you will correct the Record by the inclusion of an additional statement which indicates that neither Emprise nor its principal stockholders have any ownership interest or association with either Ice Capades or its parent company, Metromedia, Inc.

Should you need any further reference with regard to the integrity of our Company,

I am certain that many of your colleagues can attest to that integrity, since we operate radio and television stations in several of the major cities in the United States. We are, of course, engaged in many other legitimate businesses, of all which are described in our latest Annual Report, a copy of which is enclosed.

I would appreciate being advised what action you take on this request.

I am taking the liberty of forwarding a copy of this letter to Mr. Martin Zad, Executive Sports Editor of The *Washington Post*, for his information.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. DOUGHERTY,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Dougherty also advised my office that Lou Jacobs formerly had at least a 7-percent interest in the ice show but has had no ownership since 1963 when it was acquired by Metromedia. It is my pleasure to enter these corrections.

U.S. POLICY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body is currently giving us another rundown on the world situation and, I might add, if the remarks of one prominent Member of that body are any indication, the outcome seems headed to run down the United States.

He suggests that the United States still has time, but not much, to arrange for a sellout in South Vietnam and that we should accept Communist domination of Indo-China—North and South Vietnam plus Laos and Cambodia—though not advocate it, as a fact of life. Of course, these facts, like art, are conceived in the eyes and mind of the beholder and it appears, much to the consternation of the gentleman, that his underlying gripe is that he does not have the authority of the President to implement what he conceives the policy of the United States should be with respect to the nations of Southeast Asia.

It is the gentleman's contention that Vietnam never really mattered to the security of the United States and he has enlisted a small, vociferous, and often violent army of believers in his cause. The fact of the matter, however, is that the Presidents of the present and recent past history have not seen eye to eye with the gentleman in the pragmatic exercise

of their constitutional authority, confronted as they were and still are with the realities of the situation.

As for the myths of which the distinguished gentleman speaks, they are like facts, what he has made them out to be. The only hitch is that he still does not have the authority commensurate with his beliefs to impose his Southeast Asia policy on the President. Idealism can be advanced by the most convincing logic, and indeed, the division in our country today is characterized by persons of all persuasions whose depth of belief is equal to that of the gentleman who purports to have the only true and meaningful solution to U.S. policy for Southeast Asia. He is not the only eminent scholar in the field of foreign affairs, but he is the only one with a forum of such prestige and influence as to further deepen the division in this country and prolong any settlement of the conflict in Vietnam. The "disaster of great proportions to American foreign policy in Asia" might very well be the caption for the position which the gentleman enunciates. If the North Vietnam regime ever sought a highly influential ally among our own people, or a persuasive propaganda tool, it must certainly find consolation in the gentleman's proposed policy for which he has long been the leading advocate.

COULD CARSWELL BE WORSE THAN OTHERS?

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the Senators from my State of South Dakota has announced that he will not vote for confirmation of Judge Harrold Carswell in spite of the fact that probably 75 percent of the voters in South Dakota feel as columnist John Chamberlain feels. The article follows:

COULD CARSWELL BE WORSE THAN OTHERS?

(By John Chamberlain)

WASHINGTON.—I am no student of the judicial opinions of Judge G. Harrold Carswell, but it amuses me to think that any lower court justice in the land could be deemed unfit to mingle on the Supreme Court bench with some of the alleged great brains that have been confusing the legislative function with the judicial for 10! these many years.

Quite privately I have long been convinced that one of the qualifications for a modern Supreme Court justice in the age of the Great Society must be that he is unable to read. How, save on the basis of functional illiteracy, can one explain the eight-to-one decision in the *Mrs. Madalyn Murray school prayer case* of 1963?

Justice Tom Clark, who wrote the majority opinion which effectively made voluntary prayers or Bible-reading in the schools illegal, could hardly have had Article One of the Bill of Rights clearly before him when he spoke for the Court. What this First Amendment to the Constitution says, quite explicitly, is that "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of a religion." Well, Congress never has tried to establish a national church; Congressmen, even the mediocrities among them, have been able to read.

The first amendment, however, conveys no

hint of an instruction to states and the local communities about legislating on religious matters. (When the Bill of Rights was adopted some state actually had what amounted to local states churches.) Presumably Articles Nine and Ten of the Bill of Rights, which defend rights "retained by the people" and "reserved to the states," leave it entirely up to the local voters in the local communities to do as they please about school prayers provided, of course, that individuals are not coerced into praying against their will.

If words mean what they obviously say, eight Supreme Court justices should have been sent back to school for remedial reading instruction after the "Mad Murray" decision.

Then there is the case of Justice William O. Douglas, who has just come out with a book called "Points of Rebellion." Douglas, as a judge, is sworn to uphold the Constitution, the established fundamental law of the land. This has not stopped him from writing this astounding passage: "We must realize that today's establishment is the new George III. Whether it will continue to adhere to his tactics, we do not know. If it does, the redress, honored in tradition, is also revolution."

In my innocent way I had always thought the way to change out basic laws is prescribed in the Constitution which Justice Douglas is supposed to be protecting. The fundamental constitutive document of our republic has been amended 25 times, proving that it can be done when the urge to depart from the older established law is compelling. Should not one assume that any right-minded Supreme Court justice would insist that "revolution" is not to be supported in preference to amendment by anyone speaking as a member of the high bench?

You can't very well advocate illegality out of one side of your mouth and presume to be taken seriously as a defender of the law when you sit on the cases brought before your court.

Let me say it again that I am not a competent judge of G. Harrold Carswell's legal acumen. To make a proper study of his record I would have to take a month off from my work as a commentator on affairs. Since I am under contract to deliver a certain number of columns to editors each week, no such time is available to me.

However, I do have time to look at individual court opinions and to refresh myself on the wording of the Bill of Rights. I would be willing to gamble that Judge Carswell couldn't do worse than five or six of the justices who have been legislating for us from the high bench for years. And I am sure that Judge Carswell would never, in his right mind, write a book condoning revolution when the amending process is open to those who want to change the law.

Some of our senators, speaking in defense of Carswell, have said the Supreme Court might benefit by the addition of a representative of "mediocre citizens." This is hardly the most felicitous way to put it. What we do have the right to expect is that judges should at least be able to understand English.

EDUCATOR OF THE YEAR

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, one of Alabama's outstanding educators has recently been named "Educator of the Year" by Kappa Phi Kappa educational fraternity. I would like to appraise the

Congress of the high caliber of educational leadership which has been achieved in my State. Dr. Harry M. Philpott, esteemed president of Auburn University is most deserving of this significant honor. Although Dr. Philpott has held the reins as President of this fine institution for only a few years, his leadership and outstanding contributions to the betterment of education are well recognized.

I might point out that in a time when discord is rampant and becomes the order of the day on many college campuses across America, Dr. Philpott is highly respected and his counsel is solicited by both students and faculty alike at Auburn University.

The enclosed article, which appeared in the Birmingham Post-Herald bespeaks the esteem and affection which my State holds for this career educator. I would like to commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

"TOP EDUCATOR" IS DR. PHILPOTT

(By Jim Goodwin)

Educators in Alabama must promote the necessary mechanism and participate in the rewriting of the basic constitution of Alabama. Dr. Harry M. Philpott said as he accepted the award as Alabama's "Educator of the Year," presented by the Kappa Phi Kappa Friday.

The award was made to Dr. Philpott, Auburn University president, for his contributions to the betterment of education in Alabama and for his work as chairman of the Alabama Education Study Commission.

"In the revision of the Alabama state constitution, certain things pertaining to education should be changed," said Dr. Philpott. "As educators," he said, "some of the things we have to do are outmoded constitutionally and these things must be done away with if we are to have an effective and an efficient school system."

"We need an objective analysis of the tax structure of Alabama. We need to have a study made, preferably by outside experts, and determine where we have equity and inequity, to determine the way to support the kinds of programs that we need and also to make such recommendations as are necessary to change this," Philpott said.

EQUALIZE TAXES

"It is not going to help the state of Alabama to say, as politicians have said, that 'if I am elected there will never be another tax, another new tax in the State of Alabama,' and they say, 'I am for quality education, and I pledge to improve the quality of education in the state of Alabama,'" he said.

"The very least they can do, if they are going to pledge no new taxes is to say we are going to take a look at the taxes we have and we are going to equalize them a little bit better," Dr. Philpott said.

The constitution, according to Dr. Philpott, should provide for annual sessions of the legislature and "we need to have those sessions as far as the school people are concerned in January, so we know what we are going to be dealing with the following year."

"These are just some of the things that the Alabama Education Study Commission talked about and some of the things that will require legislative and political action."

"In the opinion of the commission, there are more school districts in the State of Alabama than we should have," Philpott said.

In the area of educator responsibility, Dr. Philpott said, "We are going to have to be more vigorous in our experimental programs."

URGES PRIORITIES

"Priorities must be established for our educational programs," he said, "and there will never be a time when we are going to have

enough money to do the things that should be done in education. One of the big jobs we, as educators, are going to have in the next decade is to decide what is most important and what is less important among all of the good things that we could do."

He said educators "have a present danger of educational decisions being made by people who will not have educational responsibility and accountability for those decisions. We need to get before the American public the fact that if we are going to have quality education, ultimate decisions in matters affecting schools will have to be made by those people who will be held accountable for the decisions."

"The courts need to recognize this and whether it be an agency from Washington that is here today and gone tomorrow or whether it be a judge, the accountability will rest with us in education ultimately as to what happens and the other folks are going to be forgotten," he said.

SECRETARY HICKEL TELLS PARTICIPANTS IN ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS WEEK SYMPOSIUM AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY HOW CONCERNED YOUNG PEOPLE CAN HELP FIGHT POLLUTION

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel, a native of Kansas, was the principal speaker at the Environmental Awareness Week Symposium at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans., Monday, April 6. His address, one of the famous Landon Lecture Series at the university, was tied in with the symposium, and was further evidence of how thoroughly dedicated this administration is to the task of improving the quality of our environment.

Secretary Hickel explained to the students and others about special programs developed by the Department of Interior to enlist the services of young people in the all-out battle to stop pollution. He explained the role of SCOPE—Student Councils on Pollution and Environment, and ECO—Environmental Control Organization.

What Secretary Hickel told the symposium at Kansas State is of interest to young people across the country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring this important message to the attention of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR WALTER J. HICKEL AT ALF LONDON LECTURE SERIES, KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, MANHATTAN, KANS., APRIL 6, 1970

I never would have dreamed, as the son of a western Kansas tenant farmer, that the clear skies and sparkling streams of Kansas would be in danger in my lifetime.

Even on the hottest summer day you could look up at those skies, breathe deeply and be refreshed.

Or scoop up a drink of safe, sweet water with your hand.

But in a few years Kansans may not be able to enjoy these same carefree pleasures.

Talk of permanent destruction of the environment is not the idle threat of an alarmist.

It is fact. And it is frightening. Smog is no longer a phenomenon peculiar to California.

Polluted water is no longer just a hazard on the Hudson or the Chesapeake.

All of mankind is plunging headlong into an environmental emergency.

And yet many people still refuse to face it. It is not always easy to recognize the warning signals.

They are as subtle in some places as cancer symptoms—but they are no less deadly.

It's a terrible paradox—air and water and land—the very elements which attracted our ancestors from the east—are being threatened by our efforts to build a vigorous society.

We are beginning to realize that the best things in life are not free. If we don't pay the cost to protect them, we shall lose them.

A spreading blanket of toxic air—the most dangerous elements of which are invisible—is encircling the globe. And scientists have found both smog and DDT in the snow layers of Antarctica.

Our rivers, the life system of the land, are becoming a death system for the oceans.

Millions of tons of pollutants and pesticides are being poured into the sea, threatening to destroy man's greatest source for future food and oxygen.

Manhattan, Kansas, is a long way from the ocean.

But even here, we must become far more concerned about the quality of this essential element of the life system.

They say Kansans are realists, like our "show me" neighbors in Missouri.

I hope that if you remember nothing else from my remarks today, you will remember my warning that pollution is not just something politically popular to talk about.

It is a worldwide threat of the highest magnitude.

The question before us is this: "Can we remold our mental attitudes and retool our industry fast enough to do something about it?"

I believe we can.

My belief—and it is mainly a statement of faith, not of fact—is based on faith in the heart of the future—the university campus.

The young people of this country have risen to the moment.

They have challenged the very foundations of our value system.

They ask, "Can we afford to consume everything we can afford to buy?"

I have met with hundreds of students in recent months, and these young people want to know:

"What right have we—in the time-span of a few generations—to use up a majority of the irreplaceable natural resources which it took millions of years to produce?"

They ask, "What will be left for our children? And for their children in turn?"

They talk about the "environmental ethic"—the right of plants and animals to continue to exist in ecological balance.

These are serious questions. And I am serious about trying to answer them.

What concerns me as an official responsible to you and all Americans, is how the input from the concerned young people can have a meaningful impact on the centers of governmental activity.

Life is changing so fast in the seventies that we can no longer tolerate the old pace of a good idea fighting its way through established channels.

A good idea today can be out of date in a year, or even a few months.

To fight this "bureaucratic breakdown" in the Department of the Interior, we have taken several steps.

Last month I set up in my office a "Task Force on Environmental Education and Youth Activities." This coordinating body will serve as a clearinghouse and creative center for a number of functions.

It will give us immediate access to a new program called "SCOPE"—Student Councils or Pollution and Environment.

SCOPE is a unique experiment in government-student relations.

Students are being invited to participate directly with the government on an emerging national issue of immense proportions.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration in the Interior Department has established SCOPE committees in each of its nine regions across the nation.

These committees will serve as a channel through which students can contact federal officials, and secure technical information developed by federal agencies.

Through SCOPE we are showing government that it pays to listen—as well as talk!

We are developing methods to insure that student suggestions, and their views on environmental problems—and program priorities—can reach us directly.

Since meeting with representatives from each of the nine regions, I have decided to expand this program from FWPCA, into a wider framework.

We are exploring the possibilities of expanding it to an interdepartmental organization. In this way it could have an impact on all the federal agencies working on pollution problems.

Already the SCOPE representatives are serving as part of a highly motivated, public "early warning system."

When pollution is spotted—or major projects are launched without regard for the environment, SCOPE is notifying the authorities.

And now, as I travel around the country, I am meeting with the regional SCOPE groups to discuss regional concerns.

Today will see the first of those meetings, with the SCOPE group here at Kansas State.

Pollution will only be eradicated when the government and the public work together on it as a team.

I am encouraged that the student community is responding.

We look forward to combining the enthusiasm and fresh ideas of youth with the technical competence, and enforcement capacity of the federal government.

We also have many young people who want to take a *full time* role in the environment battle.

Because the crisis we face is much deeper than just pollution. It has to do with the entire way men live.

For this reason, I have called for creation of a National Environmental Service Force, patterned roughly after the Peace Corps.

... In fact, a few editors have already called this proposed organization the "Environmental Peace Corps."

I have received hundreds of letters from young doctors, undergraduates, engineers, high school students, biologists and architects.

These are eager young people who want to *participate*.

We are suggesting that this group take the formal name of Environmental Control Organization, or "ECO" (E-CO).

The idea is to place young talent in those areas of the nation needing study and help the most.

Spontaneous groups on the grass roots level have already sprung up across the country.

And I believe ECO members can provide leadership for those willing efforts which often need direction.

At the secondary education level, ECO could help fill the gap in schools which do not have the trained personnel to meet the mushrooming demands of environmental education.

The scientists, lawyers and social scientists who participate could lend their skills to the community leaders in a given region to evaluate, plan and execute new approaches to ecological problems.

Educated, and educating others in environmental problems, these Americans are de-

termined to find solutions—with or without governmental involvement.

This makes this situation both an opportunity—and an obligation—for the Administration.

The opportunity:

At a time when we are beginning to realize the deteriorating condition of our environment, the Administration can acquire invaluable aid—in terms of commitment, knowledge, and sheer manpower—to bring about a reversal in ecological trends.

Some are highly skilled and others are only beginning.

But the task at hand has a broad range of needs.

The obligation:

Most of these individuals are "apolitical," or even "antipolitical."

The environmental crisis may well present our last chance to bring significant numbers of potential future leaders *back* into the political process.

Government *can* and *must prove* that it can respond, and encourage youth involvement.

We are finding that a highly developed society such as ours demands a whole new breed of professional—a person who can study *both* ecology and economics—and biology and philosophy.

We need people who are broad enough in their exposure to have balanced judgment.

These must be people who are ready to do exhaustive research and wide field work—and who are fascinated by nature and the needs of man.

There is a lot of talk heard today about students and the environmental movement.

In fact, you can even get an argument from some that the "Environment Bag"—as some of my younger staff people refer to it!—is a "sellout."

A sellout of the issues of the day.

For example, you may have heard that a group of students demonstrated against me, when I spoke a few weeks ago at Princeton.—Although more than a thousand Princeton students later signed a petition of apology.

During my speech, I was interrupted with shouts like,

"What about racism and black liberation?"

My attitude about these protests, and others, is this:

As Secretary of the Interior, a clean environment for all Americans is *my responsibility—and my commitment*.

For example, I want to make sure that as we get our black Americans out of the ghettos...

That they have somewhere worth getting *in to*.

By no measure does the environmental crusade conflict with man's struggle for equal treatment and justice.

It is *complimentary* to any attempt to improve the quality of an individual's life. It is forcing us to realize that there is really only one race—the human race.

America is a crusading nation.

Recently I addressed the American Petroleum Institute and I told them:

"The oil industry—like much of today's industry—stands in danger of becoming the monster of American society.

"This is a crusading nation... and the crusaders are up in arms."

The enemy is becoming clearer to the people... it is those who foul the nation's air and water... and those who stand in a position of authority to do something about the destruction of our resources—but who do nothing.

I am challenging you—as you are challenging government—to respond to national and world needs.

Industry does not produce just for its own good.

They don't make cars just because they

enjoy making cars . . . nor does any manufacturer produce a product without knowing he has a market for it.

They produce because you want—and often need—what they produce.

You are challenging government to regulate broadly and prosecute those who pollute—and I am moving to meet that challenge, as you can see in our recent request for a Grand Jury investigation into oil pollution in the Gulf of Mexico.

My challenge to you, is to crusade not only against the sins of the past, which you can blame on the older generation, but to also crusade to safeguard the future by changing our priorities and even our lifestyles.

Do not fall for the temptation to write-off government and business. There are elements in both groups who are determined to find ways of doing things.

Many of us are searching for how to streamline clumsy bureaucracy. We are fighting daily to create a country in which man's surroundings are not sacrificed for his technological advance.

At stake are the most precious ingredients for sustaining life.

Air you can not only breathe without choking but which refreshes and invigorates.

Clean water to drink and swim in, and natural water, the womb of the delicate balance of nature.

Land that is not only the producer of our food and energy, but which restores the soul of man through its beauty and intricate marvels.

But make no mistake—if the people leave the job to government—and if they do nothing but protect—it will not be done.

It will take positive achievement and a commitment on the part of every American.

My deepest wish is that my native State of Kansas lead the way in producing a new generation with a new set of values.

A generation dedicated to caring for the Earth and all the people in it. I am confident you will respond to this great challenge of the hour.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE ON HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the far-sighted message the President sent to the Congress this week for the comprehensive reform of higher education programs will be recognized as one of the outstanding achievements of his administration. Not only does this message set a course for the future role of the Federal Government in assisting our Nation's students, but it also establishes a partnership between Government and the colleges and universities which can benefit all the people of the country. The message calls for the establishment of a National Foundation for Higher Education which will have as its purpose the support of excellence, innovation, and reform in institutions of higher education.

In the area of student financial aid, the message proposes a realistic system of Federal assistance to the poorest students which will help make higher education available to all who can gain from it regardless of income. This provision

recognizes that in a time of fiscal stringency the Federal Government should make its support available to the most needy, since those who are relatively well-off may find alternate methods of assistance from non-Federal sources. To complement these provisions, the message also calls for the creation of a program to assist the States in establishing career education programs, particularly in junior colleges and community colleges, and provides \$100 million to carry it out. This recognition of the need for a viable vocational component in post-secondary education has long been lacking, and I congratulate the President for it. I urge all my colleagues to study carefully the reforms contained in the President's message on higher education and join in supporting this effort.

NIXON'S MESSAGE ON SCHOOLS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent message on education attracted predictable analysis and commentary. One of the most thoughtful and penetrating editorials on the President's message was in the Chicago Today, Saturday, March 28, which I place into the RECORD at this point:

NIXON'S MESSAGE ON SCHOOLS

It would be hard to disagree with much of what President Nixon said in his message on education this week. His theme was the need to achieve quality education for children of all races within the integrated framework demanded by law. Forced desegregation by busing, in areas where housing patterns constitute de facto segregation, is not necessary in Mr. Nixon's view.

The message spells out good aims. One difficulty in analyzing it, tho, is the vagueness of certain terms which may mean more or less than the listener takes them to mean. Phrases like "local control," for instance, have taken on a secondary meaning; sometimes they can be read as nice ways of saying segregation. Much depends on how the administration itself defines these terms and how literally it means to carry them out.

That is true particularly of Mr. Nixon's position on neighborhood schools and local school boards. He said they should have the principal voice in forming compliance plans, so long as they act within the Constitution. If that means exactly what it says, we couldn't agree more. Yet school boards that have done all they could to resist integration could agree, too, and to go right on resisting it.

Much of what Mr. Nixon said on this point needed to be said. For example: "Children in many instances have not been served, but used—in what all too often has proved a tragically futile effort to achieve in the schools the kind of multiracial society which the adult society has failed to achieve for itself."

This is a recognition that racially separated housing patterns are not the responsibility of school systems, and that schools shouldn't bear the burden of readjusting them along with their immense job of educating children. It is welcome, and so is Mr. Nixon's pledge that his administration will explore ways of encouraging other institutions besides schools to do their part.

His message was short on specifics and figures [except for the 1.5 billion dollars to be spent on improving education in racially impacted areas, and that hardly seems adequate]. Still, this is one area where we'll have to follow Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell's advice and watch what the administration does, not what it says. That's the only sure way to be sure what is meant by the blurred, ambiguous terms now used in talking about schools and segregation.

SCHWENGEL PRAISES RUMSFELD FOR OEO REORGANIZATION

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last year we "lost" one of our ablest colleagues. Fortunately we "lost" him only in a relative sense, inasmuch as President Nixon tapped him for an extremely important job. I refer, of course, to Don Rumsfeld, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Those of us who had the opportunity to work with Don here on the Hill had, and continue to have, the highest regard for his abilities.

He was particularly effective in the field of congressional reform. In appointing him Director of OEO, the President called on him to undertake still another reform project. The President asked him to take over an agency that had in many respects become discredited by poor management, and in some cases was guilty of clearcut misuse of Federal funds. Don set out to put OEO programs on a soundly managed basis, and to restore some credibility to its efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that Don has come a long way in achieving that goal. Today I received a letter from him outlining a major effort in the reorganization process. The letter, together with the regulations which it describes, are abundant proof of the real progress that is being made at OEO, and I would like to insert them in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues.

I do not necessarily sleep better at night knowing Don is directing the Office of Economic Opportunity, but I do feel confident that my constituents are going to get a better return on their tax dollar because he is there. Also, those who are supposed to be benefited by the OEO programs are much more certain to receive meaningful assistance rather than shallow promises.

The material follows:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1970.

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: Since coming to the Office of Economic Opportunity early last summer, a great deal of my time and the time of my senior staff has been spent in the reorganization of the Agency. This reorganization was undertaken so that the Office of Economic Opportunity could more adequately respond to its new mission.

However, reorganization is not, of course, the sole answer to the running of a more efficient and effective program. Many of the

policies and procedures in the Agency needed to be changed or more stringently enforced and a number of new procedures needed to be instituted. Inadequate administrative control had led in many instances to poor project management and at times misuse of federal tax dollars. Over the years criticism has been leveled against the Agency for mismanagement and I have found some of the criticism to be valid.

Therefore, after appropriate study and review I have issued new instructions intended to tighten various administrative procedures of the Office of Economic Opportunity. I have been informed that the effect of these instructions will be to assure one of the most stringent grant and contract review procedures in the Federal government.

For your information, I have enclosed a set of these instructions along with a summary. If you have questions regarding these new procedures, Mrs. Carol Khosrovi, Associate Director for Congressional and Governmental Relations, will be pleased to discuss the matter with you.

Sincerely,

DONALD RUMSFELD,
Director.

NEW POLICY TO BAN CONFLICTS OF INTEREST ANNOUNCED

Stringent new instructions aimed at preventing conflicts of interest and tightening the administration of contracts and grants by the Office of Economic Opportunity were announced today by Director Donald Rumsfeld.

In the past few months, the Agency has conducted an office-by-office review of hundreds of contracts and grants made in recent years. The Agency-wide survey revealed extensive deficiencies in the review and monitoring of contracts and grants as well as a widespread lack of proper management. Based on this experience a new policy governing the handling of grants and contracts has been prepared. The conflict of interest instruction is one of a series of 11 instructions implementing the new policy.

The purpose of the instructions is to assure fair competition among prospective contractors. The intent is not to exclude any contractor from competing for the opportunity to do business with the agency but to establish sound and consistent management practices and a thorough review based on full information before the award of contracts. The Agency seeks to avoid the occurrence of any factor that would give any firm an unfair advantage.

The new conflict of interest instruction provides that for one year after an employee leaves the Agency, no sole source contract may be awarded to a firm that employs him in a senior position. An exception to this rule may be granted only by the Director. In the case of competitive bids, no contract may be awarded to a firm that employs in a senior position a person who has left the Agency within the previous year, without the approval of the Deputy Director.

The instruction also:

Provides for the maintenance of records of former personnel who have joined prospective contractors or grantees.

Says a firm bidding for contracts will be asked to disclose whether it is seeking to hire former Army staff people in senior positions and how much such an employee would participate in the contract; and whether any present Army employee or his family has a substantial financial interest in the firm.

Requires prospective grantees to identify any former OEO employee who has left the Agency within the year prior to the grant application, who has a financial interest in or is employed by the grantee, by its delegate agency or by a subcontractor.

Other new instructions:

Establish project review boards to examine proposed grants and contracts with the ex-

ception of certain routine refundings of operating grants. This means that, in contrast to past practice, a grant or contract cannot be approved without review at a high level.

Insure that only designated Agency officials shall commit or obligate the Government under a contract or grant. Violations will constitute cause for disciplinary action.

Require that project managers prepare a written evaluation of a contractor's performance within 60 days of contract expiration. These evaluations will be considered in the awarding of future contracts. No such system has operated in the past.

All project requests for \$2,500 or more will be reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel.

The new instructions apply to projects approved by the Washington headquarters office. New instructions will be issued to the Regional Offices and to Community Action Agencies funded through the Regional Offices in the near future.

REPORTING AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR PREVENTING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN CONTRACTS AND GRANTS

1. PURPOSE

To establish reporting and review procedures for preventing conflicts of interest in contracts and grants.

2. GENERAL

Because many Agency employees develop a unique expertise in the poverty field, they are in demand for employment by organizations that contract with or receive grants from the Office of Economic Opportunity. Even though a Federal law may not be violated by employment in such organizations, it creates the possibility of, or at least the appearance of, misuse by such employees of their influence with their former colleagues.

3. CONTRACT AWARD LIMITATIONS

For a period of one year from the date of termination of employment with the Office of Economic Opportunity, no contract shall be awarded without competition to any organization which employs in the capacity of officer, director, or other senior management position a former Office of Economic Opportunity regular employee or a special employee who served Office of Economic Opportunity for a total of more than 60 days during the 365 days prior to the termination of his Office of Economic Opportunity employment. A special Government employee is an employee appointed to serve not more than 130 days during the 365 days following his appointment. Special Government employees are so designated by the Personnel Division at the time of their appointment. An exception to this requirement may be granted only by the Director. No contract shall be awarded as a result of a competitive procurement to a firm employing in any of the above capacities a former regular employee or a special employee of the Agency to whom the above restriction applies without the prior written approval of the Deputy Director.

a. *Reporting Information.*—In order to maintain current information on former employees employed by Agency contractors, the Personnel Division shall include in the Exit Clearance Form (OEO Form No. 73) a requirement that the departing employee reveal the name of his next employer, if known, and his position with that employer. The Personnel Division shall then submit this information to the Procurement Division, which will be responsible for establishing an index of firms employing former Agency employees. This index shall be expanded by periodic inputs from other staff officers, such as the Office of General Counsel, as to the current employment status of former employees.

Contract negotiations shall check this index before entering into negotiations and shall secure the advice of the General Coun-

sel as to whether a potential conflict of interest exists if a former employee is employed as officer, director, or other senior management position by a contractor being considered for a contract award.

b. *Contract Reporting.*—The following shall be inserted in all Office of Economic Opportunity solicitations of \$2,500 or more: "Offerors shall state as part of the proposal:

"(1) Whether or not it is now negotiating with a regular or special OEO employee for employment; and, if so, specify the name of the individual(s) and the position(s) for which considered:

"(2) Whether or not it now employs as a regular employee or consultant a former regular or special OEO employee whose employment with OEO terminated within the past 365 days; and if so, specify the name of the individual(s) and the position(s) held:

"(3) Specify the names of any present OEO employees or their spouses or minor children known to have a substantial financial interest in the offeror's organization. A financial interest shall be considered insubstantial if it amounts to less than \$5,000 in the market value and less than one (1) per cent of the organization's outstanding stock or other securities, and the OEO employee or spouse or minor child is not active in the management of the organization.

"(4) If either (1) or (2) is answered in the affirmative, specify whether any such individual(s) shall participate in the performance of any contract that may result from this solicitation and the extent of such participation.

Contractors are advised that the foregoing disclosure request is for informational purposes in order to protect former employees against potential conflict of interest situations.

The fact that a contractor employs or contemplates employing a former OEO employee shall not prejudice that contractor's competitive standing, provided that the employment or proposed employment is not contrary to the public interest and that the relationship is consistent with the Federal law and OEO conflicts of interest regulations."

The Director of the Procurement Division shall instruct his negotiators and contracting officers to report to the General Counsel any affirmative responses to the above disclosure requests.

c. *Grant Reporting.*—Because the conflicts of interest problem is not restricted to the procurement field, but also is found in the employment of former regular and special employees of the Agency by grantees, delegate agencies, and subcontractors to such organizations, each grant application form shall include a form containing the following clause:

"The Grantee, as part of its application for a new grant or for a refunding, shall identify any former regular or special OEO employee whose employment with OEO terminated within 365 days prior to the date of grant application, who (1) is employed by the grantee, its delegate agency, or a subcontractor who performs work for the grantee or delegate agency under a subcontractor of \$25,000 or more; or (2) who owns or has a financial interest in the grantee or its delegate agency; or (3) who is in any other way involved with the grantee or its delegate agency in his private capacity. The grantee shall specify as an attachment to its application the names of such individuals and their position, degree of financial interest, or other relationship with the grantee or delegate agency. The grantee shall also identify any present or former employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity who is negotiating for employment with the grantee, any delegate agency or subcontractor to any such organization."

Agency personnel receiving grant applica-

tions shall forward any information received as a result of this paragraph to the General Counsel for consideration.

WESLEY HJORNEVIK,
Deputy Director.

PROJECT REVIEW BOARDS FOR PROPOSED
GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

1. PURPOSE

To establish a procedure for the detailed review of procurement requests and proposed headquarters grant actions by Office of Economic Opportunity officials at an early stage in the review process.

2. GENERAL

There shall be established a Project Review Board in each of the following headquarters offices:

- a. Office of Health Affairs.
- b. Office of Legal Services.
- c. Office of Operations.
- d. Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation.
- e. Office of Program Development.
- f. VISTA.

No other headquarters office shall initiate procurement requests or grant actions, except for normal procurements of supplies and services for Agency administrative needs which are the responsibility of the Office of Administration. However, the expertise of staff offices shall be utilized by program offices in procuring goods or services where staff office expertise is relevant.

3. ORGANIZATION

a. The permanent Chairman of each Project Review Board shall be the Deputy Assistant or Deputy Associate Director of that Office, or such other appropriate person selected by the Assistant/Associate Director of the Office and approved by the Deputy Director of the Agency.

b. Each Assistant/Associate Director shall name, in addition to the permanent Chairman, a minimum of ten individuals in his Office who, based on seniority, experience and judgment, are authorized to sit on the Project Review Board for that Office. Changes in the composition of the Project Review Board may only be made by the Assistant/Associate Director.

c. In addition, each Board shall include two members from the Office of General Counsel and two members from the Procurement Division, of the Office of Administration chosen by the General Counsel and the Chief of the Procurement Division, respectively.

d. The Office of Program Development shall include in its Board membership a senior member of PRE and the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation shall include in its Board membership a senior member of OPD.

e. For each project, or group of projects, to be reviewed, the permanent Chairman shall schedule meetings and call together those individuals most competent to review the project/projects under consideration. For such meetings, a quorum shall consist of five members, which must include the Chairman and a member from the office of General Counsel. Whenever a procurement request as against a grant package is being reviewed, the Chairman should make every effort to include a member from the Procurement Division.

4. SCOPE

a. Each Project Review Board (Board) shall consider all projects including refundings, renewals, modifications and overruns with a projected cost of \$50,000 or more. If an initial project request is for less than \$50,000 but will ultimately involve more than that amount, it must be approved by a Project Review Board. However, refundings of the following operating projects need not be reviewed by Project Review Boards:

- (1) Office of Legal Services operating grants funded under Section 222 of the Act;
- (2) Office of Health Affairs comprehensive health center operating grants funded under Section 222 of the Act;

(3) Office of Operations Indian operating grants funded under Section 221 and 222 of the Act; and

(4) Office of Operations migrant operating grants funded under Title III B of the Act.

b. The Board's review of a procurement request or proposed grant action should include but not be necessarily limited to such factors as:

(1) Whether the requirement is part of the agency's operating plans, including the Research and Demonstration Plan, the Training and Technical Assistance Plan and Evaluation Plan.

(2) Whether the requirement should be fulfilled by grant or by contract.

(3) Whether the requirement can be met through less costly methods than awarding a contract or making a grant (i.e., can it or should it be done in-house?).

(4) Whether other Federal agencies or other Agency offices are contracting or making grants for the same or similar requirements.

(5) Whether the requirement is capable of performance.

(6) If appropriate, whether the justification for noncompetitive procurement is adequate.

(7) Whether the Office of Economic Opportunity cost estimate for the effort is valid.

(8) What the prior history of the requirement has been.

(9) Whether, in pilot or demonstration projects, an adequate evaluation design exists.

(10) Whether the statement of work adequately defines the requirement.

(11) The past performance history of the proposed grantee or contractor, if applicable.

(12) Whether adequate evaluation criteria and point factors have been established.

5. PROCEDURE

a. Proposed contracts

Project requests shall be submitted to the Project Review Board after sign-off by the Activity Finance Officer, but prior to submission to the Office of General Counsel and prior to submission to the Assistant/Associate Director of the program office for formal approval.

b. Proposed Grants

(1) The project request shall be submitted to the Project Review Board at the time the project is being seriously considered for funding. It is not possible to define this point with certainty for all grants, but it should occur after a prospective grantee, or group of grantees, has been identified, and before any steps have been taken by Agency personnel which in any way commit the agency to a particular grantee or work program. This may or may not be after a formal funding request or application has been received. Thus, the project request must be submitted to the Board at an early enough stage so as not to preclude alternative prospective grantees and work programs.

(2) Whenever possible, more than one project request of a particular category or type should be submitted to the Board at the same time.

(3) Proposed grants submitted to the Board shall contain full documentation justifying the method of selection of the prospective grantee.

(4) Formal legal by the Office of General Counsel and formal approval and sign-off by the Assistant/Associate Director of the initiating program office shall occur after approval by the Project Review Board. However, initiating office personnel are encouraged to consult with the Office of General Counsel at early stages in the development of a project.

c. Other

(1) Agency personnel presenting the project request to the Board shall furnish to the Board members, at least two days in advance of the meeting, a copy of the proposed statement of work or work program and all other

information pertinent to making a decision on the requirement. The initiator of the project request and, if necessary, his superior, shall appear personally before the Board.

(2) If a formal funding request or grant proposal has been received, and it is not too lengthy to be reproduced conveniently, a copy should also be furnished to the Board members. In the case of grant refundings, the complete grant files for previous grant actions need not be furnished, however, copies of previous highlight memos and significant memos and other documents, including evaluation reports, shall be furnished.

(3) If the Board determines, it may request that additional information or supporting documents be presented at a later meeting of the Board for further consideration.

(4) Detailed minutes shall be kept of all meetings, including the recommendation of the Board, and shall be signed and dated by the permanent Chairman of the Board. The minutes shall form a permanent part of the project file.

WESLEY HJORNEVIK,
Deputy Director.

AUTHORITY TO COMMIT OEO UNDER CONTRACTS
AND GRANTS

1. PURPOSE

This Instruction establishes authority to commit OEO under a grant or contract.

2. AUTHORITY

Within the Office of Economic Opportunity, the authority to execute, amend, revise or to otherwise commit or to obligate the Government under a contract, grant or inter-agency agreement has been delegated by the Director to specific individuals under written delegations of authority.

The authority to commit the Government is the exclusive responsibility of those individuals. Any other employee who attempts to exercise such authority shall be subject to disciplinary action. In addition, any such employee may be peculiarly liable to the contractor or grantee who relied upon the employee's unauthorized representation.

WESLEY HJORNEVIK,
Deputy Director.

REVIEW OF PROCUREMENTS (GRANTS AND CONTRACTS) BY THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

1. PURPOSE

This instruction provides for review of procurement grants and contracts by General Counsel prior to final action.

2. PROCEDURES

a. All project requests (grants and contracts) for \$2,500 or more, whether new initiatives or refundings, shall be submitted for legal review to the appropriate branch of the Legal Division of the Office of General Counsel. Where Project Review Board approval is required, legal review shall take place only after approval by a Project Review Board.

b. Office of General Counsel review will be prior to sign-off by the Assistant/Associate Director of the responsible program office. The Director of the Procurement Division will not process any procurement requests for contracts that do not contain sign-offs by the Office of General Counsel and the Assistant/Associate Director of the proper office. No request for proposals (RFP) or other solicitation shall be issued, and no resulting contract shall be executed for \$2,500 or more, without legal review by the Office of General Counsel.

c. Likewise, the Assistant/Associate Director of each program office may not sign off on a procurement request or grant package that does not contain a sign-off by General Counsel.

WESLEY HJORNEVIK,
Deputy Director.

EVALUATING CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE

1. PURPOSE

This instruction assigns responsibilities and establishes procedures for evaluating the performance of contractors.

2. RESPONSIBILITY

Office of Economic Opportunity Project Managers shall be responsible for evaluating contractor performance and preparing a statement of contractor performance for the Agency's permanent records at the expiration of a contract.

3. PROCEDURES

A statement shall be prepared by the Project Manager within 60 days following the expiration of a contract. It shall be approved by the Assistant/Associate Director of the program office and addressed to the Director of the Procurement Division, Office of Administration. The Procurement Division will be responsible for maintaining a permanent file of such contractor evaluations. Such files shall be used by the Procurement Division in assembling bidders lists, and contractor evaluation files shall be made available, upon request, to the Chairman of technical review panels when a particular contractor is a competitor for a new Agency contract.

Attached hereto is a form of proposed contractor evaluation statement.

WESLEY HJORNEVIK,
Deputy Director.

CONTRACTOR EVALUATION STATEMENT

In evaluating a contractor, Project Managers shall give consideration to, but not be limited to, the following criteria:

1. Performance under the contract as compared with the statement of work, including quantity, quality, and timeliness of work done;
2. Relationship of contractor's personnel to OEO and other parties involved in the performance of the contract. Did the contractor's personnel conduct themselves in a professional and businesslike manner with high standards of conduct? Did they respond in a constructive way to problems and difficulties as they arose? Was there stability in the leadership and personnel assigned to the contract or were there numerous changes?
3. Did the contractor report on progress in a timely and thorough manner as called for by the contract?
4. Did the contractor perform within the cost structure of the contract?
5. To what extent was the final product of the contractor, including data and conclusions, of utility to the agency?
6. How would the Project Manager rate the contractor's overall performance?
Excellent; satisfactory; if less than satisfactory, explain why.
Would he recommend that the contractor be used again? If not, why not?

REVIEW OF TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

1. PURPOSE

To establish headquarters procedures for the effective review of proposals received in response to negotiated, competitive solicitations.

2. REVIEW PANEL

Each Assistant/Associate Director reporting directly to the Director shall establish a review panel to review technical proposals received in response to negotiated, competitive solicitations. In the discretion of the Assistant/Associate Director, the review panel may be permanent or ad hoc. He shall designate a chairman of each panel who is familiar with the requirement but not necessarily from the office initiating the procurement. The chairman shall appoint the panel members, giving due consideration to appointing some members from outside of the requiring office including whenever possible individuals from outside of the Office

of Economic Opportunity; and appointing, where possible, individuals who are not under the direct employment supervision of the chairman. The chairman shall insure that his presence on the panel poses no actual or apparent conflict of interest with respect to any of the organizations submitting proposals; and he shall insure the same for each panel member by inquiring personally of them, including whether such member is negotiating for employment with any organization which has submitted a proposal. If an actual or apparent conflict of interest exists, the chairman shall disqualify such person, be it himself or any proposed member, or refer the matter to the General Counsel before any reviews are conducted by the individual involved.

3. REVIEW OF PROPOSALS

a. Requests for Proposals (RFP) shall contain the evaluation criteria upon which the proposals will be evaluated. The criteria shall not be later modified by the Agency without a formal modification to the RFP. If a point factor is applied to the evaluation, it also shall be contained in the RFP.

b. As a general rule, the panel will receive only the technical proposals. However, if requested by the chairman, with good reasons therefor, the contracting officer, may make the cost proposals available to the panel.

c. In reviewing the proposals, it is appropriate for the panel to conduct personal interviews with key personnel of the offerors submitting acceptable proposals, provided that a representative of the Procurement Division is present during such interviews. During such interviews, or at any time prior to award of the contract, no offeror shall be given information relative to the requirement that is not also made available to all other offerors. In no event, during this period, should any offeror be told the number offerors, the identity of offerors, prices or ranges of costs or the Government's cost estimate.

d. The goal of the panel is to assist the contracting officer in determining those offerors which have offered proposals that are technically responsive to the RFP and which are acceptable to perform the technical aspects of the procurement; and to give ranking in order to preference, based upon the criteria of those firms deemed acceptable.

4. COMPETITIVE RANGE

Based upon the recommendations of the panel and other information available to him, the contracting officer will determine those offerors which are within a competitive range for negotiations. Such determination will consider price, technical and other factors. The attached document (Selection of Offerors for Negotiation and Award) presents a discussion of the meaning of competitive range for use by panel members. The panel and the contracting officer should bear in mind that the requirement for negotiation does not mean that a firm which is considered to be in a competitive range and is negotiated with must be awarded the contract if it submits the lowest price or cost proposal.

Rather, after negotiations have taken place, the Office of Economic Opportunity will accept the proposal that is most advantageous to the Government. Therefore, a proposal lower in price or cost need not be accepted if the Office of Economic Opportunity determines that its technical requirement is better fulfilled by an offeror which offers a higher price as long as its technical proposal is considered to be more advantageous to the Government. Furthermore, frequently the RFP provides that an award may be made without negotiations. This may occur where the offeror's proposal is lowest in price and is technically acceptable to OEO, and further provided that the contracting officer has determined that the offeror's price is fair and reasonable.

5. CRITERIA FOR PROPOSAL REVIEW

It is recognized that it may not be feasible to establish uniform criteria for every procurement requirement. Consequently, it is the responsibility of each Assistant/Associate Director to insure the development of meaningful evaluation criteria so that each proposal is evaluated on a fair and equal basis. Attached to this instruction is a document entitled "Suggested Evaluation Scheme" which each program office may wish to consider in developing its criteria for review of proposals.

6. SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

If a proposed contract over its projected life, including contemplated extensions, is estimated to exceed one million dollars, the panel to review the proposal will be selected by the Deputy Director, and the report of the panel will be submitted to him for review.

7. EVALUATION REPORT

The evaluation report shall be signed by the chairman and each panel member and shall constitute a permanent record in the procurement file. The report should reflect the voting of each member on each proposal; a general response to each proposal by each member; a detailed response to each proposal by each member in support of the general response; and a listing of the ranking of the technical proposals resulting from the combined voting of all the members based upon the evaluation criteria contained in the RFP. The report should list all proposals which are technically non-responsive, those which are technically unacceptable, and those which are acceptable in the order of rank.

WESLEY HJORNEVIK,
Deputy Director.

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Selection of Offerors for Negotiation and Award (FPR 1-3.805-1, -2)

All purchases and contracts, whether by formal advertising or by negotiation, must be made on a competitive basis to the maximum practicable extent. Thus, even when we procure by negotiation, it is incumbent upon negotiators with the assistance of panel evaluation members to make selection of the offeror and the award on the most competitive basis practicable. The fact that it is a negotiated procurement does not eliminate the need for competition.

Negotiation and competition imply a series of offers and counter-offers until a mutually satisfactory agreement is concluded by the parties. The provisions of FPR 1-3.805-1 and -2 (see attachment) are an integral part of this process. The former provision requires for fixed price contracts, that "after receipt of initial proposals written or oral discussions shall be conducted with all responsible offerors who submitted proposals within a competitive range, price and other factors considered . . ."

1. ". . . Within a competitive range, price and other factors considered . . ."

Determining which proposals fall within a competitive range will depend upon the particular circumstances of each negotiation. Thus, any number of realistic evaluation factors can be used to determine the bounds of this range. Price alone is often controlling. But, it should be noted that the competitive range is not necessarily merely a price range, but may encompass technical capability and other relevant factors as well. (E.g., 45 Comp. Gen. 417)

In all cases it is important that the factors leading to the establishment of a competitive range be meaningful and realistic and in no way arbitrary. Of course, decisions as to which firms are and which firms are not within a competitive range is a matter of administrative discretion. However, this discretion should be exercised in a reasonable manner, since the Comptroller General will

reverse such a determination where it was shown to be made arbitrarily. (See Comp. Gen. dec. B-158042, March 30, 1966).

Recent decisions of the Comptroller General illustrate the scope of the regulation. For example, in an award of certain ADP equipment to the only contractor whose equipment performed well in a live bench mark test, the Comptroller General pointed out that even in such a case discussion should have been conducted with other offerors within the competitive range: "To give effect to the statutory and regulatory requirement for discussions and for such discussions to be meaningful, failure to pass a bench mark test should not automatically preclude the necessity for further discussions. When the application of a mandatory bench mark test requirement results, as in this case, in leaving one proposer, and its price is, initially at least, substantially in excess of a price of another proposer we believe the spirit and intent of [the regulation] would not be served without further discussion to determine whether the other proposal can be improved to meet the bench mark requirement." (Comp. Gen. dec. B-161483, July 14, 1967) In one case, negotiation only with the firm submitting a proposal which was "distinctly superior" to all other proposals was held not proper because the regulation requires discussions with all responsible offerors submitting competitive proposals. (Comp. Gen. dec. B-158686, September 2, 1966). In another instance the Comptroller General noted that there was "ample justification in the record for concluding that, in the absence of negotiation [with a certain proposer], there was a lack of competition both as to price and in technical aspects of [the award]. We find it difficult to understand how a current contractor may have its technical proposal . . . categorized, not as unacceptable but as inferior, . . . without affording such an offeror at least an opportunity of discussion and explanation especially when its cost proposal represents significant savings to the Government." (45 Comp. Gen. 426).

Perhaps the clearest statement of the factors determinative of a competitive range was made by the Comptroller General when he stated that a proposal is within a competitive range unless it is either so high in cost or so inferior technically "as to preclude any possibility of meaningful negotiation with [the] offeror." (emphasis added) (45 Comp. Gen. 417, 47 Comp. Gen. 252).

2. "Written or Oral Discussions shall be conducted with all responsible offerors . . ."

Generally, the methods of conducting negotiations are quite flexible. The primary purpose is to obtain the best deal for the Government, price and other factors considered. Where discussions are held pursuant to the quoted regulation, it is important that they be meaningful and useful. As a rule, these discussions should take place face-to-face and the factors upon which the evaluation of the proposal is being made should be specifically discussed, with opportunity for the proposer to explain his proposal and to refute any alleged deficiencies.

There are two restrictions on this process, however, which are quite important. FPR 1-3.805-1(b) provides that "whenever negotiations are conducted with more than one offeror, no indication shall be given to any offeror of a price which must be met to obtain further consideration since such practice constitutes an option technique which must be avoided. Likewise, no offeror shall be advised of his relative standing with other offerors as to price or be furnished information as to the prices offered by other offerors."

Where the discussions result in revisions in a particular proposal, "all offerors selected to participate in such negotiations . . . shall be offered an equitable opportunity to submit such price, technical, or other revisions in their proposals as may result from the negotiations."

Finally, FPR 1-3.805-1(d) provides that

when during the negotiations "a substantial change occurs in the Government's requirements or a decision is reached to relax, increase, or otherwise modify the scope of the work or statement of requirements, such change or modification shall be made in writing as an amendment to the request for proposals, and a copy shall be furnished to each prospective contractor. Oral advice of change or modification may be given if (1) the changes involved are not complex in nature, (2) all prospective contractors are notified simultaneously (preferably by a meeting with the contracting officer), and (3) a record is made of the oral advice given. In such instances, however, the oral advice should be promptly followed by a written amendment verifying such oral advice previously given."

The Comptroller General decisions interpreting these requirements indicate that federal buyers normally have a large degree of flexibility in complying with the discussion requirement. It is important that discussions be a meaningful attempt to get the best deal for the Government. And they must be fair to the proposers: "One further matter requires comment on our part, and that is that [one proposer] was permitted to refute or explain away the areas of deficiency in its initial survey, but [another proposer] was not given the same opportunity. . . . The contracting officer . . . could have and should have conducted discussions with [the latter proposer], concurrently with [the former], concerning its non-responsibility, in an effort to obtain a second responsible offeror so that competition could have been established. (Comp. Gen. Dec. B-161448 pp. 10-11, Feb. 7, 1968).

A recent decision of the Comptroller General has also emphasized the importance of amending the RFP where, during negotiations, a substantial change occurred in the government's requirements or decision is made to modify the scope of work. (See Comp. Gen. dec. B-161405, October 2, 1967).

The import of these and similar decisions on the conduct of negotiations by OEO is obvious. We must be especially careful to comply with the discussion requirements of the cited regulation. In every case, therefore, it is incumbent upon buyers to make a prompt determination after the receipt of all proposals as to who are responsible proposers and what is the competitive range. Meaningful discussions should subsequently take place with those proposers that the determination indicates fall within the scope of the requirement.

Where discussions are not held the documents in the files should accurately reflect the reasons for this omission. For example, one of the enumerated exceptions in the regulation may fairly be applicable to the situation. (See attachment, 1-3.805-1(a)(1) to (5)). Or, it might be established that there was no other responsible bidder, (but note Comp. Gen. decision above which required discussions attempting to obtain a second responsible offeror) or that no responsible bidder was within the competitive range. In all instances, however, these factors and findings should be carefully documented.

The discussion requirement of FPR 1-3.805-1 is not strictly applicable to negotiations in cost reimbursement type contracts. We believe, however, that the intent of the discussion requirement should be carried out in such negotiations also to the maximum extent practicable. The fundamental difference will be that price alone is not determinative in establishing a competitive range, since an award of a cost reimbursement type contract is primarily dependent upon the technical competence of the contractor. The key here is which contractor can most adequately fulfill OEO's needs.

SUGGESTED EVALUATION SCHEME

1. Does the Proposal Respond to and Meet the Requirements of the Work Statement? (20 points maximum)

In responding to this question the proposals should be compared to the work statement for consistency of goals, objectives, purposes of compliance with OEO requirements, as well as specific requirements of the work statement. Does the proposal reflect understanding of the training requested?

Scale

0-7 points—1 rating: indicates that several requirements of the work statement are missing or have been ignored.

8-15 points—2 rating: indicates that all the requirements of the work statement have been included.

16-20 points—3 rating: indicates that all the requirements of the work statement have been included and met with exceptional balance and creativity.

2. What is the Quality of Staff and Consultants? (200 points maximum)

It is important to review carefully the resumes of staff and consultants, not only for academic qualifications, but for length and variety of experience in similar tasks. The resumes should clearly demonstrate relevant training and experience.¹

0-7 points—1 rating: indicates that staff is weak both academically and experientially.

8-15 points—2 rating: indicates that staff has academically superior qualifications with little experiential training.

16-20 points—3 rating: indicates that staff has both superior academic and experiential qualifications.

3. What is the Quantity of the Staff Specialists and Consultants?

This question reflects a numerical pattern as well as a staffing pattern. Is the staffing pattern clear and does it include the amount of time each staff member will contribute to the program? Are there enough staff full time to deliver the services requested? Are the consultants or specialists committed to enough time to effectively deliver the services? (15 points maximum)

Scale

0-5 points—1 rating: indicates limited quantity in both number of staff and time devoted to training.

6-10 points—2 rating: indicates sufficient quantity in both number of staff and time devoted to training and adequate consultant use.

11-15 points—3 rating: indicates more than sufficient quantity in both number of staff and time and number of consultant time.

Should information necessary to a responsible determination of this question require information contained in the pricing section, contact the contracting officer for release of such information.

4. Administration Provided by Contractor? (15 points maximum)

This question essentially addresses itself to the contractor's performance and management capacities. The important questions to be asked deal with contractor's ability to carry out the program. If he is a past contractor, his past work should be examined to focus on whether he in fact carried out the proposed activities, whether he reported clearly and timely, whether he dealt with training funds competently. Further, some review should be made of any existing consultant reports, site visits and evaluations which may have been made. Prior problems in administration, community relations or manpower utilization, or other areas should have been resolved and new approaches to these problems reflected in the proposal.

¹You are to evaluate proposals on the basis of what is requested in a RFP. If one offeror furnishes information not requested by the RFP, contact the contracting officer who will request similar information of the other offerors.

Further consideration needs to be given to the contractor's ability to maintain and attract staff for the development of a stable professional group. What evidence is there that he can deliver required services on time? Will the contractor be able and willing to develop harmonious smooth relationships with OEO and SEEO staff, where necessary, and to consult and work with various groups?

Another aspect of administration which should be considered if appropriate under the RFP, is the willingness of the contractor as shown in the proposal to employ and develop non-professionals and minority group members. Is evidence presented that such persons are being employed and upgraded as a regular part of the contractor's operation?

Scale

0-5 points—1 rating: indicates limited capacity and/or limited experience in carrying out the administration of the contract.

6-10 points—2 rating: indicates prior good performance or an indication that good performance would be received.

11-15 points—3 rating: indicates prior excellent performance or that excellent performance would be received.

5. What is the Contractor's Knowledge of and Experience With OEO and the Subject Matter Being Procured?² (10 points maximum.)

Consideration should be given to the understanding of OEO concepts in relation to the requirement being procured.

This question really asks whether the applicant and his staff are "beginners" or "veterans" in the area of the requirement and whether the proposed activity actually falls within their area of expertise.

Scale

0-3 points—1 rating: indicates no prior knowledge of or experience with OEO by the majority of the contractor's staff or by the company.

4-7 points—2 rating: indicates prior knowledge of and some limited experience with OEO and subject matter being procured.

8-10 points—3 rating: indicates prior knowledge of and vast experience in OEO and subject matter being procured.

6. What is the Contractor's Knowledge of and Experience With Population and Geographical Area Being Serviced?³ (10 points maximum.)

This question addresses itself to the knowledge and experience the contractor and his staff have with poverty workers, para-professionals and resident low-income workers as well as knowledge and experience with the geographical area to be served. Do they know the people and the communities? Have they worked in comparable circumstances and situations with like people? If so, how did they do? If not, how might they do from information indicated in the proposal?

Scale

0-3 points—1 rating: no prior experience with the population or in the geographical area.

4-7 points—2 rating: some experience with the population and the geographical area.

8-10 points—3 rating: considerable experience with the population and the geographical area.

7. How does the Over-All Design of the Proposal "Shape-up"? (10 points maximum.)

This is essentially a broad "feeling-type" question. What is your "gut" feeling about the whole proposal? Does it sound and read as though it will accomplish the task for which intended? Although specific criteria for the answer to this question are not given,

² This factor should be used only where prior OEO experience is considered essential to satisfactory performance.

³ Use only if appropriate to consideration of RFP.

the importance of the evaluator at least giving an over-all rating to the proposal and contract is of valuable importance.

0-3 points—1 rating: it just won't work.

4-7 points—2 rating: fair to average.

8-10 points—3 rating: "it all hangs together and feels good."

COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENTS

1. PURPOSE

This instruction establishes the Office of Economic Opportunity's policy for competitive procurement of supplies and services.

2. BACKGROUND

Government policy and procurement regulations require that all procurements be on a competitive basis to the maximum extent practicable. This is based upon established experience that (1) competition is an effective technique in obtaining lower prices; (2) competition stimulates and maintains the private sector's interest in OEO programs and does not eliminate otherwise qualified sources of supply; (3) competition affords OEO a broad base upon which it can appraise more than one solution or approach to a problem and, thus, arrive at the most favorable manner for a fair and equal opportunity to satisfy Agency requirements. Only through the most meticulous planning can there be achieved satisfactory compliance with the requirement for competitive procurement. However, due to the sometimes unique and difficult to define nature of the supplies and services that the Office of Economic Opportunity procures, at times it is necessary to consider exception to the requirements for competition.

3. PERIOD OF CONTRACT

The Agency has authority to enter into contracts for periods up to two years using a particular fiscal year's appropriation. It also is possible to enter into contracts for a basic term of up to two years with an option to extend the contract. No contract, however, shall run with extensions for more than three years without being completed. Only the Deputy Director may grant exceptions to this policy.

Before contracts are entered into for a basic term of more than one year, or for one year with options to extend, the Project Review Board or other reviewing authority when Board review is not required, shall determine that such a procurement will best serve the interests of the Agency. The Project Review Board, or other reviewing authority, shall determine that an adequate evaluation of the contractor's effort will be instituted so that an option will not be exercised or that the contract will not proceed beyond a reasonable, fixed period, without a detailed review of the contractor's performance in order to establish that continued performance or the exercise of the option is proper. Moreover, before an option is exercised the contracting officer must establish from historical pricing or other cost information that the contract price is the lowest that is obtainable and that due to the experience gained by the contractor in the previous period of performance, the Agency will not realize full cost and performance benefit from the contractor's initial experience unless another period of performance with the same contractor is permitted.

4. PROCEDURE

a. *Circumstances That May Permit Noncompetitive Procurement.*—exceptions to the competition requirements may be submitted for consideration to the Office of Economic Opportunity Contracting Officer under the following types of circumstances:

(1) A prospective contractor has submitted an unsolicited proposal in a relatively unexplored area which cannot be divulged to the contracting public in sufficient detail to per-

mit competitive proposals because it is not feasible to define the work desired without divulging technical data which is contained in the unsolicited proposal and which is subject to proprietary restriction.

(2) The supplies or services or substantially equivalent supplies or services can be obtained within the time required and for reasonable prices from only one person or firm because of exclusive or predominate capability by reason of experience, specialized facilities or technical competence. In this case it is not sufficient justification merely to show that a particular firm may do a better job, or is more capable because of certain named personnel, or is more experienced due to its prior association with OEO, or is able to deliver more expeditiously. As to delivery, it should be a rare occasion that the time of delivery is so urgent that it justifies a noncompetitive procurement on the basis that only one firm can deliver within the time required.

b. *Method of Approval of Noncompetitive Procurement.*—It is important to observe that the circumstances set forth above are only possible reasons for noncompetitive procurement. The factual existence of any of the foregoing situations will not automatically give rise to the approval of a noncompetitive procurement. The Chief of the Procurement Division, as Contracting Officer, and his duly designated contracting officers are vested with the authority to determine whether or not a particular procurement should be competed. A Procurement Request for a noncompetitive procurement shall be submitted with an attachment signed by the Initiator's supervisor, to the Project Review Board setting forth a complete justification for such a request citing this Instruction and its relevant part along with a statement as to the possibility whether the effort, if awarded, will be extended in subsequent years. The justification shall include information substantially in accordance with the attached form. It shall be the responsibility of the Project Review Board to examine the factual basis for a noncompetitive procurement and to set forth as part of its recommendations to the program office chief whether or not the effort should be competed. After the last program official has approved a Procurement Request calling for a noncompetitive procurement and before transmission to the Procurement Division, such a request shall be submitted to the General Counsel for review as to legal sufficiency. Noncompetitive procurements in the estimated amount of \$250,000 or more will be approved by the Deputy Director.

5. RESPONSIBILITIES OF PROGRAMS AND CONTRACTING PERSONNEL

a. It is imperative that no action be taken by Office of Economic Opportunity personnel that may affect the integrity of the competitive procurement process. Office of Economic Opportunity personnel shall not deal with contractors in a manner that presumes a noncompetitive situation without first obtaining the approvals outlined above.

b. Further, they shall not divulge to a particular contractor information that may give that contract an unfair competitive advantage.

c. The following information, if given out at all, must be given to all potential offerors:

(1) The Office of Economic Opportunity cost estimate of the work to be performed;

(2) Prior Office of Economic Opportunity cost or technical experience on the same or similar work;

(3) Key proposal evaluation factors;

(4) Any other information not made a part of the official solicitation which places an offeror in a preferred position of knowing what the Office of Economic Opportunity is seeking in a cost or technical proposal.

d. In short, all Governmental personnel

engaged in the procurement process shall conduct business dealings with contractors in a manner above reproach in every respect.

6. BIDDERS LIST

In order to insure the broadest feasible competitive base, solicitations shall be sent to the maximum number of qualified sources consistent with the nature of and the requirement for the supplies and services being procured. Office of Economic Opportunity personnel shall not use bidders lists in a manner that restricts potential sources of supply, nor shall Office of Economic Opportunity personnel make advance determinations as to an offeror's capability by limiting the distribution of solicitations only to selected sources.

7. REMEDIAL EFFORTS

It is the responsibility of program officials to state program requirements in a manner that encourages competition on the broadest possible base. If a noncompetitive procurement is permitted for a particular effort, the responsible program officials shall, in conjunction with the Procurement Division, take immediate steps to state future program requirements in a manner that will permit competition. A renewal of a noncompetitive contract will be allowed only in the rarest circumstances.

WESLEY HJORNEVIK,
Deputy Director.

JUSTIFICATION FOR NONCOMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT

(This form must be submitted to the Project Review Board for justification of non-competitive procurement.)

1. Fully express the circumstances which operate to make competitive negotiation impractical or not feasible;
2. Explain the exclusive or predominant capability the proposed contractor possesses which meet the requirements of the procurement; and
3. Show the degree of consideration that has been given to other sources in the field and the reasons why they lack the capability which the proposed contractor evidences.
 - a. What capability does the proposed contractor have which is important to the specific effort and which makes it clearly more desirable than another firm in the same general field?
 - b. What prior experience of a highly specialized nature does the contractor possess which is vital to the proposed effort?
 - c. Does the contractor have a substantial investment of some kind which would have to be duplicated at Government expense by another source entering the field?
 - d. If schedules are involved, why are they critical and why can the proposed contractor best meet them?
 - e. Is the effort a continuation of previous effort performed by the proposed contractor?
 - f. Does the proposed contractor have personnel considered predominant experts in the particular field?
 - g. Is competition considered precluded because of the existence of patent rights, copyrights or secret processes or proprietary data?

USE OF CONTRACTS AND GRANTS

1. PURPOSE

It is the purpose of this instruction to set forth criteria which should be of assistance in determining whether to use a grant or a contract to carry out a particular activity of the Agency.

2. POLICY

It is essential that there exist a consistent and rational use of grants and contracts. Those responsible for choosing between grant and contract methods are obligated to exercise the choice responsibility; and not for the purpose of evading Federal procurement rules, personal services prohibitions, or similar legal requirements. It is one of the re-

sponsibilities of Project Review Boards to determine the appropriateness of the form of transaction being recommended, be it contract or grant. In determining whether a contract or grant should be used as the financing mechanism to fund a particular activity of the Agency, the following criteria are to be considered. If circumstances arise where the application of these criteria is not clear or where special factors suggest a choice other than that called for in the criteria, the decision as to whether a grant or contract shall be used will be made by the General Counsel.

a. *Use of grants.*—When a proposed activity has one or more of the following characteristics, it normally will be financed by a grant:

- (1) The principal intent is to allow considerable discretion and initiative within the framework of OEO policy by the non-federal agency that will perform the activity.

- (2) The non-federal agency that is to carry out the activity is a state or local government or agency thereof, or a private non-profit organization that has a quasi-governmental character.

- (3) The activity has a continuing aspect rather than being a one-time effort and if successful is likely to be continued for an additional period of time.

- (4) A non-federal matching contribution is required by law.

b. *Use of contracts.*—When the proposed activity has one or more of the following characteristics, it normally will be financed by contract:

- (1) The matter is clearly classifiable as procurement for the Office of Economic Opportunity needs. Usually there will be detailed requirements defining what the Office of Economic Opportunity is procuring.

- (2) The principal intent is to preserve a dominant initiative for the Office of Economic Opportunity in deciding on the scope and nature of the work.

- (3) The activity is to be carried out by a private, profit-making organization. (This does not preclude the use of contracts when the activity will be performed by a private non-profit agency).

- (4) The intent is to obtain competitive bids or proposals for the work to be performed.

- (5) Because of the nature of the work, the agreed performance depends upon certain mutual promises to be made by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the agency performing the work.

3. SPECIFIC APPLICATION

Notwithstanding the criteria set forth above for grants and contracts, all requirements for training, technical assistance, and evaluation shall be funded by contract. Any exceptions must be approved by the Deputy Director.

WESLEY HJORNEVIK,
Deputy Director.

PROHIBITED SUPPORT CONTRACTS FOR PERSONAL SERVICES

1. PURPOSE

This Instruction sets forth Office of Economic Opportunity policy and procedures related to procurement of support services utilizing non-Government personnel.

2. REFERENCES

- a. Federal Personnel Manual Letters No. 300-3 (December 12, 1967) and No. 300-12 (August 20, 1968).
- b. Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-76, sec. 4(b) (August 30, 1967).

3. BACKGROUND

The Civil Service Commission and the General Accounting Office require Federal agencies to perform their functions by using Government employees rather than by utilizing support contracts to obtain the personal services of non-Government personnel. This rule is designed to protect the integrity of the Civil Service System, pre-

vent circumvention of personnel ceilings and budget limitations on administrative expenses, and avoid the risks inherent in delegating the discretion and authority placed in Government agencies to persons not directly responsible to the Government. In addition, executive agencies cannot contract out certain basic management functions that are necessary to retain control of the conduct and content of Federal programs. These functions include the selection, orientation and direction of Government employees, assignment of organizational responsibilities, and final decisions on the planning of programs, establishment of goals and priorities, and evaluation of the performance of Federal employees, contractors and grantees.

4. POLICY

The Office of Economic Opportunity must strictly observe the above prohibition against obtaining personal services through support contracts. This rule does not prevent the Office of Economic Opportunity from properly contracting for a variety of professional and technical services in support of the Agency's programs that require the use of non-Government personnel. Contracts should not, however, be made by the Office of Economic Opportunity when such a degree of control and supervision over the contractor's employees is desired that the contract would create what is tantamount to an employer-employee relationship between the Government and contractor personnel or when contractor personnel are desired for the performance of non-delegable Federal functions.

5. PROCEDURE

The Legal Division, Administrative Affairs Branch of the Office of General Counsel shall be consulted whenever during the proposal, drafting, negotiation, administration or performance of a contract any possibility appears that, because of the existence of any of the elements enumerated in the following section, such contract might violate this prohibition. Before any Office of Economic Opportunity Headquarters contract for support services is awarded, a written determination shall be made by the Contracting Officer, after consultation with the program office requesting the contract, the Office of General Counsel, Legal Division, Administrative Affairs Branch, and the Office of Administration, Director of the Personnel Division, that it does not violate the rule against support contracts for personal services. For procurements delegated to the Regional Offices, the Regional Contracting Officer shall consult with the Regional Program Administrator, Counsel, and Personnel Officer before making such a determination.

6. INDICIA OF PROHIBITED SUPPORT CONTRACTS

a. *Direct Government Control and Supervision.*—This is the classic test of an employer-employee relationship. It is indicated where:

- (1) *Approval is exercised by Government personnel over the individuals to be furnished by the contractor.*—Office of Economic Opportunity cannot specify, suggest, or approve in advance the persons to be hired by a contractor, but may in rare cases, where the position involved is crucial to the success of the entire program, retain power to disapprove a clearly unqualified person. This limited approval power should not be used as a disguised method of selecting the personnel desired to implement a contract. Nor should Office of Economic Opportunity retain the right to require dismissal of individual contractor employees, except in rare cases for flagrant misconduct endangering the success of an entire program. If performance is unsatisfactory because of unqualified or deficient personnel, the contractor may be warned and if the situation is not remedied the contract may be terminated for default. This prohibition is particularly

important in case of evaluation contracts, where the value of the contractor's effort is in large measure related to the independence of his selection of evaluators.

(2) *A Government supervisor assigns tasks and schedules to contractor employees from time to time during the performance of the contract.*—The Contract "Statement of Work" should be drafted in sufficient detail so that the contract will be self-operating to the maximum extent feasible, thus avoiding the need for continual supervision by Office of Economic Opportunity personnel. Additional or changed tasks, when necessary, should be assigned to the contractor in general terms by the Office of Economic Opportunity Contracting Officer. Assignments of specific jobs and schedules among its employees should always be made by the contractor.

(3) *The Government reviews the performance of individual contractor employees.*—The Office of Economic Opportunity should evaluate interim or final performance by the contractor on an overall basis.

b. *Performance by Contractor Employees of "Federal Functions."*—This is indicated when:

(1) *The work involves the exercise of personal judgment and discretion on behalf of the Government.*—Contractor employees should not sign official documents which normally require the signature of a Government officer or render decision on whether or not a project should be funded, continued, or terminated. Final responsibility for all management decisions must clearly rest with Office of Economic Opportunity officials.

(2) *Contractor employees perform tasks normally performed by Government employees.*—If Contractor personnel are desired for the performance of tasks that the Office of Economic Opportunity also uses its own employees to perform, it is likely that the proposed contract is for illegal staff supplementation. If Contractor personnel are desired for the performance of tasks carried out by Government employees in other Federal agencies, the proposed contract is also suspect. When such tasks are to be carried out on a long-term basis, the likelihood that Contractor personnel would be utilized illegally increases.

c. *Other Key Indicia*—

(1) *The Contractor provides no end product to OEO.*—When all that is desired from a Contractor is the furnishing of a certain number of man-days of Contractor employee services to Office of Economic Opportunity, the proposed contract should be closely scrutinized to see if it violates the personal services prohibition. A fixed level of effort in terms of man-days, however, may and should often be provided for in a contract as a minimum standard of performance when a genuine end product is being furnished by a Contractor.

(2) *Contractor employees work on Government sites or in Government offices with Government-furnished property.*—The Office of Economic Opportunity should not provide office space, secretarial assistance, or office equipment to a Contractor employee. Such an employee is more likely to come under the control and supervision of Office of Economic Opportunity personnel, and may be asked to or may appear to perform Federal functions.

WESLEY HJORNEVIK,
Deputy Director.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Instruction is to set forth Office of Economic Opportunity policy governing the use and application of Project Management as it applies to both contracts and grants within the headquarters office of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

2. DEFINITIONS

Project Manager.—A project manager is a designated individual within the Office of

Economic Opportunity assigned the responsibility and delegated the authority for the centralized management of a particular headquarters project of the Agency.

3. OBJECTIVE

The purpose of this directive is to strengthen the effectiveness of headquarters project management so that Office of Economic Opportunity can plan, direct and control projects in order to insure that they possess the performance capabilities required by approved program plans and within the resources allocated to specific projects.

4. POLICY APPLICATION

a. Selection of the Project Manager—

(1) A Project Manager should have sufficient grade and organizational stature within the Agency to effectively carry out his responsibilities in dealing with contractor or grantee personnel operationally responsible for the project. The grade should be commensurate with the magnitude of the task.

(2) It is mandatory that a Project Manager have a high degree of technical, professional, business and managerial competence, supplemented whenever possible by recent experience and training in the special requirements of project management.

(3) A Project Manager shall be carefully selected on the basis of his general intelligence, judgment and proven willingness to make decisions. He should become the visible center of project authority and information, with his career affected by his performance.

b. Role and Authority of the Project Manager—

A Project Manager shall be responsible for the successful accomplishment of his project. He shall exercise executive authority over the planning, direction, and control of the approved project. Specifically a project manager shall:

(1) Be able to develop in a professional way project statements of work, procurement requests, non-competitive procurement justifications, when necessary, proposal evaluation schemes, proper cost estimates and suggested source lists. For proposed grants the Project Manager shall be able to develop clear statements of purpose, performance standards and timetables and an effective monitoring schedule.

(2) Present proposed projects to Project Review Board.

(3) Be able to forecast program difficulties with sufficient time to develop alternate solutions.

(4) Project dollar needs in advance so as to respond to annual budget cycles, if appropriate.

(5) Avoid overruns by constant attention to economy.

(6) Insure attention to reliability and quality during performance.

(7) Report on the progress of his project in accordance with contract or grant terms.

(8) Identify explicit progress milestones together with an appropriate information system in order to maintain project control.

(9) Prepare, in the case of contracts, a contractor performance evaluation statement at the termination of a contract.

(10) Provide leadership and direction to those junior staff members assigned to the Project Manager as aides in the management of particular projects. The project manager shall be responsible for the manner in which aides carry out their duties on a given project and shall be responsible for their growth and development as potential project managers.

WESLEY HJORNEVIK,
Deputy Director.

PREPARING CONTRACT STATEMENTS OF WORK

1. PURPOSE

This Instruction establishes responsibilities and prescribes procedures for preparing contract statements of work.

2. PROCEDURES

The preparation of a specific, clear statement of the work desired to be carried out by an OEO contractor is the responsibility of the program office submitting a Procurement Request. The statement of work should be submitted as an attachment to a Procurement Request (PR) in a form that can be inserted without change in a Request for Proposals (RFP), and with only minor changes in a final contract resulting from that RFP. Information that need not be given to firms submitting proposals on the contract, but which must be communicated to the Project Review Board, such as the justification for the proposed procurement or the level at which it is to be funded, past history of contracts of this type, reasons for requesting noncompetitive procurement, if appropriate, should not be included in this statement of work, but should be submitted as a separate attachment to the PR. A statement of work for an RFP will normally contain the following elements:

a. *Background.*—This portion of the statement of work is designed to set forth briefly for the information of offerors the magnitude and objectives of the OEO program for which the procurement is desired, the general purposes of the proposed contract, and other information that may give firms an insight into the program area in which they will be submitting proposals. In many cases the purposes of this section can be served by attaching to the RFP OEO guidelines, instructions, or brochures explaining the methods and purposes of the program and the regulations under which it operates. Such materials also can be identified in the RFP but made available to offerors at designated places.

b. *Detailed Requirements.*—This section should usually begin as follows:

"The Contractor shall provide the necessary qualified personnel, facilities, materials, and services (including travel and per diem) required to furnish _____ (name of product or services desired)."

The product or services to be provided should be stated in sufficient detail that if the contractor deviates from what he promises to deliver, OEO can hold the contractor accountable to exactly what the agency contracted for. Some of the specific items that should be set forth in the contract are the following:

(1) The exact number and locations of sites where work is to be performed.

(2) The exact number of items to be delivered, or man-days of services to be delivered, for each separate task. Man-days should reflect the total requirement to accomplish the desired result, and not available dollars.

(3) The exact number and dates of reports that are to be submitted by the contractor. It is important to note that reports should not be requested more frequently than is absolutely necessary.

(4) Whether travel and per diem for contractor employees is to be included in the contract price. When this amount can be estimated as a known factor by the program office, and will be a very substantial portion of the contract amount, it should be made known to offerors in the RFP and cost proposals should be judged solely on other variable factors.

(5) If site training, technical assistance, evaluation, or other visits are required, the number, frequency, and length of such visits.

(6) If surveys or field testing is required, the number of sites at which surveys or field tests shall take place, the length of each survey or test, and the number of persons to be surveyed or tested at each site.

(7) If training is required, the number of training sessions, their location, length, number of participants, and whether the contractor shall provide travel and per diem for participants.

(8) If materials are to be developed, the exact type and number of such materials, the dates for submission of each, whether draft copies must be submitted to OEO for approval, the target group for such materials, and whether the contractor will be required to print and distribute the materials or whether he need only submit prototype copies for OEO's own printing and distribution.

The above list is, of course, only illustrative of the many specific items that may be necessary in a particular RFP.

c. *Schedule of Performance.*—A detailed chronology of target dates for completion of performance of sub-tasks under the contract should be provided in the Statement of Work. Such dates may be firm or estimated, depending on the circumstances. If justifiable delays are encountered, the target dates may be changed only by contract modification. Milestones are absolutely necessary in work statements, and are vital to maintaining project control once a contract has been let.

d. *Level of Professional Efforts.*—This serves two different functions, on in an RFP and another in a signed contract:

(1) Because it is often difficult to accurately specify in a more tangible way the magnitude of services to be performed, most RFPs should contain an estimate of the levels of professional effort required to perform the tasks stated therein. This estimate will greatly assist firms in submitting accurate cost proposals and the level of qualification of the staff necessary to perform the task.

(2) By putting into a fixed price contract the minimum professional level of effort that will be provided by a contractor, OEO can hold a contractor to a certain level of performance even if the end product it desires is difficult to define qualitatively. In a cost-reimbursable contract, OEO will only pay for actual time worked by contractor employees, but an estimate should still be in the contract as an indication of the scope of services the contractor is expected to provide.

Levels of professional effort may be stated in terms of man-hours, man-days, man-months, or man-years, as appropriate. They may be stated in the aggregate or be broken down into professional subcategories, such as "Project Director—one man-year, 2 Training Specialists—6 man-months each, 3 Education Specialists—3 man-months each."

In conclusion, if a RFP is to be a document which communicates the maximum feasible amount of information to enable offerors to determine whether or not they wish to bid, the statement of work must be a clear, well drafted and precise statement of OEO's requirements.

WESLEY HJORNEVIK,
Deputy Director.

MARYLAND SOLDIER KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Army Sp4c. Paul T. Burrier, a fine young man from Maryland was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PAUL T. BURRIER DEAD IN VIETNAM—ARMY SPECIALIST, FOURTH CLASS WAS KILLED NEAR CAM RANH BAY

The Department of Defense announced yesterday the death in South Vietnam of Army Spec. 4 Paul T. Burrier, 21, of Catonsville.

He was killed in action on March 31 near his home base of Cam Ranh Bay, the Pentagon said.

CATONSVILLE HIGH GRADUATE

Specialist Burrier was a graduate of the Catonsville Senior High School. For two years he had also attended the University of Maryland, where he majored in political science on the Catonsville campus.

He enlisted in the Army in July, 1968, and left Baltimore for Vietnam in late August, 1969.

Although he wrote often from Vietnam, he was "quiet about the war," his relatives said.

LIFE SCOUT

He was a life scout in the Troop 307 in Catonsville, where he was also a member of Salem Lutheran Church.

His other hobbies included chess and rifle-shooting.

He is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Paul S. Burrier and a sister, Mrs. Susan Causey, all of Catonsville.

TEN WAYS LAWYERS CAN HELP THE CAUSE OF PEACE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the March 1970 Missouri Bar Journal contains an article by Charles S. Rhyne, president of the World Peace Through Law Center, entitled "Ten Ways Lawyers Can Help the Cause of Peace." I think this article, which follows, should be of general interest:

TEN WAYS LAWYERS CAN HELP THE CAUSE OF PEACE

(By Charles S. Rhyne)

An idea can be more powerful than an atom. Especially is this true of an idea whose time has come.

The time of a world peace system built out of law will arrive in our day if we of the law profession assume adequate leadership. By providing leadership in making the time of peace under the law arrive we will lift the hearts and hopes of all peoples. We will also provide for all peoples a new faith in their future for the eons of time stretching out before them.

To avoid misunderstanding, let me say that I do not contend that a World peace structure built out of law will cure all the ills of man. Imperfect human beings run nations and conduct international contacts and they are certain to have disputes. Law rules can only lessen their number and provide for their peaceful decision.

While a law system is not perfect, it is still the best concept yet conceived by the mind of Man for conduct of relations among men and nations.

I believe that lawyers of many nations must work together to build peace with law, and do so with the widest vision of a common humanity. The world's people are acting and thinking more and more as one. Much greater international cooperation is necessary today than in the past. Especially is this true of the overriding desire for a new world peace system which will end forever the archaic ancient ritual of deciding disputes between nations by the sacrifice of human lives.

How do we or the law utilize our capacity to achieve and maintain a human condition of world peace? I believe there are 10 specific things lawyers of the world can do for this universal cause.

First, we must drive home to all mankind the fact that the peacemaking machinery of the world is archaic and inadequate for today's world and requires a fundamental change in the way order is maintained. We must spell out plans and programs to supply the fundamental change which is required by strengthening law into a peace framework capable of creating a peaceful world order with justice and security.

Second, we must rededicate ourselves to our common cause and commitment to peace by continuing to perfect our worldwide cooperative organization and the World Peace Through Law Center. A million-strong lawyer-judge peace army can be a mighty force.

Third, we must use computers and other electronic marvels to their full potential to speed up the processes of lawmaking transnationally.

Fourth, we must bring the power and prestige of lawyers and judges more directly to bear in a massive effort to involve the public in—and mobilize public opinion behind—plans and programs to strengthen peace through law. Our special talents and training, which give lawyers a unique ability to create understanding among peoples to replace disagreement, are not yet fully utilized in this great endeavor.

Fifth, we must constantly urge upon the United Nations, regional organizations and national governments every treaty, every institution, every idea, plan or program which will add to the law and the law framework of the world. This concentrated effort can and will in time bring into existence a World Law System, a World Court System, and a peaceful world order with justice.

Sixth, we must clearly identify our peace through law program in the hearts and minds of all peoples as the means whereby they can achieve their eternal dream of world peace with justice. Public opinion is a mighty force. A sense of the necessity of their support must penetrate the people's awareness of our plan. With the power of public opinion behind our mission it will become the recognized imperative of our day.

Seventh, in our focus upon world trade and world aid for developing nations let us be at the forefront in devising plans and programs to carry out mankind's desire to share fairly among all men, women and children the enormous productivity, the wonders of technology and science, of our era. The gap between the rich and the poor must be closed. Let us help lead that crusade also as its achievement will create the social and economic stability required for order with justice under the rule of law.

Eighth, each of us can discharge part of our responsibility to help build a world peace edifice out of law by asking our government officials to accept one or more existing international treaties. There is not one nation whose peoples cannot but benefit from accepting one or more of the many existing treaties to which they are not now a party. Every lawyer or judge can help advance peace by this very simple but very essential personal action.

Ninth, in personal relations between lawyers—both in our own countries and internationally—our contributions toward understanding and peace can be great. In the law we share a common concept, a common language and a common life endeavor. Working together we can make plans and programs which will translate a towering ideal into achievement of the most desired dream of all peoples since the dawn of recorded history. No greater joint enterprise can command the endeavors of any profession than the cause of peace.

We must not over-promise, as ours is not an easy road to peace. Our plan cannot be accomplished in a few months or even a few years. It is not a plan for the short-winded or for those looking for an instant accomplishment from which world peace will spring

full blown. We must use concentrated effort to build a peace structure out of law, treaty upon treaty, law upon law, transnational legal institution upon institution. That the task is complex, difficult and long-range should not deter or discourage but should be taken as a challenge to spur us on the extraordinary effort which is required.

Tenth, we should give our utmost effort to achieve agreement on concrete plans and proposals which we can urge upon the United Nations, regional organizations and governments to expand transnational law and increase the use and number of international legal institutions devoted to peaceful settlement of disputes under the rule of law.

When the rule of law exists throughout the world, then and only then can any man, woman, or child live or travel any place on the face of the earth, or into the vistas of endless space, in freedom, in dignity, and in peace.

HANG OUR HEADS IN SHAME

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is a very, very old joke with the punchline of—"Yes, but what have you done for me lately?" Doubtless, most of the Members know the story because we, ourselves, have often been the victims of such an attitude.

But my purpose in rising today is to call attention to a gross ingratitude being paid by us—all of us; this Nation—to a body of men—and women too—to whom all of us owe debts which can never be discharged adequately. I refer, of course, to our veterans.

It is no secret to us, those of us who live daily with the letters and telephone calls from constituents pleading for help for a son, a husband, a father who has been disabled or incapacitated in his military service to his Nation and now faces the bleakest of futures.

It is no secret to us that in recent months aid and services for veterans have even declined drastically; and this disturbs me greatly. I do not know whether to attribute this trend to callousness or ignorance; but regardless, we must do all within our power to reverse this trend.

Apropos of this situation, John S. Knight, distinguished journalist and newspaper executive, whose organization recently assumed ownership of the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Philadelphia Daily News, in my constituency, has demonstrated this same concern in his weekly news column which appears in the Knight newspapers.

I wish to commend Mr. Knight for his public service in bringing this plight to the attention of the citizenry and, hopefully, to the administration.

So that my colleagues can share these lucid and pertinent facts, the article follows:

NEGLECT OF VIETNAM VETS AN ALL-AMERICAN SHAME

(By John S. Knight)

Are the people of America failing to honor our servicemen returning from Vietnam?

Do they appreciate the sacrifice of these young men who fought in a war brought on

by the miscalculations of their nation's leaders?

Is adequate tribute being paid to those who have suffered so much while we at home make no sacrifices whatsoever?

Plain-spoken Lt. Gen. Herman Nickerson Jr., retiring Marine commander in Vietnam, says he is "disappointed in the silent majority" for not honoring Americans who have lost life and limb in Vietnam.

"There are relatively few places," the general added, "where they waved flags and honored our servicemen as they did in the great days when the boys came home as heroes. They're not interested in the exploits of our young men. Maybe we're getting to be pretty blasé about the whole thing."

NO BANDS, PARADES

The general's indignation is shared by others. As one Veterans Administration official remarked, "the guys who fought in World Wars I and II found gratitude and the traditional hero's welcome when they came home. These guys get no bands, no parades, not even a flicker of interest."

This shabby lack of attention is bad enough. But a more severe indictment can be drawn against the treatment of wounded veterans in government hospitals.

Prompt use of the helicopter, intensive battlefield medical care and the Army's modern evacuation procedures save thousands of wounded men who would have died in an earlier war.

Unhappily, this superb medical treatment on the field of battle is not duplicated on the home front. When wounded veterans are ultimately assigned to Veterans Administration hospitals for long-term treatment, the story changes.

In Miami, doctors have charged that veterans suffer a "tragic lack of care" because the VA hospital is "grossly understaffed."

Dr. Stewart Wolf of the University of Oklahoma says "there is real danger that the administration and Congress are about to see veterans' hospitals revert to the mediocre status of the 1920s and 1930s when tired physicians and political jobholders provided the care for the defenders of our country."

And Dr. Ernest H. J. Bors of the VA hospital in Long Beach, Calif., blames lack of people for the deterioration in the care of paraplegics. "We don't have the hands to do the job," says Dr. Bors. "It boils down to a matter of the budget."

Donald E. Johnson, newly appointed head of the VA, insists that veterans still receive top quality care—"care second to none."

Yet most of the evidence is to the contrary.

A GRUESOME TOLL

The cruel nature of the Vietnam war—booby traps, jungle ambushes, mines and hidden spikes—has taken a gruesome toll of combat troops. More than a quarter of a million Americans have been wounded in Vietnam, with about half of them requiring hospitalization.

Correspondent Don Oberdofer reports that an Army study of 1,000 men separated from the service for disability discloses that 28 per cent were amputees, 25 per cent suffer from paralysis of extremities and 14 per cent have "impairment of sense organs."

These are much higher percentages than in previous wars. The rate of blindness is triple that of World War II.

President Nixon and the Congress have an imperative responsibility to upgrade the quality of care being given to wounded veterans in government hospitals.

Words such as "economy" and "budgetary considerations" strike a discordant note when applied to the obligation we owe to young men whose lives and bodies have been shattered in the service of their country.

SAD COMMENTARY

The fortunate ones—those who returned sound of mind and body—can abide the

neglect as they move almost invisibly through civilian life.

They don't talk much, but the distrust within them runs strong and the bitterness lies deep.

As 25-year-old Wally McKay, a much-decorated Marine veteran, has remarked: "I just keep my mouth shut about the war. If anybody asks me about Vietnam, I just refer them to the library."

Mike Sergieff, an ex-sailor, put it this way: "I didn't expect to be treated like a hero when I got home. But I didn't expect to be ignored."

The tragic neglect of our Vietnam veterans is a sad commentary on present day society, steeped in greed and devoid of compassion.

We should hang our heads in shame.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF EULOGY FOR FORMER CONGRESSMAN LEONARD WOLF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of this body who knew him was as saddened as I to learn of the recent and most untimely death of our former colleague Leonard Wolf. He ably represented the Second District of Iowa from 1959 to 1961 and since that time was associated with many campaigns to alleviate the world's hunger problems. At the time of his passing he was director of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation.

I would like to take this opportunity to announce that I will obtain a special order on Thursday, April 9, for the purpose of eulogizing Mr. Wolf. I invite Members to participate with me on this occasion.

BOONDOGGLE DELUXE

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, columnist Jack Anderson has discovered what some of us in the Congress have known now for quite a while—that the international giveaway organizations the U.S. Government has fostered and financed so lavishly in recent years are nothing more than monumental boondoggles.

Mr. Anderson reports in his column of April 7, 1970, on the latest chapter in the boondoggle that operates under the name of the Asian Development Bank. I suggest that he might find much the same story, or worse, in the operations of such institutions as the African Development Bank, the World Bank, the International Finance Corp. and the rest of these slush funds.

I offer the column for insertion in the RECORD at this point.

BOONDOGGLE DE LUXE

(By Jack Anderson)

A secret inquiry into the Asian Development Bank, supported by the American taxpayers to the tune of \$200 million, has produced evidence of a galloping boondoggle.

The inquiry was conducted behind closed doors by Rep. Otto Passman (D-La.), the crusty arch-foe of foreign aid, who dropped out of the fourth grade, studied accounting while he scratched out a living, and developed a fierce attachment for every dollar he ever earned. He now treats the taxpayers dollars with equal tenderness.

Breathing flame from both nostrils, he blistered the bank's U.S. representative and a gaggle of Treasury Department officials for not taking better care of the taxpayers' \$200 million.

Before the hearing ended, the exasperated Passman was moved to exclaim: "I think this is the most mismanaged outfit I have ever had anything to do with! . . . Gentlemen, you are taking this country for a ride!"

The Asian Development Bank was founded in 1966 to provide loan assistance to underdeveloped nations. Passman discovered, instead, that most of its funds are tied up in investments and that almost half its profits are squandered on overhead. Here are some of his secret findings:

SECRET SCANDAL

Although the bank has assets of about \$452 million, loans have been approved for less than \$140 million. The bank, whose purpose is to grant development loans, seems more interested in seeking investment opportunities.

In more than three years of operation, the bank has disbursed only \$9.3 million against the loan commitments, but has spent \$11.6 million for administrative expenses. This shocking disproportion can be justified, in small part, by the extra expense of getting organized.

The bank has 438 people on the payroll, not counting the top executives. The Export-Import Bank, with six times its assets, has only 364 employees.

Last year, the Asian Development Bank reported \$12.9 million in profits. Less than 2 per cent of this came from interest, the rest from investments. About 40 per cent of the profits, \$5.6 million all told, was eaten up by administrative expenses. In contrast, the Export-Import Bank spends only 5 per cent of its profits for overhead.

The Asian bank, whose loan money is supposed to be used strictly to develop poor nations, has been granting personal loans to its staff.

The U.S. representative, Bernard Zagorin, told Passman that the bank had invested about \$100 million in American securities. Yet despite this unused \$100 million, the bank recently borrowed \$15 million.

ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES

By now, Passman was incredulous. "Why," he demanded, "would it be necessary to float bonds and pay 7 per cent interest on \$15 million when you had approximately \$100 million on hand that you didn't need for immediate use?"

Zagorin explained lamely that "it is felt necessary to get the international money markets familiar with the bank and the bank's operations."

When Passman began to dig into the bank executives' entertainment expenses—euphemistically referred to as the "representation allowance"—he found it had increased over the past year from \$24,000 to \$44,000. He asked why.

"Because," said Zagorin, "more than half of the \$44,000 is for the office of the presidency and for official receptions and so forth."

"He is really living high on the hog, is he not?" snapped Passman.

"We included a lot of the official conferences hosted by the president," mumbled Zagorin.

HEATED EXCHANGE

When he began inquiring into the bank's loans to staff members, however, perhaps the most heated exchange of the hearing ensued.

Passman: "Are you making any loans to your staff members?"

Zagorin: "Yes, sir."

Passman: "Could you furnish for the record the amount of each loan? . . . We want to know the amount of loans, the rate of interest during calendar year 1969."

Zagorin: "Mr. Chairman, I cannot give it to you by name, nor the specific loan."

Passman: "Why can't you?"

Zagorin: "Because the president of the bank (Japan's Takeshi Watanabe) will not disclose that information to me for this purpose."

Passman: "What if you did not get any more money? Let me say this to you. You are telling me that the president of the bank, to which we have pledged \$200 million, will not permit this committee . . . to have the names of the staff members who borrowed money from the organization . . . You will get this information for the committee, or you will not get any money."

The bank, which wants an additional \$100 million from the American taxpayers, is expected to tell Passman what he wants to know.

HARBOR COLLEGE ECOLOGIST SEES END TO POLLUTION, OVERCROWDING

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, when we consider man and the environment, not all is bleak. The advancements made in improving our surroundings and making the earth more habitable have been rapid. Our knowledge concerning the causes and cures of our troubled environment has increased tremendously. We must continue to study, to learn, and to act. Yet, we must do so with a greater sense of urgency. For studies indicate that under existing vehicular emission control standards, automobile air pollution in the United States will more than double in the next 30 years because of the projected increase in both the number of vehicles and miles driven by each vehicle.

Although some authorities are predicting that, within 30 to 50 years, life as we know it on this planet will cease to exist, Dr. Ellen Erchul, a professor at Harbor College, in Harbor City, Calif., sees a silver lining among the clouds.

I insert in the RECORD the following article, which appeared in the March 25, 1970, edition of the San Pedro News Pilot, revealing the optimism of Dr. Erchul.

HARBOR COLLEGE ECOLOGIST SEES END TO POLLUTION, OVERCROWDING

(By Gayle Palmer)

In this era of vastly increasing crime, pollution of water and air, over-population and imbalanced economy, there is a threat to one of the ideals held most dear: "America the Beautiful." Conservationists hold that the causes are all inter-related.

Crime and dirt in the cities are driving people back to the country. Increasing population in concentrated megalopolises create contamination of waters. Exhaust fumes from jet planes and cars combined with industrial waste are poisoning the atmosphere. And, the demand for better living of the burgeoning upper middle-classes all add to the crisis.

The few remaining paradise areas of the United States are being crucified according

to such groups as the Sierra Club, the John Muir Society, the Audobon Society, the National Geographic Society and various auto and travel associations.

Many of these organizations have valid reasons to challenge the progression of society. But much of the damage is a result of their own doing. One bureau in the western states, a chamber of commerce, has long advertised the beauty of its state to entice visitors. Many visitors came and saw and were convinced. They decided to stay. But they had to have a place to live.

The once-advertised beauty has slowly dwindled to make way for a place to build and live.

Once remote and historically quaint Park City, Utah, for example, now is an attraction for thousands of skiers each winter. Much of the natural beauty is permanently destroyed because it is a popular resort.

Millcreek Canyon outside Salt Lake City was caught in the web of migration. The canyon, on the west slope of the towering Wasatch Mountain range, has lost much of its charm because of an expanding suburbia.

So many of the nearly 3 million members of the LDS faith and others as well have clustered around the monument to Brigham Young who said "This is the Place," it's difficult to see the white marble statue in Emigration Canyon because of all the new homes.

Utah is not the only western wilderness area to be devastated by the advance of ecologism.

The California redwoods are still as beautiful, but not as many that once beautified the green and golden state. The proposed Mineral King project in the southern end of the Sequoia National Park has blasted out mountains. The thundering Snake River's "Hell's Canyon" in Idaho is in danger of being tranquilized by dams for water supply for cities and farms to grow produce to feed the cities. Wildlife is suffering from the pollution created by man to expand his environment.

This sounds like a dismal state of affairs. The end of the impossible dream.

"Quite the contrary," a San Pedro sociology professor counters. "Within another 10 years we will have resolved a lot of problems in this direction."

She is Dr. Ellen Erchul of 2286 Sparta Drive and a professor in the social sciences at Harbor College.

"We have had the know-how for at least 10 years but until now we have done very little about it. Because of the startling and acute danger of pollution and all its accompanying factors recently brought to public attention, we must and will have to take our plans off the drawing board and put them into practical application," she said.

"We will have to have a meeting of the minds between physical, biological and sociological concepts and work together as a unit. This coordination is long overdue. In the past, each of us who have specialized in our own fields have gone off on our own tangents. And, you can see what a mess we're in."

The sociology expert first put the word "ecology" on "the board" in her classes a decade ago and students began to become aware of the term but not alarmed enough to take it seriously. Now, the young generation of deep thinkers are beginning to do something about it, she said.

"After all, the oncoming generations are going to inherit the world after we're gone. They are becoming aware of their responsibilities in dealing with the concentration of population as an economic entity and the resultant pollution and its related consequences.

"I have every faith in the oncoming generations because they will profit by the mistakes of our own haphazard planning and lackluster system of social disorder."

Dr. Erchul firmly believes that the new gen-

erations will preserve what's left of the once natural beauty of Western America.

"We have been far too careless in the past without necessarily intending to tear down our once beautiful countryside," she contends. "Our ancestors and present older generations have been thinking too much of protecting our purse strings than protecting our society and its natural surroundings."

"Future generations will become more knowledgeable about preservation while, at the same time, applying their knowledge about keeping America beautiful."

The professor, who has been a social teacher and social worker 38 years, cautions against the "shock value" of converting the "don't cares" into "do cares."

"This simply isn't true in our concern. While little has been done to correct this situation, our young people know what's happening. Educating them into action will be more beneficial than frightening them into action."

The Harbor College social authority added that there is sufficient space left in the United States without contaminating its ecology. The answer is, as she sees it, to reorganize our social structure and build new cities with their tandem industry within the open spaces. This system is working not only in Europe with its long history of over-concentration of population, but in the Eastern United States, as well.

"There will be better planning and better distribution of utilizing our natural resources when we decentralize the metropolitan areas as we now know them," she envisions.

Scientists already have confirmed the theory of converting the atmospheric inversion that causes smog over the urban areas into pure, clean air.

"Here in Los Angeles we know that we can syphon-in the sea breeze by a simple process of reducing the atmospheric pressure," she said. "But it would require a long, hard process with the cooperation of industry. This requires money, and that gets back to the old theory of unloosening the purse strings."

In the past, science has lost the personal contact with people, Dr. Erchul inferred.

"We are realizing now that to be scientific, you must also have value judgment. We have used up much of our resources because we did not use individual responsibility in developing our westward expansion. The almost extinction of the buffalo is a good example."

Dr. Erchul was brought up in the "land of the Thousand Lakes" in Northern Minnesota and appreciates the "loveliness" of nature. She is a member of the Sierra Club and other conservationist groups and still maintains her desire to preserve the land as it once was.

"I traveled around the world and saw the beauty in the cities because of well-advanced planning. Hong Kong is a good example. There isn't one utility pole there even though it has one of the highest population concentrations in the world," she marveled. "Every possible utility scheme is hidden from view underground."

The professor met her husband, John, who is a research chemist in the Harbor Area, while they were teaching in another of nature's wonderlands at International Falls, Minn. They moved to Southern California in 1940 and have lived in San Pedro since 1961.

Although a lover of nature she became interested in sociology during World War II as a receptionist for the Travelers Aid Society at the Los Angeles Union Station.

In summing up her observations, Dr. Erchul said:

"This is still a pretty good country in spite of some of the young people and their ideologies. This will be their country some day to look after.

"And I'm extremely optimistic about their future."

VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNING ESSAY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States sponsors a voice of democracy program in which high school students are asked to write a broadcast script. All five winners of this year's contest on "Freedom's Challenge" were guests of honor at the VFW Congressional Dinner and received a personal congratulation from President Nixon. I would like to include the essay of the fourth-place winner, Bonnie Brewster of Bridgewater, Mass. A 17-year-old Cardinal Spellman High School student, Bonnie is vice president of the National Forensic League and of the oratorical society, and hopes to pursue a career in the communications arts and English. The VFW should be commended for their sponsorship of such a fine program. After reading this essay, I think you will agree that we all can take pride in the patriotism and faith in America displayed by this young student. The essay follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Bonnie Brewster)

"I have died in Vietnam
But I have walked the face of the moon.

I have beat down my enemies with clubs
But I have built courtrooms to keep them free.

I have built a bomb to destroy the world
But I have used it to light a light.

I have outraged my brothers in the allies
of the ghettos
But I have transplanted a human heart."

Closing the cover of today's Time Magazine, 1969, I recall the words of a favorite novel which speak to me of yesterday.

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of uncertainty, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair."

So wrote Charles Dickens, 1869.

And it is the best of times—fantastic achievement is now and always will be our path—the corridors of space loom infinite and inviting through the explorations of Apollo 11 and 12, modern medicine has thrown open the window for new hope through continuing research, and now, as never before, the doors of higher education stand open to all who seek admittance.

It is the worst of times. There are killers lurking among us—wars rage taking their toll upon humanity, air pollution and water pollution threaten extinction of life, while rioters plague university campuses and city streets.

Why? . . . and how? . . . in such an age of wisdom, can man be so foolish?

We as human beings have been given such a capacity to love and to give—and yet, we continue to hate and to take and to demand.

I speak today of Freedom's Challenge—that challenge which I believe, in the best of times, seems disciplined, loving and selfless men build and develop life for a newer and brighter world, while, in the worst of times, sees selfish, undisciplined, slavish men destroying any semblance of earthy harmony and—ultimately—destroying their very freedom.

Remember when the first step was taken on the moon, and astronauts Aldrin and Armstrong, looking down on their small world, described it as a mere "pinpoint" where imposed barriers, boundaries, and "gaps" no longer existed. Through the revelation that this giant step gave to mankind, I ask you, has any time, any era, ever been such a season of light?

In Sydney Carton, Dickens saw that it was the courage and spirit of each individual that salvaged the world. Carton lived with compassion and love for his fellow beings, for a universal justice—even to his death on the guillotine.

Let's all try to live every minute projecting this freedom of our best times onto the kaleidoscope of the worst times. Let's bring the baptism of liberty, the spring of hope, to those prisoned times which are ever born in the winter of despair.

These times present the challenge which I realize as a spoiled patriot, and as an unspoiled patriot, I, as an individual, try to live this challenge in my refusal to lapse into the apathetic and "comfortable" life, in my refusal to condone slavery and slaughter and suffering and starvation, and in my refusal to recognize those who strike out against peace among men. It is in my refusal that I do accept Freedom's Challenge. I am humbled, but I am proud—I am an American.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Internal Security recently marked the first anniversary of its creation by the House of Representatives. As chairman, I now want to call the attention of my colleagues and the public to the availability of the first annual report of the Internal Security Committee. The report reviews the committee's legislative and investigative operations during 1969. Rather than attempt a restatement of the contents, I am attaching for inclusion in the Record the complete table of contents. I also submit herewith the text of my remarks contained in the foreword, as an expression of my position with regard to the responsibilities, policies, and objectives of the committee.

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	1
SECTION A: HEARINGS ON BILLS	
Chapter I.—Hearings relating to H.R. 12699 (reported with amendments as H.R. 14864): Industrial, vessel, and port security. (Hearings held September 9, 10, and 24, 1969.)	7
Chapter II.—Hearings relating to H.R. 959: Obstruction of Armed Forces. (Hearings held September 15 and 16, 1969.)	17
SECTION B: INVESTIGATIVE HEARINGS	
Chapter III.—National SDS data and local chapter activities at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. (Hearings held June 3-5 and 17, 1969.)	28
Chapter IV.—SDS activities at Kent State University, Kent, Ohio. (Hearings held June 24 and 25, 1969.)	43
Chapter V.—SDS activities at George Washington University in Washington, D.C. (Hearings held July 22-24, 1969.)	53

Chapter VI.—SDS activities at American University, Washington, D.C. (Hearings held July 24, 1969.)	67
Chapter VII.—Communist Party and SDS activities in Chicago, Ill., including the University of Chicago, and aspects of the SDS 1969 Convention. (Hearings held August 6 and 7, 1969.)	71
Chapter VIII.—SDS activities related to high school students and other teenagers in the summer of 1969 in Columbus and Akron, Ohio; Detroit, Mich.; and Pittsburgh, Pa.; plus involvement in labor-management dispute in Washington, D.C. (Hearings held October 20-22, 28-30, and December 17, 1969.)	86
Chapter IX.—SDS and "Newsreel" involvement in the release of American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. (Hearings held December 9-11, 1969.)	106
Chapter X.—Hearings on links between SDS and Newsreel film propaganda company; SDS activity at Fort Dix, N.J., Army Base; SDS National Action activity in Chicago, Ill., October 8-11. (Hearings held December 16-18, 1969.)	116
SECTION C: REFERENCE SERVICE AND COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS	
Chapter XI.—Report of Committee's Files and Reference Section	131
Chapter XII.—Committee Publications	132
SECTION D: CONTEMPT CITATIONS	
Chapter XIII.—Review of current status of contempt citations	134
Index	1

FOREWORD

On January 29, 1969, I was elected chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities by the House of Representatives. An organizational meeting of HCUA was held on February 6, 1969, at which time action was taken on routine procedural resolutions. I presented to the committee the new chief counsel, Donald G. Sanders, and made several operational announcements. That was to be the last meeting of HCUA, which had been a standing committee of the House since 1945.

Twelve days later, on February 18, the House approved by a vote of 306 to 80, H. Res. 89 which I had introduced a few weeks earlier to abolish HCUA and simultaneously to create the House Committee on Internal Security.

In my years of service on HCUA, beginning in 1963, I progressively moved toward the belief that a new emphasis, a new direction, was essential in the field of internal security. I felt this could be most effectively accomplished by a fresh, clear, and straightforward statement of objectives in the light of contemporary conditions. HCUA had served its purposes, but revolutionary concepts which swept across our land in the last decade necessitated a different concept of approach. I envisioned a modern committee, with a pragmatic mandate, a meaningful name, a restructured staff, and purposeful investigations, enabled thereby to make legislative considerations realistically commensurate with an atmosphere of increasingly pervasive defiance of law and open threats to alter our form of government by other than democratic processes. A resolution to effectuate these ideas which I first introduced in the House in January 1967 and which was identical with H. Res. 89 was never brought to a vote in the 90th Congress. At the time of my election as HCUA chairman in January 1969, I reiterated my intention to press for the establishment of the House Committee on Internal Security in order to make the most beneficial contribution to the Nation's internal security. During the debate on February 18, 1969, I explained:

"This resolution if adopted would give the

Committee on Internal Security jurisdiction over revolutionary groups which would work toward the change or the alteration of our institutions and systems of government through revolutionary means outside the democratic process. It is not concerned with change through the democratic process which is, of course, inherent in our system of government. But every democratic government has the responsibility to take the necessary steps to preserve and protect itself from unlawful subversion.

"I think what has happened is that the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been caught—not only the House Committee on Un-American Activities, but the House of Representatives itself—has been caught up in a battle between two extreme views in this country, the extreme view on the one hand that people with unorthodox political thoughts, political ideas or political ideologies, should be taken out and eradicated and in some way disposed of, and the equally absurd view on the other extreme holding that Congress has no business legislating or investigating in the very important field of subversion. As I stated before, this is the basic right of every democratic government. Subversion is as old as the history of organized society and the threat may be one form of ism today and a different one tomorrow."

It was with a deep sense of gratitude to my many colleagues who supported H. Res. 89 that I designed new policies and procedures to suit the times and the mandate of HCUA.

In this first annual report of the House Committee on Internal Security I want to restate the committee's responsibilities and the areas in which it is mandated by the House of Representatives to conduct its activities.

First, the committee was granted authority to investigate organizations which seek to overthrow or alter the form of government of the United States or any State by force, violence, or any unlawful means as distinguished from change through the democratic process. This would include organizations, whether or not a part of the international Communist conspiracy, which seek a violent revolution.

Second, the committee was given authority to investigate organizations which incite or employ acts of violence to obstruct or oppose the lawful authority of the Federal Government in the execution of any law of the U.S. affecting internal security. This could include organizations which, while not seeking violent overthrow of the Government, nevertheless employ violence in defiance of law, such as the Ku Klux Klan has in the past.

Finally, the committee has oversight responsibility relative to the administration of any law pertaining to the above areas of authority. Thus the committee will assist the Congress in the exercise of three well-established congressional functions: legislative, investigative, and oversight.

The question whether the investigative power should be institutionalized in a standing committee is a legitimate one. But I can carry on no meaningful dialogue with those who contend a committee of Congress should have no power to investigate and disclose the facts about such activities. In order for the Congress to legislate with intelligence and reason, it must have access to facts. The power to investigate is an indispensable predicate for the development of such facts.

Congress has not only the right, but also the duty, to keep itself informed of subversive activities so that its members may be able to legislate wisely, effectively, and promptly.

Against that background, on February 20,

1969, the then newly constituted Committee on Internal Security held its first meeting and adopted a resolution approving the study and investigation in depth of revolutionary violence within this Nation.

In a statement to the committee, I said at that time:

"It is becoming increasingly evident that one of the gravest threats to our internal security and to the free functioning of our democratic institutions is posed by the activities of certain organizations which would effect changes in our Government or its administration by other than constitutional processes. Recent investigations of this committee, the statements of responsible officials, Federal and State, and daily press reports, appear to me to sustain this conclusion."

The same statement is just as valid at the outset of 1970 as it was in the winter of 1969.

For the past year the Nation has been witness to continuing violence in the streets, on campuses, and in classrooms and corridors of secondary schools. We have read the searing headlines of mass murders for "kicks" by drug-using "hippie" cultists. Bombings, arson, shootouts with police in our major cities, coupled with massive demonstrations—peaceful and otherwise—against the policies and authority of government have been publicized throughout the world. In truth, the television screens, newspapers, and radio stations of America have presented the people of this country with what amounts to a psychedelic kaleidoscope of uncontrolled, undisciplined, and irresponsible behavior by militant elements of our youth and frustrated minority groups.

In my statement of February 1969, I called the committee's attention to the fact that any such study "will obviously require the most painstaking and thorough inquiry and understanding of the extent, character, and objectives, the organizational forms, financing, and other facts, with respect to those organizations and individuals engaged in revolutionary violence, sedition, and breach of peace and law, as are proper subjects of investigation as mandated by the House. Obviously, we cannot legislate in a vacuum."

On March 6, 1969, the first specific full scale investigation as part of an in-depth study of revolutionary violence was authorized and subsequently I declared that the policy of the House Committee on Internal Security would be to exercise meticulous care to avoid any interference with academic or other freedoms in the course of our investigation.

I stated in a release to the press:

"Our concern is with the nature and extent of what may be organized, unlawful subversion. It is not our purpose or intent to restrict any of our established freedoms in any way. Neither is it our desire to punish. Trials and punishment are for the courts. And, at the same time, it is not our intent to enforce existing laws. These are responsibilities of the executive branch of Government. We merely want to find out the facts.

"Our goal in this effort will be to investigate, report, and recommend. And we are supremely confident the people of this country will support this effort to ascertain the facts to the end that the legislative process may be facilitated and the interests of democratic government enhanced."

On the basis of preliminary staff studies, the committee then resolved that the first comprehensive investigation should be devoted to the origin, character, objectives, activities, and other facts relating to the Students for a Democratic Society, with particular reference to:

"(1) the extent to which it may be involved in acts of violence or other unlawful activities to accomplish any of its purposes or objectives; (2) the extent to which, and

the manner in which, it may incite or employ acts of force, violence, terrorism, or any unlawful means to obstruct or oppose the Government of the United States in the execution of any law or policy affecting the internal security of the United States; (3) the extent to which, and the manner and means by which, it or any of its chapters or affiliated groups may be controlled, directed, or assisted by organizations or individuals who seek to overthrow or assist in the overthrow or alteration of the form of Government of the United States or of any State thereof by unlawful means, or by any such means to obstruct or oppose the Government of the United States in the execution of any law or policy affecting the internal security of the United States; (4) the manner in which it is financed and supported; (5) the extent to which it may act in concert with, aid or assist, or be supported by, foreign Communist powers, their agents or nationals; and (6) all other facts in relation to the foregoing."

This investigation progressed and on May 14, 1969, the committee authorized hearings to be held. The results of investigative hearings conducted between early June and mid-December dealing with SDS in its wide range of activities are summarized in the following report.

While most of our investigations and hearings were focused on the Students for a Democratic Society—up to and including their recent splintering into greatly weakened factions—the committee staff has paid careful attention to the development and activity of other organizations which may threaten America's internal tranquility and security.

For example, on October 8, 1969, the committee ordered an investigation into the activities of the Black Panther Party and the Progressive Labor Party with guidelines similar to those for the investigation of SDS carefully enumerated.

Hearings on the Black Panther Party commenced on March 3, 1970.

Of particular concern to the committee is the increasing evidence that the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam—popularly referred to as New Mobe—is being manipulated by prominent "old left" Communists. The New Mobe leadership quite candidly pride themselves on having captured—in the name of peace-seeking—an impressive number of this Nation's idealistic and sincerely motivated young people to be used in the near future for the advocacy of other causes which are part and parcel of the Communist plans for debilitating our great Nation.

On November 4, 1969, I placed in the *Congressional Record* a study compiled by the research staff of the committee on the so-called Fall Offensive of the New Mobe, and on December 10 the committee ordered an investigation of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

At that time, we pointed out that the findings of the committee staff "raised serious questions about the true nature and objectives of the New Mobe. The investigation which the committee has ordered will separate the grain from the chaff."

The staff study disclosed a significant Communist presence within the leadership of the New Mobe, including members and partisans of the Communist Party, U.S.A., the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance. The committee investigation of New Mobe is in progress, and initial hearings are scheduled for April 1970.

On the legislative front, the committee reported out a bill which will strengthen the security of our Nation's defense facilities. This major piece of legislation, H.R. 14864, evolved from H.R. 12699, introduced on July 9, 1969. During hearings numerous witnesses presented their views. More than 50 amendments were proposed and considered. Not less

than 30 were adopted and incorporated into the clean bill, H.R. 14864, which will provide an explicit legislative base for the maintenance of three basic and necessary national security programs for the purpose of safeguarding, first, selected industrial facilities essential to the defense of the United States against espionage, sabotage, and acts of subversion; second, classified information released to contractors; and, third, vessels and waterfront facilities. By a vote of 274 to 65 the bill was passed by the House on January 29, 1970; it has been referred to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. I am hopeful that this significant and vital legislative proposal will be enacted into law in 1970. Details concerning the measure will be found in the first chapter of this Annual Report.

A subcommittee of HGIS conducted hearings on H.R. 959, "Obstruction of Armed Forces." This bill, still pending with the subcommittee, was drafted to prohibit and prescribe penalties for certain misconduct intended to prejudice the interests of our Armed Forces during periods of armed conflict abroad.

The report concludes with a review of the status of recent contempt citations.

As we move into 1970 and a new decade, I sense an air of confidence in America's responsible citizenry. Citizens and governmental officials in the last few months have become more concerned about the dangers of revolutionary violence and, in many respects, they are developing more effective ways and means of curbing the threat. Although the level of violence and dedication to subversion is still high and may yet reach greater proportions, we must resolve to contend with such by means of even and studied determinations, rather than by convulsive, ill-considered reaction. As we devise measures to secure the blessings of liberty for all our people, we must at the same time build for future generations a heritage of reason and justice. The work of this committee will be guided by these considerations.

RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Chairman.

MARCH 26, 1970.

THE POSTMEN RING OUT

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the recent postal strike has brought home vividly to the American people the plight of the underpaid postal worker. I have recently had called to my attention a statement by postal employees of Macomb County, Mich., expressing their support of the carriers' strike. I include this statement, as carried in the *Macomb Daily*, at this point in the *RECORD*:

THE POSTMEN RING OUT

Twenty-three years of postal service and never did I dream that the only way to be recognized and compensated for our service would be for postal employees to walk out against our government. It truly is a sad day for us as employees and citizens to have such a dark day being weighted against us.

Believe me, it hurts, but since New York letter carriers moved, it was inevitable that postal employees all over the nation would follow.

Wages are being mentioned foremost, but there are many inequities that should be settled now that we are on the move. A labor management contract that is meaningful is also of prime importance. Fringe benefits have to be improved. Postal employees

pay seven per cent of their salary for their retirement plan.

We pay more than 70 per cent towards the government-sponsored hospitalization plan that we have. The government also sponsors life insurance and we pay a part of that, too. The starting salary of postal employes is \$6,176 with a top of \$8,442 after 21 years of service.

There are annual increases of \$206 for the first seven years and then there is a three-year wait before the next five steps and the increase is still only \$206 each step.

This is no longer an issue of clerks and letter carriers. Here in Mount Clemens it is the postal employes of the Mount Clemens post office who are withholding their services in sympathy with the New York letter carriers.

You cannot call this a movement of "hot heads" or of "militant youth" when you have employes with 20 and 30 years of service asking to be treated as human beings and citizens.

We are entitled to all the equal rights of the Constitution. Cooler heads are prevailing. We have had employes for years who have wanted this to happen. We are not proud of this sad state of affairs.

We feel that the blame has to be put directly to the Congress and administration both past and present.

The many promises of better legislation, the inequities in the meager pay bills that were passed and the threat of veto by the President if a particularly good bill was voted out of Congress has given rise to our feelings.

Postal employes have only been able to "exist" in this economy of today. We can no longer just "exist."

We ask the public (our patrons) that they try to understand our needs and perhaps join with us by writing to our senators, representatives and the President in our support.

MOUNT CLEMENS POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

MILTON HOLMES—A REAL CONSTRUCTIVE LEADER

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker—

Somehow you never forget what poverty and hatred can do when you see its scars on the face of a young child.

So spoke President Lyndon B. Johnson in the course of one of the most deeply felt, and deeply moving addresses ever delivered by an American President. The date of March 15, 1965, on the occasion of a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Thanks to the inspired leadership of President Johnson and his predecessor President John F. Kennedy and the efforts of the Congress, our Nation addressed itself to often vexing problems in attempting to resolve conflicting race relations, in coping with unfair discrimination, and in removing one of the causes for needless violence. Yes, we have come a long way, but we must go further in creating a favorable climate for both the black and white citizen.

However, to achieve the desirable goals we seek, we must necessarily have the cooperation of the people and I am indeed happy to be able to report that in

Baltimore City, we do receive such cooperation. That we were successful is due mainly to the creative leadership of Mr. Milton Holmes, project director of the Target City youth program in Baltimore, Md.

Few things have given me more pleasure than to be able to obtain approval of the funding for one of the Target City youth programs proposed by Mr. Holmes. As chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, I obtained committee approval and urged favorable action by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for such a worthwhile endeavor to train people for employment in the printing industry and I am pleased that \$924,000 was provided for this project.

To train and help our youth is one of the most meaningful and necessary endeavors in today's world. We are indeed fortunate in having such enlightened leaders as Mr. Milton Holmes to work with the underprivileged. May others take inspiration from his life and work.

The Baltimore Afro-American recently called attention to his accomplishments and I include that brief article at this point in the RECORD. Much has been said about the deficiencies in our poverty programs but too little is said about dedicated men like Milton Holmes who make these programs work. I know that my colleagues in the Congress join with me in commending him for his achievements.

The article follows:

TARGET CITY LEADER

Milton Holmes is project director of Target City Youth Program, a Community Action Agency project designed to provide constructive and productive past-times for youth in the area.

In addition to his paid assignment, Mr. Holmes is a moving force in the Maryland Society of Social Welfare, in the Maryland Society of Training Directors, Baltimore City Apprenticeship Information Advisory Committee, and the Board of Directors, Baltimore Urban Coalition.

As conceiver and founder of the Target City Youth Program, Mr. Holmes has placed more than 300 former unemployed black males in jobs with added dignity.

In addition, 48 women, (mostly welfare recipients) were trained and placed in clerical and secretarial related positions.

A former resident of Turner Station and a graduate of Dunbar High School, Mr. Holmes attended the Howard University School of Engineering and the Hampton Institute as a cadet in the U.S. Air Force. He is presently enrolled in the George Washington University Graduate School of Business and Public Administration.

He and his wife, the former Miss Louise Tyler, have five daughters.

OPENING DOORS TO OPPORTUNITY

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

MR. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Leon H. Sullivan is the successor to Martin Luther King. No black in America has had the impact of Reverend Sullivan. He has the same constructive approach and is proving it today in Philadelphia and all over the country where

his influence is being felt. The Reverend Leon Sullivan is scoring victory after victory in campaigns to bring the underprivileged more profitably into the profit system. He is truly opening the doors to opportunity for blacks. I append herewith an article which appears in the April issue of Nation's Business on Reverend Sullivan, "Opening Doors to Opportunity," and hope, Mr. Speaker, that all of my colleagues will read it.

It was the privilege of myself, Senator RICHARD SCHWEIKER, and Senator J. CALIB BOGGS of the other body to testify in behalf of Reverend Sullivan's bill for the funding of Opportunities Industrialization Center, Inc., which was created in 1964 to provide job training to disadvantaged black people in Philadelphia. My own community of Champaign-Urbana, Ill., has had an opportunities center for over 2 years. The community raised over \$100,000 last year and is in the process of raising another \$100,000 to implement the program conceived by Reverend Sullivan. It worked in Philadelphia; it is working in Champaign and over 90 communities throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that this bill will pass the House and Senate and be signed into law before we adjourn this year.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Sullivan is nationally recognized among all groups as the outstanding black in America today, who is trying to bring home to his people the motto: "Build, brother, build." He is recognized nationally, and Nation's Business of April 1970 has an excellent article on his distinguished record and his many accomplishments. Nothing is more needed to show how we can help the underprivileged in our country.

The article referred to follows:

OPENING DOORS TO OPPORTUNITY

"For my people," says the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, "I want ham and eggs on earth instead of milk and honey in heaven."

He has been working wonders in moving his people toward that goal. And more's to come.

Dr. Sullivan, a Negro, is the founder of Opportunities Industrialization Center, Inc., created in 1964 to provide job training to disadvantaged Philadelphia black people and to give them a crack at a variety of industrial jobs which had long been beyond their reach.

There are now some 90 OIC centers throughout the country, from Montgomery, Ala., to Seattle, Wash., and San Jose, Calif., to Roanoke, Va.

Last year alone, 20,000 men and women, generally untrained and unschooled, and mostly black, went through OIC training. They now hold jobs in a wide range of skills. Many would still be in menial jobs—or on welfare—except for this opportunity to better themselves.

It is estimated that these people, and others who have gone through OIC before them, have added \$40 million in new income to the national economy and, just as importantly, have reduced by \$10 million the annual cost of welfare and other assistance to cities, states and the federal government.

Most men would be satisfied with such an accomplishment. Not Leon Sullivan, a product of extreme West Virginia poverty who thrives on setbacks and challenge. He told NATION'S BUSINESS:

"We now have about 35,000 people in OIC training around the country. My aim is 100,000 in a year and by 1980 I hope we will have trained two million in all."

Not so many years ago, if you mentioned Dr. Sullivan to a Philadelphia businessman, you were apt to be told you were talking about the city's No. 1 radical, out to destroy the free enterprise system.

Mention him today and you'll find he's been embraced by the Philadelphia business community for his contributions in the field of Negro employment.

ROAR OF THE "LION OF ZION"

Dr. Sullivan's activities during the early Sixties were hardly of a kind to endear him to businessmen. The "Lion of Zion," as the hulking, six-foot-five-inch pastor of Zion Baptist Church sometimes is called, decided to take on those he felt were denying decent jobs to Negroes.

At his request more than 400 Negro pastors called on their parishioners to stop buying from 29 Philadelphia firms accused of hiring bias.

Job opportunities opened.

Dr. Sullivan had made a name for himself but he soon realized he had won only a partial victory. Thousands of jobs were waiting to be filled in Philadelphia, but few of the city's 100,000 jobless—mostly Negroes—were equipped to fill them.

It was here that the OIC concept was born. Leon Sullivan was determined to train the people so they could take the jobs. A Philadelphia philanthropist donated a six-story building.

The city let Dr. Sullivan take over an abandoned, rat-infested jail. He prowled Philadelphia scrounging unused, unwanted equipment—tools, electronics gear, a computer, a whole chemistry lab.

Businessmen began to grasp the idea that this radical man of the cloth was not out to destroy the free enterprise system but to help his people enjoy some of its fruits. Dr. Sullivan said at the time:

"The benefits of the free enterprise system weren't filtering to my people. We were getting crumbs. I decided we should get some of the bread instead."

Almost from the outset OIC was a success. Contrary to what was said, there were men and women on welfare who wanted steady jobs instead of the dole. They came by the hundreds to sign up.

In the beginning, skeptical employers agreed to gamble on OIC trainees. After a while these same employers actually began asking for OIC workers. The word got around Philadelphia that it was good business to do business with Leon Sullivan.

The pressure that Dr. Sullivan was applying was black power all right, but not the type you generally imagine. He has pointed out many times:

"I say that black power without green power and brainpower is no power."

FINDING THEIR WAY

The kind of people who came to Dr. Sullivan's training center might have discouraged a lesser man. Some could not find their way on a bus or read or write. He taught them reading and writing but called it communication and computation so they would not be ashamed. Men who had been lifting garbage cans found they could adapt to a lathe machine. Women domestics became skilled keypunch operators.

Racial tensions ebbed and flowed in the City of Brotherly Love, but Leon Sullivan kept urging: "Build, brother, build; not burn, baby, burn." More and more of his people trained and more and more of them got jobs. In Philadelphia alone almost 10,000 have been trained and placed in useful, rewarding employment.

Dr. Sullivan is not content to take on one project and rest on his laurels. Rest is not in his lexicon and the 47-year-old pastor is constantly on the search for new ways to uplift his race.

At about the time the OIC program was catching hold, Dr. Sullivan decided to take

another bold step, this one into the world of business investment. To his 5,000 parishioners one Sunday he announced the start of the 10-36 Plan. He asked for 50 members of the congregation each to put up \$10 a month for 36 months—about the price of a good television set—to launch an investment cooperative program.

"At that time there was not a single apartment building of any size, worthy of the name, which was owned by black people in all Philadelphia," he recalls.

There also was not a single shopping center, factory or bank developed or owned by Negroes.

Instead of 50 volunteers Dr. Sullivan got 200. That was in 1962. By 1965 there were 400 participants. Today, there are 6,000, including outside contributors.

In 1964, the 10-36 Plan bought a \$75,000 apartment building. A year later ground was broken for a million-dollar garden apartment complex, the first of its kind and size developed and owned by black people in Philadelphia's history. There soon were 400 people on the waiting list to move in.

In 1967, work began on a \$2 million shopping center called Progress Plaza. It now has 10 stores owned by black entrepreneurs. Because the project was a gamble, and to give it stability, six large establishments were invited to "anchor" the \$1.3 million mortgage.

Two banks, a Bell Telephone office, a Marriott restaurant, a Florsheim shoe store and an A&P supermarket are doing business in Progress Plaza today.

All are managed by Negroes.

"When the A&P food store chain signed a million-dollar 20-year lease it was the largest agreement ever made with a black group in the history of America," according to Dr. Sullivan.

MORE PROGRESS AT THE PLAZA

Things were really happening. The Ford Foundation gave the Zion Nonprofit Charitable Trust (as the 10-36 Plan was legally named) a \$400,000 grant to build an Entrepreneurial Training Center at Progress Plaza. Operating day and night, the school has turned out hundreds of black managers and entrepreneurs for Philadelphia.

Later, another Ford grant helped set up a National Economic Developmental Center which trains Afro-American economic developers for other cities around the country.

One spring day in 1968 Dr. Sullivan put in a phone call to Mark Morton, vice president and general manager of General Electric's huge Missile and Space Division at Valley Forge, Pa. He casually invited him to breakfast. The two men had come to know each other when the Negro pastor was scrounging around for equipment for his OIC operation.

Over coffee and toast Dr. Sullivan asked Mr. Morton: "What do you need to start an aerospace company?" The GE executive already was aware of his host's go-for-broke approach but this one took him slightly aback. He said he would have an answer in a week.

At their next meeting Dr. Sullivan hung on every word as Mr. Morton spelled out the complexities of launching an aerospace firm from scratch. Finally, he asked, "But where do I get a guy to run it? And what must he know? Just give me the qualifications and I'll find the man."

Mr. Morton put his staff to work to draw up the qualifications that an aerospace company manager should possess. Among the staffers was Benjamin W. Sallard, 39, a highly-talented production manager with a promising career at GE. Mr. Sallard is a Negro.

Shortly after receiving the GE staff study, Dr. Sullivan invited Mr. Sallard to his home.

The latter assumed the visit was necessary to clear up some points in the report. Dr. Sullivan peppered him with questions. Mr. Sallard was completely unaware that he actually was being interviewed to head up the nation's first black-managed aerospace company.

Not long afterward another of Leon Sullivan's dreams began to take shape and Progress Aerospace Enterprises, Inc., a maker of parts and components in the aerospace field, was established. True, it had no money, no plant, no equipment, and only one employee—Ben Sallard.

But Dr. Sullivan had been busy behind the scenes and soon this was corrected—with a \$2,575,000 contract from General Electric. GE's involvement was visible all over the place. As Mr. Morton was to say later:

"PAE must succeed; it's already taken a half-dozen of our best people, and the ones Rev. Sullivan couldn't hire are working for PAE as consultants."

Soon there were other contracts, from Boeing, Philco-Ford, Westinghouse and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Another Sullivan enterprise had been successfully lifted off the launching pad.

CLOTHES-MAKING, TOO

At about the time Dr. Sullivan was scurrying around to get PAE organized and productive he was engineering the birth of still another project, Progress Garment Manufacturing Enterprises.

Working closely with the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union and the Villager Corp., one of America's largest makers of women's garments, and with the help of the Singer Corp., he was able to announce in August, 1968, the opening of Philadelphia's first Negro-owned-and-operated garment factory. By the end of the year it was producing clothing, appropriately labeled "Ten Thirty-Six Fashions."

One of Progress Garment's major purchasers today is Sears, Roebuck & Co. Of this arrangement Dr. Sullivan says:

"Mr. [Arthur] Wood, the president of Sears has become one of my strongest supporters. He has taken a personal interest in what we are trying to accomplish and he has become a close friend."

Though perseverance and prayer have had a lot to do with Dr. Sullivan's success, many of his ideas would have died aborning without funds. There have been grants from foundations and outright gifts of cash but, in the end, the federal government has put up the big money.

OIC's budget across the country amounted to \$23 million in 1969 with a substantial portion of this coming from the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare.

To achieve Dr. Sullivan's goal of 100,000 trainees a year in OIC centers will, he says, require an outlay in the neighborhood of \$300 million. Dr. Sullivan is confident OIC, which is now being run by a professional staff but which still gets plenty of its founder's time, will receive the money. Ultimately, he thinks, OIC will become the major component of technical training in this country.

From the taxpayer's standpoint the government's contribution to OIC manpower training is a sound investment. Dr. Sullivan can show that OIC will train a worker for \$1,300 on an average, or about one-third what the federal government normally pays in this area.

GOING NATIONAL

As more and more centers began operations Dr. Sullivan realized he no longer could deal with the business community on a city by city basis. He would have to involve industry on a national scale.

The basic goals had not changed, however. People needed jobs, and industry and busi-

ness needed workers. It was a question of putting the two ingredients together, but on a much grander scale.

"I decided, then, to organize a national advisory council composed of the top industrial leaders of America," Dr. Sullivan remembers. "And I set my sights at the very top."

He did not have to go far. The Scott Paper Co. is headquartered in nearby Chester, Pa., and there he put his proposition to Thomas McCabe, then chairman of the board.

"If anyone could reach the top executive industrial leadership it was Mr. McCabe," Dr. Sullivan wrote in his autobiography, "Build, Brother, Build."

Mr. McCabe agreed to help and soon was on the telephone calling his friends, some of the biggest names in American industry. The late Gerald Phillippe, board chairman of General Electric, would serve as chairman of OIC's National Industrial Advisory Council. Joining him were William M. Allen, president of Boeing; Joseph A. Dallas, vice president of Du Pont; John T. Dorrance, chairman of the board of the Campbell Soup Co., and many others.

In February, 1968, the council gathered in Philadelphia for its initial meeting. One newspaper called it "the most formidable and influential group of business leaders assembled in the recent history of Philadelphia, at one place at one time."

George Champion, former board chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank and a strong supporter of OIC, said: "This is the most extraordinary and exciting program I have ever seen. The business community of America must help it to succeed."

And J. Paul Austin, president of Coca-Cola, exclaimed, "It ought to be duplicated across America."

AFIRE WITH SELF-RESPECT

President Lyndon Johnson toured the Philadelphia OIC facilities in June, 1967, and talked with many trainees. As he was leaving he said:

"What I have seen is not just a training program. I have seen men and women whose self-respect is beginning to burn inside them like a flame."

OIC, conceived as a means of helping Philadelphia's disadvantaged blacks, draws neither a geographical nor a color line today. Some 80 per cent of the trainees in San Jose, Calif., are Mexican-Americans. Sixty per cent of those in Roanoke, Va., are white.

Many Indians attend OIC training in Oklahoma City. A new center is planned in Kentucky's hill country for poor whites.

New jobs and new outlooks replace despair for most men and women who move through OIC training. One man's experience, although not typical, tells the story.

"He came into my basement office in the church one day," Dr. Sullivan recalls. "He was not long out of jail—15 years for grand larceny. He had tried to get a job but his prison record was against him. All he wanted from me was a handout."

"I gave him a dollar and said, 'This won't last you long. What you need is a job.' I encouraged him to try OIC."

"One of the biggest industries in Philadelphia took a chance on him after he completed his training as a machinist. That was more than three years ago. Today, he is a foreman and a respected man in the community."

Many other Americans have gained respect through Dr. Sullivan's efforts coupled with their own. And Dr. Sullivan hopes the story will be repeated among non-Americans, too.

He is trying to get similar job training programs for the unskilled started abroad, and already the governments of Kenya, Ethiopia, Algeria and the Dominican Republic have asked him to help them do so.

NEW JOBLESS: THE HIGHLY PAID OUT ON THE STREETS

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems now besetting hundreds of thousands of Americans is the effect that defense and aerospace reductions are having on their jobs. My congressional district in southern California, is composed of thousands of these dedicated Americans. An article published in the March 19 issue of the Los Angeles Times contains an excellent summary of the effect that these cutbacks have had on one engineer. I believe that his story is typical of many of these people who now find themselves unemployed as a result of these cutbacks.

Their story is important and I believe that this article should be read by all of my colleagues here in the House:

NEW JOBLESS: THE HIGHLY PAID OUT ON STREETS

(By Robert A. Rosenblatt)

What happens when your income drops from \$327 a week to \$65?

"We eat hamburgers and chili beans," says A.G., a 57-year-old engineer with a master's degree who hasn't worked since October.

"My wife and I changed functions. She goes to work every day. I stay home and take care of the house and the children."

For A.G. and thousands of others, the aerospace industry cutback is a full-scale depression. Hired two years ago, he was laid off by McDonnell Douglas Corp., a St. Louis-based firm that dismissed 15,000 Southern California workers in 1969.

During 13 years in the industry, A.G. worked at four companies on a variety of missile and space program jobs. He was transferred to Houston once during an economy move but never was laid off.

Now he's out on the street and desperately looking for work.

NEW ECONOMIC PHENOMENON

A. G. is part of a new phenomenon in the post-World War II economy—the suddenly growing ranks of the highly educated, highly paid who have lost their jobs.

Layoffs traditionally hit the man carrying a lunch pail, not the man with a briefcase.

However, American industry's growing sophistication produced a highly educated, professional work force. Modern companies have an ever growing number of white collar jobs. When layoffs come, they hit large numbers of these employees.

A. G.'s income is \$65 a week in unemployment insurance benefits, and he is nearing the end of the eligibility period.

Letters and resumes to more than 100 companies as far away as South Africa, and 8,000 miles of car trips around California, haven't produced a job.

A CHANGED HIRING SCENE

The boom and bust aerospace industry is deep in a down part of the business cycle with little relief in sight. In previous slack times, layoffs at one company were balanced by hiring somewhere else.

"People could move from one job to another and keep their homes and families in the same area," recalls Frank Smith, director of industrial relations at Northrop Corp., Beverly Hills, which has sliced 1,600 workers from its West Coast payrolls this year.

A slimmed down defense budget, curtail-

ment of the space program, and a slackening of orders for civilian aircraft hit the industry all at once.

Commercial aircraft development, and subcontracting jobs for military contracts are expected to put some people back to work in Southern California. But industry sources agree that these improvements won't offset recent cutbacks, at least in the near future.

Even for workers who are willing to leave the state for another aerospace job, the picture is gloomy. Boeing Co., Seattle, has laid off 12,000 in the Puget Sound area, plus 3,000 elsewhere. Since Jan. 1, Grumman Corp., Bethpage, N.Y., has been planning to trim its 32,500-man work force to 27,500 by the end of the year. About 8,000 employees at the Ft. Worth, Tex., and Pomona plants of General Dynamics Corp. lost their jobs in a cutback that started in mid-1969.

The British government reports a huge upsurge in applications from aerospace engineers who emigrated to the United States during the "brain drain" of the past decade.

"Sure, I'll pick up and move in a minute if somebody offered me a decent job," says a \$20,000-a-year administrator laid off by North American Rockwell Corp., El Segundo, in February. The company dismissed 17,000 workers last year, and another 5,000 will be jobless by April 1. About 30% of the jobless are engineers, and 10% are managers.

LEAVING INDUSTRY

The former administrator says, "I would be willing to take a pay cut to \$16,000 or \$18,000 a year, but nobody is offering any work."

He's ready to leave the industry. "I was going to lease some land and run a boarding stable for horses, but the property didn't become available." He also applied unsuccessfully for jobs managing a resort and working on industrial development for a Chamber of Commerce.

One engineer is running a gas station, another writes for a financial magazine, and several have taken civilian jobs in South Vietnam.

Three of every five aerospace people applying to one Los Angeles-based employment agency are asking for jobs outside the industry.

"Hundreds of them want to be salesmen in the engineering field or handling technical products," said one job counselor. "They feel it's a chance to get big money and have more job security."

But, he warns, "These jobs aren't so easy to get. A man has to have the right background and personality to be a good salesman."

Many unemployed professionals are job hunting in government agencies at the state and city levels. Others are signing up for federal civil service examinations.

"My main interests now are job security and a decent wage even if it's not as much as I was getting before," says a former contract planner at North American Rockwell.

He has applied for management jobs at the Post Office, the Internal Revenue Service and the Los Angeles County Engineering Department.

Aerospace firms are holding job fairs, where representatives of businesses ranging from computer manufacturing to grocery retailing can pick up packages of resumes and get a line on the skills now available.

Hiring has been spotty, with no trends apparent on how aerospace professionals will be absorbed into the economy.

In aerospace itself, some hiring is going on, to take care of normal attrition but the new jobs are mostly restricted to specialties such as structural engineers.

TIES TO SOUTHLAND

An exodus from the southern California area has not yet begun. Most of the unemployed are going through their savings

and cutting expenditures for everything but necessities while they search for work.

"It's very difficult to relocate people," says an employment agency executive. "Their kids are in school, they have 5% loans on their homes, and they like living in California. People don't want to pick up and move. They don't want to face an 8.5% or 9% loan for a home somewhere else. Many of them say the cities in the East are too crowded and uncomfortable."

Some aerospace workers are getting jobs in the computer and computer peripheral equipment industries, reports Leo May, technical manager at VIP Agency, Inc., Los Angeles.

"People who can qualify, such as circuit designers, can make the transition," he said.

Jobs are also available at firms making electronic components—semiconductors and integrated circuits—but the positions usually require moving from Southern California, May said.

Applications at VIP, which specializes in professional and technical people, are up 50% in four months.

"There's a tremendous pool of skills available," says May. "People being laid off now are very good men. But it's really tough to move them into jobs outside the aerospace industry."

"It's easy to convince an out-of-work engineer to go to a nonaerospace company. But often, it's hard to convince the commercial company to take him. Aerospace pays a high dollar."

MANY OVERTRAINING

Marge Selman, an employment agency president, says, "Normally we have any number of positions open with salaries between \$17,000 and \$25,000. Today we have all the qualified candidates and not many positions."

High salaries and narrow job skills make many aerospace personnel virtually unsuitable for other technical jobs.

"We got 400 responses to a simple, blind ad for a junior industrial engineer," says an executive with a large Southern California company outside the aerospace field. "It was a case of generals applying to do a private's work. They were overtrained and overpaid for the job we have in mind." He hasn't hired anyone yet.

A. G. is caught in this dilemma. He has worked on ultra-sophisticated missiles and moon shot equipment, wrestling with the problem of shielding the communications system from electromagnetic interference (radio waves, atmospheric problems or signals from another part of the system).

"I worked damned hard to build up my knowledge and to give my family a good standard of living," he says bitterly. "Now nobody wants me. All I ever get is moral encouragement. Employers say they are impressed with my credentials, but they won't give me a job."

"I'm tired and nervous, and I just don't know where to turn."

HARD ROW TO HOE

A. G. is barely coping with economic slump. His wife formerly worked part-time when the family wanted something special like an expensive vacation. Since A. G. lost his job, she works full time as a clerk and typist, contributing her full salary to help pay for food and meet monthly mortgage expenses.

Their savings are gone and A. G. says, "I just don't know what I'll do when the unemployment checks stop coming. We barely pay all the basic bills now."

"I'll go anywhere to get a job. You can't imagine how bad it is until something like this happens to you. You lose all your dignity and pride as an intelligent person."

The vice president of a small consumer-

oriented electronics firm says he's sorry to see so many jobless engineers, but insists they can't help his company.

"We aren't shooting off any spaceships here. These guys worked on magnificent projects. We need nuts and bolts people. People from aerospace won't fit in here."

Kaye Kiddo, corporate manpower administrator at Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, is very worried about the industry's attraction for young people.

"Each time we go through one of these convulsions, the image of the industry as a good place to work tarnishes a little. Enrollment in the engineering schools goes down, and the brighter kids go into other professions."

NIXON AND THE POOR

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, Richard Nixon is increasingly being seen as a President whose actions speak louder, and more convincingly, than the words of his critics. In a perceptive column entitled "Nixon and the Poor," Roscoe Drummond explains how the President "is saying less and doing more to remove the blight of poverty in the United States than his predecessors."

The column enunciates six areas, encompassing family assistance, education, housing, and spending on social programs where the President's leadership is promising relief and hope to poverty-stricken citizens in the United States. I commend this column to the attention of my colleagues:

NIXON AND THE POOR

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Don't try to pin a cliché label on Richard Nixon. It won't stick.

He displeases the extreme right. He infuriates the extreme left. And he makes it impossible for either conservatives or liberals to decide whether he is really their man.

He isn't. He is a mixture of both and a captive of neither. His actions are a mixture of both, and on balance they defy all the old-style political labels.

It isn't deliberate. It's the way Richard Nixon as a person thinks and acts. He simply doesn't measure his policies or his actions with the yardstick of liberal or conservative, political right or political left.

Obviously there are numerous Nixon actions which please conservatives.

There is his priority goal of holding inflation, his determination to cut spending to keep a balanced budget after so many years of deficit spending, his plans to decentralize government, his tougher line on crime and violence.

But just when the politicians or the columnists think they have got the President neatly ticketed, he embarks on a series of measures which fit quite a different label—if any at all.

Central to so much the President is doing is the issue of poverty, the end of which he sees as the key to racial justice, better education, better housing.

This is why Mr. Nixon is not neglecting the poor.

This is why the first activist Republican President since Teddy Roosevelt is saying less and doing more to remove the blight of poverty in the United States than his predecessors.

Here are some of the things he is doing:

1. The Nixon-proposed family assistance program, which is a significant stride toward a guaranteed annual income, goes further to reduce poverty than anything undertaken in the most innovative years of the New Deal. It will be passed by Congress this year, and it will be the capstone of the Nixon record. Few realize that its early effect, together with food stamp assistance, will be to lift some 7,000,000 low-income people above the official poverty-level of \$3,400 yearly for a family of four.

This is an antipoverty measure with a sweep. It extends financial assistance to about 12,000,000 more than now covered. It requires recipients to take job-training programs and go to work where work is available. It provides an incentive to get off welfare by enabling recipients to earn more while graduated reductions in welfare payments take place.

2. Richard Nixon is asking Congress to guarantee that the children of poor parents get the means to have a college education. "No qualified student who wants to go to college," he says, "should be barred by lack of money. That has long been a great American goal. I propose that we achieve it now."

3. At the same time the President is pressing Congress to take further steps so that ownership of public housing can be more easily attained by low-income people. Rents are to be cut, and no down payments for federal housing administration loans are to be required.

4. Mr. Nixon is not waiting for the end of the fighting in Vietnam to cut military spending so that more money can be available for acute domestic needs. The defense part of the federal budget is lower today than at any time since 1951. More than 40 percent of the total '71 budget now goes to social programs and the human resources percentage of the budget is 21 percent higher than 1969.

5. The President's revenue-sharing plan is designed not alone to decentralize government but to help the states provide more adequate social services.

6. President Nixon isn't stopping here. At his direction the Office of Economic Opportunity will devote itself primarily to innovating and testing new programs to reduce poverty so that they can be proved out before applied on a larger scale.

There is no thundering rhetoric from the White House on a "war against poverty," but it is already evident that action is exceeding promises.

NIXON ON SCHOOLS

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, from all parts of the Nation and from all segments of the press have come words of praise for the President's recent statement on school desegregation.

Typical is one from the liberal Los Angeles Times which calls the President's program "the most constructive possible at this time."

Attached is the entire editorial from that paper, of March 23. I commend it to my colleagues:

PRESIDENT'S SCHOOL PLAN SOUND

Issue: What are the consequences, for Los Angeles and the country, of the President's school desegregation statement?

"The issues involved in desegregating schools, reducing racial isolation and providing equal educational opportunity are not simple," Mr. Nixon said in his statement on schools Tuesday.

"... Our continuing search, therefore, must be not for the perfect set of answers, but for the most nearly perfect and the most constructive."

We believe that the President has presented a program for action which is, on the whole, the most constructive possible at this time.

If the President's proposals are followed in full by his Administration, the courts, Congress and local school boards, the country will have put itself on a sound footing for making real progress toward both racial equality and better education.

Mr. Nixon's program is, to be sure, a compromise. But it represents the most in the way of movement toward school desegregation that most Americans will support now. With popular assent, significant and steady progress can be made; without the backing of public opinion, progress would be more doubtful.

It would be a mistake to suppose that this program, if carried out, would be a retreat on the matter of school desegregation.

On the contrary, it represents an advance in several respects:

Mr. Nixon has stated unequivocally that his Administration will move against all de jure segregation, North and South—segregation imposed or abetted by government power.

Racial balance in teacher assignments must be achieved in all school districts.

School administrators in all parts of the country must remove all vestiges of discrimination in educational quality—things, like class sizes, length of session, textbooks, buildings.

The President has asked Congress for \$500 million in the coming year and \$1 billion in the next to help school systems under court order to desegregate, to give special aid to inferior segregated schools, and to finance innovative techniques for bringing children together for interracial experiences.

School boards will be encouraged to devise effective desegregation policies.

Mr. Nixon again stated his opposition to massive busing to achieve desegregation and to imposition of strict formulas for achieving racial balance, although a school district could integrate by using if it desired. Where segregation is truly de facto—the result of residential housing patterns only—the President would not take governmental action to desegregate schools.

We in Los Angeles should not suppose, however, that because the President opposed massive busing and singled out Superior Judge Alfred Gitelson's decision here as "probably the most extreme judicial decree so far," we can return in forgetfulness to the old ways.

For the President, like the courts, said that a school board's good faith toward desegregation is an essential; and both President and courts have been unequivocal about eliminating de facto segregation. Judge Gitelson presented impressive evidence to show that in Los Angeles the school board was guilty of both bad faith and de facto segregation. If applied to Los Angeles, the President's proposals would probably bring about some significant changes, at least in district boundaries and teacher assignments.

The important word here, as throughout the President's program, is "if." Mr. Nixon left some aspects of his proposal vague. But if he carries out in full the intentions he expressed, the nation will have, The Times believes, a reasonable program of action toward both school desegregation and better education which all Americans can, and should, support.

OEO TRAINING PROGRAMS

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Washington Post describes an OEO-supported community action agency in Alabama that has adopted a novel approach to the problem of inadequate housing for the poor.

The organized community action program—OCAP—of Pike, Bullock, and Coffee Counties trains poverty-level men in the building trades. While in training, these men actually construct homes which are then sold to the poor. The buyers of the homes pay only for the materials used in the construction and are aided through special FHA loans.

Of course all vocational programs offer the advantage of job training and the possibility of moving up the ladder. This particular program has the added advantage of providing new homes for poor residents of the three-county area.

What is equally interesting to those of us concerned with the plight of the poor and their housing needs is that the local community action agency has been experimenting with prefabrication, a form of construction which could have a major impact on the housing crisis in general.

This case of the poor housing the poor is a fine example of how the projects of the Office of Economic Opportunity can teach the poor to help themselves and each other. It also shows how a little imagination can be used to double the effectiveness of our job training programs. For this reason, I would like to place in the RECORD the Post article which discusses this very worthwhile program:

OEO PROGRAMS PROVIDE HOUSING, BUILDING TRADES TRAINING
(By Bruce Galphin)

SMUTEYE, ALA.—Moving around in Pearl Cox's cabin is a bit like running an obstacle course. Bedding and belongings of Mrs. Cox and her husband, daughter and seven grandchildren fill the two-bedroom home.

Patches cover only some of the holes in the walls and floor. As a final sign of hostility, the sagging, unpainted wood dwelling has a low porch roof that cracks the head of an unwary visitor.

But what most bothers Mrs. Cox, an elderly, frail woman, is the fact that there are no closets. Clothes must be hung on nails in the wall.

All that is about to change. Any day now, the whole family will move down the road here in rural Bullock County a few miles north of Troy to a new three-bedroom house. "The closets alone be worth it," says Mrs. Cox.

DAUGHTER'S HOUSE

The prefabricated house actually will belong to Mrs. Cox's daughter, Mattie Lee Rodgers, whose job at a cotton mill is the family's principal source of income.

Given the size of the family she supports, Mrs. Rodgers is officially poor under the OEO poverty index. She could have no hope of buying a house under conventional financing methods.

But under an experimental project of the Pike-Bullock-Coffee County Organized Community Action Program, Mrs. Rodgers will

own her home. And thanks to a combination of programs for the poor, her notes will run only \$19 a month.

It is a case of the poor housing the poor. OCAP's Low Income Housing Program, the only one of its kind, operates under a \$100,000-a-year budget from OEO and local sources. It trains poverty-level men in building trades, pays them \$1.60 an hour while they learn, then sells the houses the trainees build to the poor.

LABOR DONATED

Buyers pay only for materials—an average of \$6,000 per house—and the minimal price of rural land. The labor, worth roughly \$4,000 on the local market, is donated.

FHA provides special 33-year loans, and mortgage payments are subsidized under a federal program that gears assistance to the recipient's income and family size.

Low Income Housing Director Floyd L. Andrews, a former teacher who can discuss construction with the familiarity of a contractor, does not claim that the LIH pilot project offers a universal solution to the housing shortage. Other approaches may be more practical in other communities, he said.

Another pilot program called "sweat equity," in which the recipients themselves build the houses, is receiving much attention in poor rural areas like Greene County, Ala. But "sweat equity," Andrews observed, requires several families to be free to work on each other's homes over an extended period.

And in a large city, neither it nor the trainee-built homes may offer a practical solution.

PREFABRICATED HOUSING

But the local OCAP program has been experimenting successfully with a form of construction that is expected in the next few years to have a major impact on the housing industry: prefabrication.

Low Income Housing trainees have built some frame and some cinder block houses, but all of the recent ones have been masonry-walled Kingsberry Homes hauled in by truck. Roof and exterior walls go up in a day, although the prefab houses require about as much interior finish work as a conventional house. Finishing includes wood paneled walls, a wall furnace, and modern kitchen and bath.

LIH gets higher marks for building houses than for training builders. Of 36 trainees surveyed after more than a year of operation, only about half were working in the building trades.

Eight could no longer be located, and eight others had taken different kinds of jobs. Two were physically unable to work, and one was in prison. The highest wage any reported was \$2.15 an hour.

But 28 houses have been built in the first year and a half of operation, and work soon will get under way on another 10. All are occupied or spoken for, and each represents a dramatic upgrading in housing standards for the new owners.

TAXPAYERS: A TRYING SIMPLICITY

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, we have all seen the TV program which asked "Gee, what can I complain about now to the IRS?" The tax returns have been simplified so that if you learned how to file one last year, you will not know this year. The New York Times carried an

article that outlines exactly how easy the present form is to use and understand. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1970]

TAX FORM: PROBLEMS START ON LINE 15b

It was bound to happen. The new tax return—designed to make the annual tax chore simpler—has, at least at the outset, caused some problems.

The problems appear to begin on line 15b of Form 1040—the form all taxpayers must use this year. (The card form familiar to low-income taxpayers has been eliminated.)

Many taxpayers who have already filed, have noted their deduction and exemption total on line 15b of the new form, which is a mistake.

The mistake is a natural one since this is the only one that seems to offer a place to set down this total on Form 1040. However, this total is not noted on Form 1040. It is listed on Schedule T, which may or may not become part of the tax return, depending on the taxpayer's circumstances.

In cases where the taxpayer need not file Schedule T, he nevertheless uses it to work out his total tax. In the process, he puts total deductions on the Schedule T work sheet on line 2 and his exemptions (times \$600) on line 4.

The figure he derives as his total tax on Schedule T will appear at line 18 and the total is then transferred to his Form 1040, also at line 18.

Line 15b of Form 1040 is used to show something entirely different. The figure shown there should include deductible sick pay, moving expenses, employe business expenses and payments to retirement plans by the self-employed.

The total for these items is subtracted in figuring adjusted gross income, which is the figure used to determine the limitation on deductible medical expense and the taxpayer's limit on charitable deductions.

As a result of the erroneous handling of deductions and exemptions on line 15b, errors in the computation of medical expenses and possible charitable contributions may have incurred.

If you have made this mistake, you may follow one of two possible avenues. You may pick up at the district tax office an amended form numbered 1040X, or you can wait for the Government to pick up the error and let Uncle Sam make the adjustment.

There are other areas that deserve particular attention before the April 15 deadline. Just a couple of weeks ago, for example, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy, Edward Cohen, noted that there were problems with the retirement income credit to which an estimated 2 million taxpayers are entitled.

The complexity of this feature of the tax law has always posed problems and Mr. Cohen estimates that perhaps a third of the people entitled to claim the credit had lost out because they found it too difficult to deal with.

The new tax kit contains a special Schedule R, which may help this year, although a wag notes that it is providential that those who claim the credit are retired and thus have the time to devote to the matter.

Here's a rundown on how to claim the credit prepared by the Research Institute of America.

First, on Schedule T, enter on line 6 the regular tax (without the surcharge) computed on the taxable income shown at line 5. Next, on Schedule R, enter the regular tax computed on Schedule T. Then fill out Schedule R to determine the tentative retirement credit as limited by the regular tax minus foreign tax credit or credit for tax free covenant bonds. The tentative credit is entered on Line 12.

TENTATIVE CREDIT

Then, back to Schedule T. Enter on line 7, the tentative credit worked out on Schedule R. This reduces the regular tax in order to arrive at the 10 per cent surcharge on line 9. Back to Schedule R.

Enter the surcharge on line 13 and compute the correct final retirement income credit limited by the full tax (regular plus surcharge).

Finally, back to Schedule T. Enter on line 11 the correct retirement income credit.

These steps may seem confusing and perhaps they are, but they will help the taxpayer get the highest possible retirement credit while the surcharge is in effect.

Taxpayers who reached 72 or were older last year please note: for you, earned income will not reduce the maximum sum subject to the credit.

If you have rental income, don't neglect it in the retirement income credit calculation. It is one of the specified types of retirement income eligible for the credit.

Even though income averaging offers an important way to save taxes, many taxpayers are reluctant to use it. They are worried about the possibility that the revenue agent will get involved in an examination of past returns in the so-called "base years."

This fear appears to be unfounded. Sidney Kess, partner of Maln Lafrentz & Co., regularly talks to certified public accountants and lawyers regarding taxes in connection with tax refresher courses he gives for the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and for the Practicing Law Institute.

Thousands of these men who annually file over half a million returns for clients report that agents almost never look at the earlier returns when a taxpayer averages.

Averaging works for the man who suddenly moves up in the world—the interne or resident who goes into private practice; the returning veteran; the actor who has starved then appears in a smash hit and becomes important.

If a man's wife goes back to work when the children are grown, the couple may become a candidate for averaging due to this quantum jump in income.

Roughly, a taxpayer who earns more by a third in a single year than he averaged over the previous four years may save taxes by averaging.

Since taxpayers who are even more successful in succeeding years are permitted to average again and again, they should check this consideration with each passing year.

IMPORTANT VARIATION

Here is an important variation on the averaging concept. If man and wife both have incomes and the two incomes are roughly equal until 1969 when one or the other strikes it rich, the averaging process should be figured on both a joint and separate return basis.

Another major plus for the self-employed: If a man lost money in 1968 in his business he would be able to carry the loss back several years.

Let's say his income shot way up in 1969. He should consider averaging because he might do very well indeed.

The effect of the loss spread back over several years could be to wipe out income in some or all of his base years.

Again, heavy medical expenses in the base years which are terminated by a death in the family may have led to a substantially higher taxable income in 1969. Averaging is again worth considering.

We live in a mobile society and the tax law recognizes the costs of moving as a deductible expense—under certain conditions.

Two tests must be satisfied. There is the distance test which holds that the new work location must be at least 20 miles farther

from the old home than the old work location is from the old home.

This seems confusing to be sure. But if you add up the mileages in your own circumstances it will become immediately clear whether you qualify.

For example, if the distance between your old residence and former job is seven miles, then location of your new job must be at least 27 miles from your old residence.

The other test concerns time. To deduct unreimbursed moving expenses—reimbursed moving expenses are of course non-deductible—you must be employed full time at the new job location or in the general vicinity for 39 weeks during the 12 months following the move.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TAKES GIANT STRIDES UNDER TOPPING

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, because of my personal association with the University of Southern California, and the fact that it is located in the heart of my district, I have followed with keen interest its activities and role in our community. The university's impressive accomplishments under the guidance of Dr. Norman Topping are effectively delineated in the accompanying article from the Los Angeles Times under the byline of William Trombley. I am proud to insert it in the RECORD for the attention and edification of my colleagues:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 5, 1970]
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TAKES GIANT STRIDES UNDER TOPPING
(By William Trombley)

Several weeks before the University of Southern California won its 12th Rose Bowl game last Jan. 1 the institution received an honor many of its officials prize much more—election to the prestigious Assn. of American Universities.

This association includes the nation's most powerful universities, public and private, and selection was regarded by USC administrators as recognition of success in the long, hard struggle to attain academic excellence.

No one had a better right to be pleased that Dr. Norman Topping, who in 12 years as USC president has built a financially threadbare and academically undistinguished institution into a first-rate university.

When Topping took over in September, 1958, USC "hadn't changed a great deal" from his medical student days of the 1930s, he recalled in a recent interview.

ENDOWMENT WAS SMALL

Some of the professional schools such as dentistry, medicine and pharmacy, were well-known and highly regarded, but at the heart of the university—its undergraduate and graduate education and research activity—little progress had been made.

The physical plant was inadequate, the endowment was small and fund-raising efforts had been generally unsuccessful. There was relatively little research activity in the sciences and in engineering. Large numbers of students attended the university only part-time and even many faculty members were part-timers.

Surveying this rather bleak academic scene, Dr. Topping appointed a commission of trustees, administrators and faculty mem-

bers to come up with a master plan for future developing. In May, 1961, they did so.

Graduate education and research were to be emphasized, especially in engineering and the sciences, where substantial federal funds were beginning to become available.

Faculty salaries would be increased, to attract and hold good people. There would be new graduate schools of business administration, public administration and international affairs and the existing graduate schools of education and engineering would be upgraded sharply.

Students were to be drawn from a wider geographical area (until the mid 1950s more than 70% came from Los Angeles); more would be full-time students, living on or near campus.

Nine years later, a short time in the life of a university, most of these goals have been reached.

"We are now at a point where we have only some tag ends of the master plan to gather up," Dr. Topping said.

These are some of the major accomplishments:

More than \$60 million worth of new buildings have been constructed, including the von KleinSmid Center for International and Public Affairs and the Frank R. Seaver Center for solid state sciences.

ONE "B" RATING

Faculty salaries have risen to the point where USC is rated "A" or better in all but one professorial rank by the American Assn. of University Professors. Only in the rank of full professor does USC draw a "B" rating from AAUP.

Graduate enrollment has been increased to about 55% of the university's overall enrollment of about 20,000.

Research support from the federal government has increased from \$2 million to \$28 million in 10 years.

Each year's freshman class is brighter than the last, as measured by test scores, and represents a wide range, economically, geographically and racially.

Most of this could not have been done without Topping's accomplishments as a fund raiser.

"Without Dr. Topping I think there's a very serious question whether this university could even have continued in existence," said Dorothy W. Nelson, dean of the law school.

USC has raised more than \$155 million since the master plan was announced in 1961. Endowment is still low in comparison with other large private universities but has quadrupled—to about \$35 million—during Topping's presidency.

Although the annual operating budget has increased from \$18.5 million 11 years ago to \$80 million in the current year, USC is "the only major university in the United States not to have run a deficit in any year," according to Carl Franklin, vice president for business and finance.

Two grants from the Ford Foundation totaling \$14 million were instrumental in USC's progress in the last decade. Both were matched by the university on a three-for-one basis.

In addition, a \$7.5 million grant from the National Science Foundation made possible many of the developments in the sciences and in engineering, especially in solid state science.

LOW RESEARCH FUND

Seventy-five new faculty members have been hired in this area in the last five years, according to Dr. Z. A. Kaprielian, dean of the school of engineering, who said these new professors have "given some visibility to the university."

When Kaprielian came to USC from Caltech in 1958, there was "zero research funding" in his field of electrical engineering, the dean said. This year USC professors of electrical engineering have attracted about \$4

million in research grants, four times more than their crosstown rivals at UCLA.

"Why, this is almost a decent university now," said the versatile, outspoken Dr. Richard Bellman, who holds a triple professorship in mathematics, medicine and electrical engineering.

"This used to be a joke school—the NYU of the West Coast," Bellman said. "People came here to play football or because it was a good way for a ballplayer to get to the major leagues. The only time the university got any publicity was when somebody died from (fraternity) hazing."

But things have changed. "Topping just decided that this was going to be a first-rate university," Bellman said. "He got the money and he got good people."

USE OF COMPUTERS

Bellman, who is interested in the use of computers to solve problems in education, medical care and other large systems, believes USC has been able to be innovative in this area because it has been catching up with other schools.

"This is one of the advantages of being behind," Bellman said. "An established place like Caltech or Harvard is not all that eager to have a new man come in and set up a large research project."

Not all of the improvement has been in science and engineering. Sam T. Hurst came from Auburn University to lead a revival in the School of Architecture and Fine Arts.

When he arrived eight years ago the school had a part-time faculty, part-time students and the curriculum was largely directed toward the immediate hiring needs of Los Angeles architectural firms.

Now, Hurst said in a recent interview, "We have mostly full-time faculty and we have many fewer 'moonlighting' students. The whole orientation of the school is more theoretical, with a stronger intellectual base. We believe that students who pay us tuition should not be getting from us what they could be getting by working in an architect's office."

The school of law has moved to make legal studies more relevant to contemporary social problems, sometimes to the discomfort of the university's administration and trustees.

"Law faculty and law students want to become involved with real problems," Dean Nelson said. "They don't want to be isolated from the system, studying appellate court decisions. They want to see the legal problems people have in real life—in juvenile court and traffic court, the trouble poor people have with certain kinds of contracts."

However, all this must be done "on the basis of precise scholarly work and study," the dean said. "We can't become politically involved."

SEPARATION DIFFICULT

Sometimes it is difficult to maintain this separation.

For example, USC was instrumental in starting the Western Center on Law and Poverty, which provides legal services for poor people in Los Angeles as part of the national "war on poverty."

At least one USC law professor has joined a law suit brought by the Western Center against the Los Angeles Police Department, alleging harassment and mistreatment of the city's black population.

This suit has irritated Police Chief Edward M. Davis and has caused him to be less than cooperative in some recent dealings, USC officials believe.

This in turn has annoyed some members of the university administration and Board of Trustees who wish they had less of an activist as dean of the law school.

MORE RELEVANT

But Dean Nelson's efforts to make legal studies pertinent to contemporary problems already have brought her, and the school, a

national reputation and most experienced campus observers think it unlikely that any effort will be made to replace her.

In another attempt to bring university resources to bear on current problems USC has established a Center for Urban Affairs, which will offer bachelor's, master's, and Ph.D. degrees to specialists in the problems of large cities.

"We are a large university in the heart of a vast urban area," President Topping said. "We are completely aware that urban problems are major problems that must be solved and that a university can't be an ostrich and stick its head in the sand."

A search is still under way for a director for the Urban Affairs Center but in the meantime several new programs have been started.

CITY PROBLEMS

One of the most interesting is the Urban Semester, in which 50 students spend all of their time studying the pleasures and problems of the city. They use Los Angeles as a laboratory, returning to campus for intensive seminar discussions of what they have seen and learned.

The Urban Semester not only brings undergraduates in contact with urban problems but provides them with an integrated course of study, answering in part the complaints of many contemporary students who object to the usual fragmented curriculum of four or five unrelated courses.

Another concentrated program in biological and environmental studies known as the Biology Semester will begin next fall.

Topping believes programs like these will "entice more of our brightest young people into helping solve what we see developing as a horrible situation" in education, housing, environment and other big-city problems.

While USC has been making great progress in the sciences and engineering and in most of its graduate and professional schools during the past 10 years, the same cannot be said of the liberal arts.

The College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, which includes most of USC's 9,000 undergraduates, faces a number of serious problems.

Physical facilities are inadequate. Founders Hall, where more humanities departments are housed, is badly overcrowded and plans for a new building are vague.

James McBath, professor of speech and coach of the USC team that won the televised "College Bowl" two years ago, said his department has only 1,520 feet of office space for 32 full and part-time faculty members.

The library is another source of complaints, particularly from professors and students in the humanities and social sciences.

With more than 1.3 million volumes the library is large enough—larger for instance, than those of Brown University, MIT or Vanderbilt—but faculty members complain that the collections are spotty and the service is terrible.

LIBERAL ARTS

Many liberal arts departments are understaffed, even though they must teach courses that are required of all undergraduates.

Faculty salaries in these departments are lower than in the sciences and engineering and lower than liberal arts salaries at other leading private universities.

As a result, many faculty members leave USC—about 10% per year, compared to a national average of 5% to 6%.

However, USC administrators say the faculty turnover problem is exaggerated. They claim the university has lost very few professors it really wanted to keep.

"There is a widespread feeling among faculty in the College (of Letters, Arts and Sciences) that the money is available, but that the pie has been sliced so that the professional schools have been at the head of the cafeteria line and the college has been at the end," said McBath, who is chairman of the University Senate.

IMBALANCE TOLD

"And just as important as the fact of this imbalance is the deep belief among faculty that it has happened."

Students complain even more loudly. "This has been a potentially great university for the past 10 years but we are frankly facing a crisis period right now," said Mark Savit, a 20-year-old senior from Los Angeles who is vice president of the USC Associated Students.

"We need money for the liberal arts and we need it soon or we'll be a group of professional and quasi-vocational graduate schools with a rotten core."

Student Body President Fred Minnes, a 21-year-old senior from Marin County, said "bright, academically talented kids come here but they transfer out."

Savit said this happens because USC offers little in the way of independent study or honors programs for its best students and because the campus is politically apathetic.

"We have a lot of encouragement for people in athletics, but we don't offer much of anything for academic achievement," he said.

Indirectly, concern over the quality of undergraduate education led to USC's only major student turbulence of recent years.

Last Oct. 25, Homecoming Day, about a dozen students picketed the dedication ceremonies for Heritage Hall, a new \$2.3 million athletic department facility, carrying such signs as "Where does USC rank in academics?" and "\$2.3 million for academics."

DEMONSTRATION

Later the demonstrators carried their protest to Alumni Park, where thousands of alumni were picnicking before the USC-Georgia Tech football game.

Apparently this was too much for a few alumni who, perhaps under the influence of the liquid refreshments they had consumed with lunch (although USC is supposed to be a dry campus), began to tear up the picket signs and push, shove and punch the demonstrators, some of whom pushed, shoved and punched back.

The altercation lasted only a few minutes and no one was seriously injured but as the story spread across the campus during the weekend its proportions grew.

On the following Monday morning several hundred students gathered for a protest rally and 150 of them marched into Topping's office.

They demanded the firing of the dean of students and chief of campus police, who they said had refused to stop the alumni from attacking students. They also demanded a public apology by the university and the establishment of a "No. 1 priority for academics."

DEMANDS REJECTED

Topping refused to accede to the demands, though he said: "I regret very much that there was an overreaction by some of the alumni. I don't even know who they were. I regret very much their overreaction and their inability to control their tempers."

That afternoon a fact-finding hearing, conducted before a capacity audience of 450 in Hancock Auditorium, persuaded most listeners that no serious injuries had resulted from the scuffle and that students, as well as alumni, had struck some of the blows.

The incident has faded into the background, but, according to Mark Savit, "It politicized the student body to a considerable extent."

"This is still a largely conservative student body," Savit said. "We have a lot of vocationally inclined students and a lot of insulated people who do not see the outside world as influencing them—kids who want to coast through, get their diploma and go to work for dad."

Topping agreed that humanities and social sciences have fared less well than science and engineering in the last decade.

FEDERAL MONEY

"But this has been true everywhere, not just at USC," he said. "There has been federal money and other research money for science and engineering and now there is starting to be some for social science, but the humanities have been the forgotten children."

He said he expected "a greater emphasis in the next few years" on humanities and social sciences, including higher faculty salaries, more endowed faculty chairs, a better library and more scholarships and other student financial aid.

Formal announcement of a new academic master plan, concentrating on the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, is expected to be made after the Board of Trustees meets April 24-26 in Palm Springs.

The man expected to lead the revival of Liberal Arts at USC is Dr. John R. Hubbard, vice president for academic affairs and provost.

FROM TEXAS

Hubbard, a 50-year-old Texan, describes himself as a European historian who "fell from grace" and entered college administration in 1953, when he became dean of Sophie Newcomb, the women's college at Tulane University.

Prior to coming to USC last summer, Hubbard directed the U.S. government's AID education program in India for four years.

He is enthusiastic about the possibilities at USC.

"All the resources are in this area—intellectually, the vitality of the place plus the raw wealth," he said. "If you can't build a really distinguished institution in this milieu you just ought to turn in your suit."

USC must have "at the central core a really distinguished liberal arts college," Hubbard believes. "I have pledged as my first concern the pursuit of that objective."

Hubbard has appointed as vice-provost Dr. John E. Cantelon, for many years a popular professor of religion and campus chaplain.

In an interview, Dr. Cantelon agreed that science, engineering and the professional schools dominate the USC campus, at the expense of the liberal arts, but he said he is encouraged by the sharp improvement in the quality of students in recent years.

"When you start with a kind of negative image USC had for so many years—a sort of combination football, rah-rah school and country club, it's tougher to attract the best students," Cantelon said. "But the tide is beginning to change. Election to the Assn. of American Universities is recognition of an academic renaissance that has been about 10 years coming."

Cantelon said USC now needs "the investment in humanities that we've had in science. We've got to realize that our most important product is humane human beings."

Another important appointment was that of Dr. Robert H. Linnell, a chemist and former administrator of the National Science Foundation, as dean of the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences.

CRISIS OVER

The appointments of Hubbard, Cantelon and Linnell have been well received by the liberal arts faculty. "There is a general feeling that the academic leadership crisis is over," said McBath.

But now faculty members and students are waiting to see if the administration and the Board of Trustees will be able and willing to raise the money needed to improve the liberal arts college.

Thomas P. Nickell Jr., vice president for planning, pointed out that it is easier to raise money for such things as the medical school than it is for the liberal arts college.

"People die of cancer and not of history," Nickell said.

However, Nickell insisted "we have always raised money for LA&S (the College of Let-

ters, Arts and Sciences) and we can raise the money they need now."

To do it he is asking for two additional fund raisers, for the liberal arts college alone, in the next budget.

Some students and faculty members wonder if the university really wants to improve the liberal arts college.

Even more than most similar governing boards, the USC Board of Trustees is composed of wealthy, conservative, Republican businessmen. Many people on campus believe the trustees are suspicious of the liberal arts and will be reluctant to support them financially as well as they have science, engineering and the professional schools.

"I think the trustees are leary of the ramifications of having a decent college," said Savit.

"At one meeting we had, a trustee said it was hard to raise money for the liberal arts because political activism and violence come from that sector.

"Considering SC's apathetic record, that comment almost made me sick to my stomach, but I think that's the way a lot of trustees think."

CONSERVATIVES

An administrator who prefers to remain anonymous put it this way: "There are implications in becoming a great university. It means brighter, more troublesome students and brighter, more troublesome faculty. There are implications that a conservative governing board might not necessarily approve."

On the other hand, he said, "This has been going on for three or four years. It's an evolutionary thing and so far they have left us pretty much alone."

Topping denied that the board will drag its feet in supporting improvements in the humanities and social sciences.

"People who say that are talking from no knowledge," he said heatedly. "The board is not that way at all."

GHETTO AREA

He said the trustees have given strong support to the Western Center on Law and Poverty, the center for Urban Affairs and a health center in Watts, all activities that might be regarded as controversial.

"I don't think any board likes to see the institution where they have concern . . . get into political activity of any kind," Topping said. "But I have no doubt whatsoever that this board will support our efforts to improve the LA&S college and our work on urban problems."

If this turns out to be true, then the next 10 years should be as rewarding for USC as the last 10.

"Our image is changing fast," said Dean Sam Hurst. "We are still considered a conservative, inbred, sports-loving, academically soft institution . . . I don't think that's true any longer, at least not much of it is true."

"The attitudes and actions of the trustees will be crucial to the future. The question is whether the more liberal student body and faculty will run too far ahead of the more conservative trustees and, if this happens, how the administration will handle the problem."

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, PIONEERS IN ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been involved along with

others in the often thankless struggle for soil and water conservation and for environmental quality. I therefore take some comfort in the fact that at long last this basic cause is becoming a popular issue.

Some prominent figures who just a few years ago avoided this unglamorous subject like the plague are now striving with one another for the right to claim the title of "Mr. Clean."

Student groups throughout the Nation have discovered the word "ecology" and are beginning demonstrations in the name of the new god. Burying automobiles may even become more popular than burning draft cards, and everybody will admit that it is a lot more spectacular.

I want to point out, however, that some of the most capable people who have made the greatest contribution toward pollution abatement and a high quality environment are now in danger of being relegated to a backseat while more vociferous groups monopolize the spotlight. One group which has been a true pioneer in this vital field is the Soil Conservation Service and the 3,000 soil and water conservation districts across the Nation with which it is closely affiliated.

I make this point, Mr. Speaker, because these conservationists are some of my closest friends and because I have been their devoted supporter for many years. I also make this point because the greatest pollutant in the country today is still sediment, a product of soil erosion.

This, however, is nothing new. The late Hugh H. Bennett, who was the first Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, testified before the committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, 79th Congress, first session, on bills for the control of water pollution in November of 1945. Let me quote you something Chief Bennett said before that committee nearly 25 years ago:

The Soil Conservation Service is in full agreement with the efforts to control pollution of America's streams and other waters, the subject now being considered by this committee. There is little doubt that pollution of the Nation's streams and lakes is one of the most serious obstacles to the beneficial utilization of our invaluable water resources. It is our feeling, however, that the various kinds of stream pollutants have not been brought completely into proper perspective. In our opinion, erosion silt—the soil washed from farm and ranch lands—is by far the most important stream pollutant in terms of its widespread effect, the monetary damage it causes, and its influence on the health and well-being of our people. Without in any way minimizing the serious and detrimental effects of pollution by sewage and mining and industrial wastes, we should like to emphasize the fact that erosion-produced silt is our worst water pollutant.

It is clear that the Soil Conservation Service people are no Johnny-come-latelys in the pollution fight. According to one estimate I have seen, the amount of sediment kept out of streams by just one conservation practice—establishing permanent cover with grass or trees—is staggering. In the last one-third of a century, the silt which this one conser-

vation measure has kept out of the streams would otherwise displace a volume of water equal to a 10-year supply for all U.S. households. So while everyone is talking about pollution, the Soil Conservation Service and conservation district leaders are and have been doing something about it.

I would like to itemize some of the ways soil and water conservation work reduces pollution.

SEDIMENT

Call it silt or mud if you would like, but sediment is the largest pollutant by volume of our streams, lakes, and harbors. It is also the carrier for other pollutants, sewage wastes, infectious agents, insecticides, pesticides, and chemical wastes often "hitch a ride" on soil particles held in suspension in water. And sediment can also increase the cost of purifying water.

More than 30 years of conservation work has greatly reduced the washing of soil from rural lands. But during that same 30 years, our Nation has gone through a period of unprecedented urban growth.

Developers have stripped the sod and trees from the land, new roads and industries have been built and other new sources of sediment uncovered. There is still a big job ahead of convincing people that conservation is not just a rural job for the farmers. Conservation methods that reduce sediment pollution on farms can also be used to fight the problem in nonfarm areas.

CHEMICALS

Many conservation measures reduce the need for pesticides and herbicides. Crop rotations are used to conserve and improve the soil—and to fight insects, weeds, and diseases. Certain plants kill nematodes, so a rotation to include these crops can help control them without the use of chemicals.

Other pests may live through the winter in stalks left standing in the fields. By mulching the old stalks, their homes are destroyed and the need for chemical control is reduced.

Conservation farming reduces runoff and erosion—and the likelihood of fertilizers and chemicals washing into streams and lakes. Obviously, if there were no soil erosion, the amount of chemicals washing into the streams would be negligible.

DUST

Wind-blown soil from the "Dust Bowl" of the Plains States once darkened the sky over Washington, D.C., and other eastern cities. The clouds of dust blew from land that had been mismanaged and overused. Conservation programs, using grass, tree windbreaks, wind strip-cropping, and better management have eliminated dust storms of this magnitude.

SMOKE

Burning woodlands, prairies, and crop residues once sent natural plant nutrients up in clouds of smoke that blanketed the countryside for weeks at a time. Now, thanks to enlightened conservation methods, this source of air pollution has been almost eliminated.

SOUND

A growing problem is irritating sound or "noise pollution."

SCS soil surveys and other land use information help zoning officials plan alternate land uses around noisy airports. Parks, lakes, and industries can often be located in such areas where the noise level is too high for hospitals, schools, or homes.

Highway noises create an irritating level of sound. A sound barrier of trees, similar to a windbreak, can be used to beautify the view and muffle traffic noise.

ALLERGENS

Pasture maintenance, vegetation of idle land and crop rotation are among conservation practices which help control ragweed, goldenrod, and other sources of allergens.

Along with many others who support the soil and water conservation movement, I am disturbed. While all this public clamor about pollution and the environment is going on, I find that the agency which for many years has been a leader in the pollution abatement field, continues to work with reduced funds and people.

In my State alone, the Soil Conservation Service now has 100 fewer people than it did 4 years ago and 150 fewer than it had on January 1, 1964.

So I suggest that if we are really serious about fighting pollution, we strengthen instead of weaken the soil and water conservation movement.

MUTUAL FUNDS VITAL TO DEVELOPING NATIONS

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, inspired by sources which have so far proven impossible to identify with certainty, some members of the working press in this country are engaged in a genuine vendetta against mutual funds which includes scurrilous, personal attacks upon those of us in Congress who recognize the valuable service performed by these institutions in furnishing the only effective avenue for channeling one's savings in relatively small amounts to diversified equities which offer some prospect of hedge against the rampant inflation of our times.

At the very moment when the stock exchanges and the brokerage houses are compelled by sharply rising overhead expenses to turn their backs upon the small investor, a few newsmen like Jack Anderson are indulging in verbal rhetoric which, like that of certain other minute segments in our society, is intended to destroy a highly respectable and beneficial American institution which serves the small investor very well.

Of course, many less strident voices in the financial press take a different view, but as Vice President AGNEW has

recently pointed out in relation to other national issues, somehow these voices of moderation do not get as much public attention as the strident few. That is why on January 28, 1970, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an example of the moderate voices on the subject of mutual funds from Barron's in which a professor at the University of Rochester concludes that the presently proposed mutual fund "reforms" would do more harm than good.

In the March 10, 1970, issue of American Banker there appears another example of a clearly disinterested but well-informed observer speaking out in moderate tones in defense of the mutual fund as a financial institution and describing the important economic function it performs for the public. This article is especially interesting because it appears in the official periodical of the American Bankers' Association, which is sometimes considered unfriendly to the mutual funds, and also in that it was written by a banker in our sister nation below the border, thus furnishing a refreshing perspective on this subject. The article is entitled "Mutual Funds Vital to Developing Nations" and is written by Agustin Vega, director, Banco de la Ciudad de Mexico, S.A. I insert this article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the International Banker, Mar. 10, 1970]

MUTUAL FUNDS VITAL TO DEVELOPING NATIONS (By Agustin Vega)

At the meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council in Venezuela in February of this year, there was discussion about President Nixon's plans for financial aid to Latin America and his requests for U.S. Congressional authorization for various specific fund allocations.

Among President Nixon's funding requests was \$30 million to encourage the development of stock markets in Latin America. Specific reference also was made to the need for creating adequate instruments for the development of these markets, such as investment banks and the establishment of other private financial intermediaries including mutual funds which have operated successfully in the Brazilian capital markets.

The mutual funds seem to be emerging as the most important of the private non-banking intermediaries in the developing nations. Though the Latin American experience is recent, this type of investment medium has consistently experienced rising growth. With total assets of about \$150 million in 1969, mutual funds have performed their basic functions as intermediaries of financial resources through the acquisition and sale of their own securities and those of industrial, commercial, banking and service companies, most of which are listed on existing stock exchanges.

There is a close relationship between the development and behavior of the mutual funds and the securities exchanges. The effectiveness and prospects of each depend on the effectiveness and prospects of the other.

An open and liquid securities market is vital to the development of mutual funds and the mutual funds further investment transactions through the stock market. They can activate the role and the orientation of the development of securities markets.

The mutual funds do not yet account for a large share of the capital markets in Latin America but, as evidenced by their growth, they will assume an increasing role. They

constitute one of the most useful and convenient instruments for mobilizing internal capital resources as these countries develop their commercial economy and progress to financial adulthood.

Mutual funds are a vital instrument for the promotion and collection of popular savings. They perform the important role of stimulator and allocator of personal savings to industrial and service corporations. They offer entrepreneurs alternative sources of financing. Additionally, mutual funds provide the small investor with more diversified holdings and liquidity than they could possibly achieve by acquiring individual stock holdings.

These developments will encourage the stock market to become a financial channel of decisive importance. In turn, this will require the stock market to transform its own mechanism and create more specialized instruments for the mobilization of popular savings that otherwise would lie idle under the mattress.

There have been several attempts in Latin America to channel popular savings into the financial market. These efforts, however, have not fulfilled expectations, partly because of the lack of financial education and partly because the sales techniques in use did not provide the potential investors with a clear and precise idea of their money's fate nor a distinct image of themselves as owners of something tangible.

Mutual funds stand out, therefore, as a most valuable means for the mobilization of savings. Their operating principles are simple and easily understood by savers and, with a dynamic sales plan, they can act with agility and effectiveness among small and medium-sized investors. The situations maintained by mutual funds in areas other than Latin America make outstanding examples. In the U.S.A., mutual funds are the most dynamic institutions within the stock market.

They number more than 500 and manage over \$50 billion. European capital markets have seen increasing acquisition of mutual fund stocks by their citizens over recent years, giving their own markets liquidity and transactions volume never before experienced. In Western Europe, there are more than 350 mutual funds with about 3.5 million share-holders and total assets close to \$4.5 billion.

In spite of the impressive growth of mutual funds in Latin America, there remain vast opportunities for the future. Such opportunities are reflected in the high volume of savings that leave Latin America for investment elsewhere and which constitute a major potential market for national mutual funds.

When the significance of the departing capital was recognized, the Latin American countries began to institute policies to encourage national savings to be invested locally. Venezuela, for example, set up a Committee to study ways to develop its capital market; Brazil began to create instruments to revitalize its stock market and thereby channel its citizens' savings into its own economy. There are many similar examples.

Between 1956 and the present, a very modest \$45 million has been collected by Mexican mutual funds.

This amount is far below what the conditions of the population and the national economy would indicate. 60% of the Mexican population is under 20 years of age and these young people are mainly concerned with attaining a good economic position as quickly as possible. Mexico also has a middle class of some size whose incomes more than cover their living expenses and who should be provided with a selection of investment possibilities. There is also an increasing number of young executives with incomes that grow each year. These are all potential investors.

If we examine the actual conditions of operations of mutual funds in Mexico, it will be realized that the presence of new mutual funds, far from creating unfavorable competition, would actually contribute to more liquid and professional stock markets in which they could all evolve. Until now the mutual funds have sold their shares without great difficulty and almost without any promotion.

Surely a well planned and organized strategy by the mutual funds would allow the collection of larger internal resources, the generation of income, the avoidance of capital out-flow and the promotion of the concept of saving. In this way the mutual funds would act as an effective complement of total investment.

The economic evolution of the Mexican nation is also pertinent. We have had 36 years of continuous growth, 15 years without a devaluation and, in 1968, a gross national product greater than those of either Sweden or Australia and greater than any other country in Latin America in the same year. Mexico's per capita income places it among the leaders of the developing nations. The government's financial program is progressive and has a growth orientation which increases each year.

In view of the progress, stability and prospects of the Mexican economy, it is apparent that the Mexican securities market has an important future if the rate of national economic growth is to continue. Statistics of countries close to us illustrate this point. If we study the structures of their securities markets, it can be observed that the percentage of common stocks traded in those markets is in comparison with the Mexican, as follows: 86% in Argentina, 87% in Brazil, 55% in Colombia, 92% in Chile, 64% in Peru and in our country 9%.

In conclusion, the growing importance of institutional investment for countries like Mexico is in their being one of the best sources of long term financing, obtaining resources from the saving sector and investing them in the stock market, widening its possibilities of being a fountain of capital for the corporations. The mutual funds constitute, at present, the most adequate way to strengthen the stock market of countries like Mexico, giving them a healthy development and providing them with more liquidity.

TELEPHONE PIONEERS OF AMERICA

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 17, 1970, I will have the honor of attending a special luncheon in Indianapolis, at the Western Electric Co., to honor Mr. Willis L. Reed, of Indianapolis, who has completed repair on 1,000 talking book machines for the blind. Mr. Reed is a member of Telephone Pioneers, the world's largest voluntary association of industrial employees. Many of the association's 77 chapters work on the talking book program as one of their community service projects, but few have achieved the record set by Mr. Reed, who is a life member of Shade-land Chapter No. 77, in Indianapolis.

The following items give the Telephone Pioneer story, and also the work done by the pioneers on the talking books program:

THE TELEPHONE PIONEER STORY

The Telephone Pioneers of America is the world's largest voluntary association of industrial employees. It is composed of men and women who have served 21 or more years in the telephone industry throughout the United States and Canada.

The first Telephone Pioneers were literally the people whose experience dated back to Alexander Graham Bell days. They had charted the course of a vital, new industry.

Today's Pioneers still have a strong feeling for the history and traditions of the business. But "pioneer" is a forward-looking word. They try to live up to their name by building a diversified and expanding program for action.

While enjoying the social side of their organization, they also search for other activities through which to express and extend fellowship. Pioneers find this "something more" in discussion courses which stretch the mind and bring out hidden talents, and in taking to heart the timeless idea that the people who get the most out of life are those who find significant ways to help others.

In Pioneering there is a common ground for people in all phases of telephone work. Accountants, secretaries, assemblers and engineers plan together for a social reunion. Repairmen, switchboard operators and vice presidents share their talents in projects of community usefulness and in many educational activities. Together they keep retired employees in touch not only with the latest developments in the business but also with their lifetime friends. Shut-ins, the ill and bereaved receive special attention from Pioneer associates.

Established in 1911 with 700 members, the organization now numbers over a quarter-million and it is growing rapidly. About 60 percent are active members (those now employed in the industry) and 40 percent are life members (those who have retired). While most Pioneers come from Bell System ranks, others are from independent telephone companies in the United States and the independent and government companies in Canada.

Pioneers are proud of their organization. They welcome this opportunity to share their story with you—the story of what they do and their hopes for the future.

PIONEERING IN ACTION

The Pioneer motto is Fellowship, Loyalty and Service—a motto which unifies the great diversity of individual interests and talents.

It is through the Pioneer program that these words really come to life. For here is the interaction of people—enjoying each other's companionship, working and learning together, being of service to members and to the community, bring experience and time-honored tradition to the challenges of a fast-changing world.

Pioneer activities are conducted through local chapters, councils and clubs, which together number well over 1,000 units. These centers of activity span the continent from the Gulf of Mexico to Hudson Bay, from the Atlantic Coast to the Pacific.

FELLOWSHIP ACTIVITIES

The lively social life of Pioneering has always been one of its most popular attractions.

A kaleidoscope of social events fills the calendar. Dinners and dances, theater parties, weekend outings, travel tours, picnics, costume balls, boat rides, sports tournaments, fashion shows—the keynote is variety. There are annual reunions with hundreds of members and weekly gatherings of small groups in a Pioneer lounge.

Sharing recreation and fellowship with younger employees makes it all more fun. The families of Pioneers are also very much a part of the social scene—participating with

an enthusiasm that rivals that of the members themselves.

Sociability is only one face of Pioneer fellowship. Warmth and sincerity are expressed in many ways: personal visits, telephone calls, cards and letters—hundreds of thousands.

TALKING BOOKS

Talking Book Machines are portable record players especially designed for the Blind, Visually and Physically Handicapped. They are provided to the blind by the Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Any person who is certified by a doctor, or competent authority such as a nurse, social worker, librarian, teacher, clergyman, or any other professional person as being legally blind, visually limited or physically handicapped is eligible to request a Talking Book Machine. Persons in Indiana make application to Talking Book Machine Service at the Indiana School for the Blind, 7725 North College Avenue, Indianapolis, Indiana 46240. The Talking Book Machine may be kept by the person to whom it is loaned as long as the disability lasts, without charge.

If the machine is in need of repair, mailing labels are furnished so that the machine may be returned postage free. Upon receipt of the machine an immediate replacement is made and there are no charges for repairs or parts.

Talking Book records are furnished by the Indiana State Library, 140 North Senate Avenue, Indianapolis, Indiana 46240. Books are assigned out for the usual 30-day period and are subject to renewal, if necessary, and cover subjects such as, history, biography, travel, science, religion, sports, drama, mysteries, westerns, science fiction, and children's books, both fiction and non-fiction. Periodicals include American Heritage, Changing Times, Ellery Queen, Harpers, Holiday, New Outlook, True, Sports Illustrated, Jack and Jill, Reader's Digest, and News Week.

The repair and maintenance program with which Shadeland Chapter Pioneers are involved began on April 18, 1961. The Western Electric Radio Amateur Club was alerted to the need for assistance in repair of the Talking Book Machines and cooperating with the Shadeland Council of Telephone Pioneers began repairing Talking Book Machines and radios for the blind.

During the early years, the volunteers encountered some difficulties in storage, pickup, and delivery of the units. Subsequently, arrangements were made for a repair bench at the Indiana School for the Blind where the Pioneers continue to repair and maintain the units.

Telephone Pioneers have been described as the most outstanding but unheralded groups of volunteers doing work in behalf of the blind. These generous and energetic volunteers in Indianapolis began by picking up the machines at the homes of the users and if not immediately repairable arranged for a replacement unit, took the units to their homes for repair, and then delivered them to the users when they were restored to working condition. At the present time, the Pioneers have no direct contact with the users. The machines are returned to the Center at the Blind School and the volunteers meet there for regularly scheduled work sessions to repair all machines that are in need of maintenance.

Other councils and chapters in the state have done and are doing repair work on the units, but, because of the centralized workshop made available at the Blind School, Shadeland Pioneers are able to repair more units than some of the other groups.

Within recent months, a Center has been established for the repair of the Cassette Tape Recorders now being issued to the blind through the Library of Congress, Shadeland Pioneers are involved in the repair and main-

tenance of those units for this region. The Chapter has provided testing equipment, in addition to that provided by the Library of Congress, for both the Talking Books and the Cassette Tape Recorders.

A VOTE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Sunday Star on April 5 commends the League of Women Voters for its campaign to gather signatures on petitions urging voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia. This worthy project is being conducted throughout the country in an effort to show that many Americans care about second-class citizenship in our Nation's Capital.

It has been almost a year since President Nixon sent his message to Congress asking approval of a constitutional amendment to provide voting representation for the District. In that message, he said:

It should offend the democratic senses of this nation that the 850,000 citizens of its Capital, comprising a population larger than eleven of its states, have no voice in the Congress.

Many bills have been introduced to change this state of affairs, and it is time hearings were held to consider them. I am hopeful that the drive undertaken by the League of Women Voters will succeed in demonstrating the commitment of Americans in all our States to full participation by District citizens in the Federal legislative business that uniquely affects their lives.

The editorial follows:

A VOTE FOR D.C.

From all reports, the League of Women Voters' campaign to gather more than a million signatures on petitions urging voting representation for the District of Columbia is in full swing in states from Virginia to Hawaii.

Congress—to whom petitions are no novelty—may never before have seen the match of this one. The thousands of signatures which members will receive on May 6 will be those of their own constituents. And we trust that, beyond the names, the members will be made fully aware of the truly extraordinary response of interest which this appeal has produced throughout the nation. Hawaii, mentioned above, has gone so far as to express its support through an official action of the state legislature. The news columns, elsewhere in today's Star, record other details.

Next Thursday, Mayor Washington and Council Chairman Hahn will initiate the Washington area's own part of the drive with a proclamation, touching off scheduled activities to extend through April 22. A great many organizations and individuals have taken on the task of circulating petitions. Students of the Federal City College, to cite one example, have voted to cancel other student activities this month in order to work within the central city on the drive.

Nonpartisan education on political issues is the most familiar of the League's many good works—and in this instance it is the professional politicians themselves who need

educating. We urge every citizen of the community to join in the appeal, for this city desperately needs voices in Congress to speak—and vote—in its behalf.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT: A GIANT STEP BACKWARD

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am as deeply concerned as President Nixon is about the recent wave of bombings in our metropolitan areas. Punishment for those who perpetrate such acts must be severe. However, I cannot agree with the Presidential recommendation that the death penalty for bombers be imposed if a fatality should occur.

The assumption on which capital punishment is based, that it acts as a deterrent to crime, has been proven false. For example, in 1961, Congress enacted the death penalty for hijacking airplanes. As we know, this utterly failed to suppress this practice which has continued with greater frequency. Since 1961, a total of 61 U.S.-flag carriers have been hijacked.

In civilized nations, modern penology is moving away from the use of capital punishment. For the past 2 years, no executions have taken place in the United States. In our desire to punish the bombers, let us not fall back upon the use of such a barbarous form of retribution.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the April 1 Washington Post succinctly presents the arguments against the death penalty, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

CUT OFF THEIR HEADS

There can hardly be disagreement with President Nixon about the seriousness of the danger created by the recent bombings and bomb threats in metropolitan centers. No doubt he is right in saying that many of them "have been the work of political fanatics," and that "they must be dealt with as the potential murderers they are." But he contributes nothing, we think, to deterrence or prevention of the danger by proposing the death penalty for bombers if a fatality occurs.

Even for murderers, the death penalty is being abandoned in civilized societies. The fallibility of human judges argues vehemently against a punishment so irreversible. Experience has shown beyond all serious question that fear of a death sentence does nothing to keep desperate, insensate and wicked men from committing the most dastardly of crimes. Obviously, such men ought to be confined until they are no longer menaces to public safety. But to extinguish their lives is to display on the part of the community a disregard for the sanctity of human life which may in itself be an encouragement to murder and violence.

The President said that his proposals were not designed to displace state and local authority but simply to assist such authority in the effort "to combat the multiplying number of acts of urban terror." Nevertheless, they do intrude upon an area reserved to the states in the American federal system. There is valuable assistance that the federal government can render through the crime detection and investigation facilities of such agencies as the FBI, and of course this assistance should be freely extended when re-

quested by the states. But there is little need to enlarge the area of federal authority over criminal law. Bombing, like arson and murder, is a crime in every state of the union.

We see some sense in enlarging the existing penalty, as the President suggested, for the transport of explosives across state lines for unlawful purposes. And we think there should be stringent controls on the sale and distribution of explosives. Talk of the death penalty, however, seems more an expression of outrage, or hysteria, than a practical way of curbing a serious peril.

IN SUPPORT OF CONFIRMATION OF
JUDGE G. HARROLD CARSWELL

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House, I of course will not have an opportunity to vote to confirm the President's nomination of the Honorable G. Harrold Carswell. I would unhesitatingly vote "aye" if I could. I therefore want to take this occasion to again express my unqualified and wholehearted support of Judge Carswell and to state my hope that the Senate's vote tomorrow will not only confirm Judge Carswell but will also give our President the vote of consent he deserves in his nomination of the judge. Judge Carswell is a distinguished American, an experienced jurist, a man of high integrity, and a close, personal friend. As a fellow Floridian, I have had the privilege of knowing the judge well, observing him firsthand, and I most sincerely attest to the superior quality of his character, his ability, and his principles.

I earnestly believe that if those who appear to be in opposition to his nomination knew Judge Carswell personally, and would estimate his fitness for the Supreme Court on the basis of his personal merits and ability, and of the man personally, as well as his experience, the opposition would find their criticism without foundation. The record clearly shows a total lack of any concrete evidence which could be determined as adverse to the judge's confirmation, and there is certainly no justification for nonconfirmation.

Judge Carswell, as I know him, is a man of impeccable honesty and integrity. He is a young man, vigorous in the discharge of his duties, and warmly human in his relationships with his fellow man. He is, moreover, both a distinguished American and an outstanding citizen. These qualities are evident in both his personal life and in his long record of public service.

I state this from a personal knowledge and long acquaintance with Judge Carswell. I recommended him for U.S. attorney in 1953, for U.S. district court judge in 1958, for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in 1969, and for the U.S. Supreme Court in 1969 when President Nixon was considering all alternatives in attempting to fill the Fortas vacancy.

Judge Carswell will be an excellent Supreme Court Justice and the fact that

he is a strict constructionist of the Constitution will add needed balance to the Court. I am proud to state my unqualified support for Judge Carswell—for his nomination by the President and for his confirmation by the Senate as a Supreme Court Justice. I do so of my own personal knowledge, having known the man over the years and having personal knowledge of his high standing with the bar, the bench, and the community.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SUPPORT
AND DESERVE EFFECTIVE, RE-
SPONSIBLE, AND CONSTITUTION-
AL ANTICRIME LEGISLATION

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join today in sponsoring the Pretrial Crime Reduction Act because I genuinely believe that this measure has the potential for actually affecting the rising tide of crime in the United States today. This problem has continually grown more and more serious in recent years. Our citizens have grown increasingly insecure and concerned about what appears to be a continually declining state of personal security. Life within our Nation's cities, for example, is now almost universally discussed in terms of personal safety before any other consideration is given thought. Whether some of the excessive insecurity is unwarranted or not, the point is that crime statistics show more and more crimes being committed and a reaction among the public of more and more panic.

One consequence of crime, which in turn leads to a higher level of public dissatisfaction, is the tremendous burden which the great volume of cases puts on our Nation's courts. It is becoming virtually impossible to guarantee that an accused individual will receive anything approaching a speedy trial under the current circumstances. Statistics show that it actually takes 3 to 24 months from the time an individual is indicted until he is tried. Caseloads in Federal and State courts have risen at a rate far greater than the rate at which the courts' ability to deal with them has progressed. The public has naturally displayed a high degree of concern at what appears to be a crippled and wheezing court system which is not able to dispense justice at a rate equal to that at which the criminal dispenses violence. This state of affairs has led many individuals to the false conclusion that the courts are a cause of crime when in fact the troubles in our courts are actually an effect of crime.

The most disturbing consequence of this kind of faulty reasoning is an unrelenting and myopic desire on the part of many political leaders, including the present administration, to blow the effects of crime out of the water with great force, taking little or no care to avoid side damage which, in the long run, could be far more odious. I refer to the

frightening spate of legislative proposals which, in their political expediency, are an affront to our Constitution and the Bill of Rights and do virtually nothing to attack the root causes of crime. One cannot cure measles with pancake make-up; one can only disguise the effects. The executive branch's current romance with the idea of "preventive detention" is a misaimed barrage not merely against a criminal whose guilt has not been proven, but against the fundamental guarantees of our society against imprisonment without due process of law and a trial by jury before any guilt can rightfully be assigned. The administration's scheme is also a dangerous affront to the eighth amendment which protects a citizen against excessive bail. I do not take lightly this proposed junking of the presumption of innocence and this far-reaching tampering with the foundations of this country's model judicial system.

"Law and order" is a phrase which has gathered many varied interpretations in recent times. Be these as they may, I view nothing with greater dismay than the prospect of seeing the politically expedient grab onto law and order as an excuse to systematically dismantle the liberties which form the core of everything we value in our free society. Because the right to commit crimes is definitely not one of these liberties, however, I recognize the critical need for us to act decisively in helping our Nation's court system to function effectively, while at the same time doing whatever is necessary to responsibly attack the myriad causes of crime in America. While the fight against crime will and should be carried on locally, we at the Federal level must be willing to lend a helping hand. I am persuaded that the Pretrial Crime Reduction Act constitutes such constructive and needed assistance.

The provisions of this measure which set time limits for speedy trials and offer Federal assistance to courts in their attempts to adhere to these limits, call for increased penalties for crimes committed while on bail, provide useful and necessary pretrial service agencies to aid judges in supervising defendants released on bail and allow for immediate revocation of parole for those parolees and probationers who commit crimes of violence are all well-directed and constructive steps which can have a decidedly positive effect on the present crime situation. I, therefore, support this measure and express the hope that many of my colleagues will agree that it constitutes a logical and well-directed step toward actual problem solving in the matter of crime and is worthy of our support.

Our goal should not be a repressive state brought on by those who would rather induce a false sense of tranquility by clubbing the effects of crime indiscriminantly; rather, it is our obligation to work within the boundaries of justice and liberty to create a viability within our court system that enables the judicial process to perform with thoroughly adequate efficiency. The legislation introduced today will do much to strengthen, streamline, and protect due process of law instead of tragically wrecking it.

A LESSON IN ECONOMICS

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that all of our colleagues who have been exposed to the magic and euphoria of the welfare state philosophy will enjoy the rather pertinent little allegory that was published in the March 7 edition of the California Farmer. It is entitled "A Lesson in Economics" and though I might have been tempted to add a paragraph in which the little red hen was offered a \$500,000 subsidy for not baking bread, I believe that the writer, Gaylord Sutherland, of Muskegon, Mich., makes his point very well. This excellent article, the text of which follows, was brought to my attention by one of my thoughtful constituents, Barney Jewett, of Ontario, Calif.:

A LESSON IN ECONOMICS

Once upon a time there was a little Red Hen, who scratched about and uncovered some grains of wheat. She called her barnyard neighbors together, and said: "If we work together and plant this wheat, we will have some fine bread together. Who will help me plant the wheat?"

"Not I" said the cow.

"Not I" said the duck.

"Not I" said the pig.

"Not I" said the goose.

"Then I guess I will," said the Little Red Hen, and she did.

After the wheat started growing, the ground turned dry, and there was no rain in sight. "Who will help me water the wheat?" asked the Little Red Hen.

"Not I" said the cow.

"Not I" said the duck.

"Not I" said the pig.

"Not I" said the goose.

"Then I will," said the Little Red Hen, and she did. She watered the ground, and the wheat grew tall into golden grain. "Now" she said, "who will help me reap the wheat?"

"Not I" said the cow.

"Not I" said the duck.

"Out of my classification" said the pig.

"I'd lose my Aid to Dependent Children" said the goose.

"Then I will" said the Little Red Hen, and she did.

When it came time to grind the flour—

"Not I" said the cow.

"I'd lose my unemployment compensation" said the duck.

When it came time to bake the bread—

"That's overtime for me" said the cow.

"I'm a drop-out" said the duck. "I never learned how."

"I'd lose my welfare benefits" said the pig.

"If I'm the only one who's helping, that's discrimination" said the goose.

"Then I'll do it myself" said the Little Red Hen, and she did. She baked 5 loaves of fine bread, and held them up for her neighbors to see.

"I want some" said the cow.

"I want some" said the duck.

"I want some" said the pig.

"I demand my share!" said the goose.

"No!" said the Little Red Hen. "I can rest awhile, and eat the 5 loaves myself."

"Excess profits!" cried the cow.

"Capitalistic leech!" quacked the duck.

"Company fink" grunted the goose.

"Equal rights!" screamed the goose.

They hurriedly painted a picket sign, and marched around the Little Red Hen singing lustily: "We Shall Overcome." And you know, they did.

When the farmer came to investigate the commotion, he said "You must not be greedy, Little Red Hen. Look at the oppressed cow. Look at the disadvantaged duck. Look at the underprivileged pig. Look at the less fortunate goose. You are guilty of making second-class citizens out of them."

"But . . . but," said the Little Red Hen, "I planted the wheat, and I watered it, and I reaped the grain. I ground the flour, and I baked the bread. I earned this bread!"

"Exactly," said the farmer. "That's the wonderful free enterprise system. Anybody in this barnyard can earn as much as he wants. You should be happy to have this freedom. In other barnyards you would have to give all 5 loaves to the farmer. Here you give 4 loaves to your suffering neighbors, and keep one for yourself! You should be grateful."

And so, they all lived happily ever after, including the Little Red Hen, who smiled and smiled and clucked and clucked: "I am grateful. I am grateful. I am grateful."

But her neighbors wondered why she never baked any more bread.

ONE OF THE FIRST GARY CORPSMEN, 5 YEARS LATER

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today Sgt. Kenneth Pace is a man respected among some of the toughest guys around—the paratroopers of the 82d Airborne at Fort Bragg. Today, he trains young men to jump into space, trusting their training, their parachute, and their faith.

But 5 years ago, Sergeant Pace took his very first plane ride. He walked out of a jail cell and onto a plane taking him, along with the other members of the first group to enter, to the Gary Job Corps Center at San Marcos, Tex.

It has been awhile since Kenneth Pace left Gary to enter the Army, but he has never forgotten what he learned there. In fact, he remembers so well that he took the time to write Dr. O. J. Baker to congratulate the Gary staff on their 5-year anniversary recently.

The letter is simple and to the point—and it is written by a scared kid that once had nowhere to go, but who found himself and manhood at the same time. Sgt. Kenneth Pace is a living tribute to the Job Corps program—and to himself. I am sure he would not mind reprinting his letter which he printed in a firm hand on ruled notebook paper.

The letter follows:

MARCH 3, 1970.

DEAR DR. BAKER: It was five years ago today that I walked out of a jail cell at 4:00 a.m. in the morning headed for Gary Job Corps. I remember it, as if it were only yesterday.

Everything seemed to be changing as I walked 5 miles home in 16 degree weather. The last words I heard from the police officer was, make something out of yourself Ken! I walked in my house at 5:30 a.m. tired, weary and full of misery. At 8:00 a.m. I rose from my bed to get dressed for my first plane ride and set my mind about the Job Corps.

A new life I thought, to myself, what would it be like. When arriving in Dallas,

newsmen swarmed the plane of us, headed for Gary Job Corps. They asked mostly what did we think about it all, and our plans. Most everyone really didn't know what to say.

I can remember saying just to do my best if people will let me.

When arriving at Austin Airport, people from Gary met us and made us feel welcome right away. That's when I realized the people of Job Corps were sincere about us and their challenge to teach us not only a trade, but a new and better way of life.

In the year and half I spent at Gary I developed an understanding of every person and walk of life.

Now a soldier, I can truly say if it were not for the people at Gary, training me not as a soldier, but as an individual, I could not have made it as easy as I have in the Army.

I very seldom land with an airplane now as I jump from them. Being a Paratrooper, is also a very experiencing and exciting task. Many times as I enter an aircraft I remember my first plane ride and what it brought me too.

I regret not being able to be at Gary on your fifth birthday as I planned. Being a soldier, duty calls for me here at Ft. Bragg.

Sir, I'm away from the Job Corps only in distance, but inside, I'll always remain a Corpsman and continue to express the many good deeds the Job Corps has done to everyone who ask about it.

In closing, I only felt it necessary to let you and the rest know how still today, it feels to have been one of the first Corpsmen to try and help set a goal for the many young men and women of our Great Nation to get ahead.

May God Bless and I Salute All of you and the Job Corps.

Sgt. KENNETH E. PACE,

U.S. Paratrooper,

82d Airborne Division.

FORT BRAGG, N.C.

PROGRESS IN ABATING AIR POLLUTION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the March 20, 1970, issue of Science magazine carried an editorial entitled "Progress in Abating Air Pollution." So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be familiar with the views of Science magazine, I include the text of the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

PROGRESS IN ABATING AIR POLLUTION

(By Philip H. Abelson)

An optimist can at last see signs of progress in overcoming air pollution. The ponderous machinery of government is beginning to move, and segments of industry are behaving as if they realize that they cannot go on increasingly polluting the atmosphere. An important example is the automobile manufacturers who are taking action against the nuisances they were creating. Emission of hydrocarbons by new cars in California this year will be only about 23 percent that of earlier, uncontrolled models. The California standards will apply nationwide in the next model year. General Motors has committed itself "to take the automobile out of the smog problem altogether." The federal government has begun to assume leadership. Recently Secretary Finch issued a schedule for reducing the permissible limits of pollutants from automobiles. By 1975 the emission of hydrocar-

bons is to drop to about 5 percent of that of uncontrolled vehicles.

Progress has already been made in diminishing the emission of carbon monoxide. Next year's models will emit about a third as much as uncontrolled automobiles. Control of nitrogen oxides has lagged behind, but California standards require a partial abatement in the 1971 model year. The federal standards for 1975 call for a substantial change—a drop to about 15 percent of present levels. A striking feature of the abatement of motor vehicle pollution is its price. The improvements incorporated in the 1971 models will cost no more than \$48 per vehicle.

In terms of tonnage of emitted pollutants, the automobile ranks first. However, in overall damaging effects, sulfur oxides from burning of fuels seem most serious. This is especially true in the area east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio, where sulfur-bearing coal is a principal fuel. In that region, major metropolitan areas have been gambling with catastrophe. An unusual weather pattern with a persistent inversion could result in many deaths. In November 1966, the New York metropolitan area came close to such an event. The experience caused authorities in the area to issue regulations calling for progressively improved control of sulfur oxides. In abating its air pollution, New York in effect limited the sulfur content of fuel to 1 percent. As a result, the concentration of atmospheric sulfur oxides is now less than half what it was in 1966. During 1971 the permissible sulfur content of fuel for most installations will drop to 0.37 percent. This will reduce pollution further. It will also have substantial economic consequences. Fuel will cost more. It will consist mainly of natural gas, purified residual oil, and clean fuel oil.

The United States cannot afford to import enough low-sulfur oil to meet its energy needs. In many regions it will be necessary to use coal which typically contains 2 to 3 percent of sulfur. Only a small fraction of the reserves contains as little as 1 percent. It is possible to remove some of the sulfur from coal by mechanical means, but most cannot be eliminated except by costly chemical processing. In major installations abatements of pollution arising from the burning of coal will require cleansing of stack gases. At a recent congressional hearing,* four processes were described that have reached the stage of commercial application. They are all capable of sharply reducing the concentrations of sulfur oxides emitted by major electric power generating stations. The consumer, naturally, will have to pay more for his electricity from 6 to 10 percent more, according to present estimates.

In view of the health hazards and other costs of pollution this seems a small price to pay. With this new technology the major polluters can lower their emissions of sulfur oxides, and they should be required to do so expeditiously.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND THE MANAGEMENT OF RESEARCH

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 23, our colleague, the gentleman

* Testimony by James R. Garvey, President Bituminous Coal Research, Inc. to Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 25 February 1970.

from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO) addressed the opening session of a 3-day Info-Expo 70 gathering of the Information Industries Association. This association is young but rapidly growing, for it represents the dynamic new field of information services, including everything from printed matter to computer based, instant retrieval, technical information libraries, and factfinding services.

In his address, Congressman DADDARIO proposed the creation of a government-wide information system which would bring modern day management techniques to our vast governmental research and development effort. He called attention to the great problems we face as Members of Congress who must make decisions on funding levels for future programs with no more than historical information on the status of these programs a year or 18 months ago.

I agree with the sentiments expressed by our distinguished colleague. We in the Congress must have information immediately available on the present status, not last year's, of the programs whose futures we must consider. In light of this, I include Congressman DADDARIO's outstanding address at this point in the RECORD in hopes that it will stimulate action by this body to meet our need for current information:

INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND THE MANAGEMENT OF RESEARCH

(REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE EMILIO Q. DADDARIO)

This country has seen a tremendous growth in the support of research and development since 1950. Federal expenditures alone have increased from slightly over a billion dollars in 1950 to a peak of more than 17 billion dollars in fiscal 1968. There has been a decline since that time. During these two decades science and technology have furnished us the ability to walk on the moon, light our houses with electricity from nuclear power or instantly destroy most of the human life on our planet.

During the 50's and the 60's, we talked a lot about centralizing Federal science activities in the United States. But at the same time we have created new agencies to deal with the goals and objectives of our society, and these new agencies have seen fit to support their own basic research programs. Instead of contracting into one or two super-agencies, our pluralistic system for the funding of research has further proliferated.

As we enter the decade of the 70's we find ourselves faced with a gigantic task in efficiently and effectively managing this research and development enterprise. Many thoughtful observers to the scene maintain that our pluralistic system can no longer just "grow like Topsy". They maintain that we must develop a new management system to effectively channel our research and development efforts into those activities generated by the problems and challenges facing our society.

What are the characteristics of such an effective management system? At the Federal level there should be strongly defined policy making centers in both the executive and legislative branches. Clearly delineated lines of authority must flow from these policy making centers all the way down to the individual scientist working in his laboratory. And at the Federal level there must be increased efforts to properly coordinate our multifaceted research efforts. There must be coordination between the disciplines to assure balanced research programs. Problem oriented research must be effectively related to existing disciplinary support. Within the

individual mission agencies, balanced programs must be put forth in the context of both the agency's requirements and related programs outside the agency. We need to coordinate the planning function in such a way that overall national requirements are not lost sight of while attaining specific agency objectives.

Coordination is not merely an activity to prevent unnecessary duplication of effort. It is not just an exchange of information at the problem-oriented, disciplinary or sub-disciplinary levels in order to prevent obvious duplication. It is a much more complex problem and requires more subtle remedies than we have utilized up to the present time.

The present system of managing research is unsatisfactory, at least at the Federal level. Let me take a moment to discuss how the executive and legislative branches of government deal with research and development at the present time.

Within the executive branch an assortment of departments and individual agencies pursue their objectives and the associated research and development activities with minimal overview from the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Science and Technology. No meaningful overall ordering of priorities in R & D, or even within academic science, occurs at the present time. This state of affairs is emphasized at the present substantial cutbacks in support for research and development. These cutbacks have not occurred with any overall plan in mind, and no one in the Federal government really knows precisely what is going on. I will come back to this point later on.

Numerous proposals have been made for reform. Our Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development has generated some of these proposals and given serious consideration to many others. Proposals for a Department of Science analogous to those found in some other countries have been made before, and will no doubt be made again.

In the legislative branch the situation in regard to the management of science, research and development is even worse. Because of its fragmented committee structure and the tremendous demands on the time of the individual Members, Congress does not at the present time get an overview of the Federal involvement in research and development. The annual Bureau of the Budget special analyses are useful, but they are a collection of agency totals and do not furnish any basis for action.

Proposals have been made many times in the past for legislative reorganization to attack this problem. Some have suggested a Joint Congressional Committee with no legislative authority, to set all of our efforts in science, research and development in perspective. This joint committee, perhaps modeled on the Joint Economic Committee, would require an annual report on the "state of science". This report would attempt to review the accomplishments of the previous year, and to outline plans and goals for the future within the context of individual agency programs.

The Science, Research and Development Subcommittee shares this concern over the inadequacy of present organizational forms for the management of research and development to meet the demands of society. The Subcommittee has undertaken an exhaustive study of the utilization of Federal laboratories, and recommended what we think are substantial improvements in this regard. We have proposed a substantial program of institutional grants to strengthen the funding of academic science. Legislation on this subject now awaits Floor action in the House.

A comprehensive evaluation of the structure of the National Science Foundation resulted in significant changes in its Organic Act in 1968, as reflected in P.L. 90-407. The issue of Technology Assessment is becoming

an increasingly critical one as we observe the massive effects which science and technology are having on our physical and social environment. Our comprehensive study of Technology Assessment is resulting in legislation which will be introduced shortly.

Last year our Subcommittee held extensive hearings on the subject of Centralization of Federal Science Activities. We expect to have specific recommendations ready in the near future concerning a substantial reorganization of science, research and development activities supported by the Federal government. Following these specific proposals, we are planning in depth hearings on national science policy in July of this year.

In looking back over these accomplishments, as well as viewing our current activities, I find a common problem which we have faced in almost all of our activities. It is the one I referred to earlier: No one really knows what is going on right now.

Let me give you an example of what I mean. For years we have foreseen the need to structure the NSF in such a manner as to permit it to assume an increasingly larger proportion of the responsibility for the support of academic science, especially basic research. Over the past few years we have seen a slackening of commitment on the part of various mission agencies to basic research. The result has been increased pressure upon the NSF to support many research projects being cut off by the mission agencies. But increased funds have not been made available to the Foundation, and we have seen the war in Vietnam and the demands for the solution of social problems receive higher priorities in the Federal budget.

Our Subcommittee addressed this problem last week in hearings on the fiscal 1971 NSF authorization bill. Before a solution can be worked out to this problem of research projects being transferred to the NSF, we need to quantify the problem. That is, we need to get from the Federal agencies an answer to the following question: "For fiscal 1970 and fiscal 1971 what academic science activities will end because of budget reductions in your agency?"

This sounds like a simple question to ask of any outfit that uses an up-to-date information system with nano-second switching times and gig-bit memories. But what answer did we receive? Well, 1968 data was available and complete. 1969 data was beginning to be available, and some agencies were able to provide it. With regard to 1970 and '71 data we were asked to wait a couple of years.

We would be more than happy to wait, except that our executive sessions for the purpose of marking up the Science Foundation bill should be completed *this* week. The substantive decisions which we, as Congressmen, must make on this 1971 budget cannot wait a couple of years.

The information systems which we presently use in research management may be excellent repositories for historical information, but they have not been as useful as they should be in furnishing information for policy decisions. What we need is a "real-time management information system" for coordination and management of the Federal science research and development enterprise. I should like to describe some of the desirable characteristics in such a system, and ask you in the audience—being experts in the field—to think about such a system and tell me if it is practical.

But before describing it, I should like to point out another reason that we need such a system. It would be nice if we did not limit it just to research, but could put information on development projects into it as well. It would be desirable to interrelate in this system information on basic and applied research and development.

Two weeks ago I presented some ideas on the management of research and development before the Armed Services Committee, in the context of its inquiry into independent research and development at industrial firms. At that time I stated that the current proposal for the Defense Documentation Center to establish a data bank on independent research and development activities had obvious merit. But I went on to say that an organization such as the Science Information Exchange, which is the Federally funded agency responsible for collecting, storing and retrieving technical and fiscal information on all unclassified government supported research, seemed a more logical place for these data. It could then serve the entire Federal government and not just the Department of Defense. We should also attempt to avoid duplication of information storage systems, just as we attempt to avoid unnecessary duplication of research activities.

The information system which seems desirable from my perspective in the Congress should be, as you say in the trade, a real-time one. We need today's information—not that which was put in the data bank during the last update eight or twelve months ago—for making decisions. Furthermore, we need the results of information which the middle manager in government would consider proprietary. We need the summation of his tentative decisions on the support of individual research projects, his tentative decisions regarding areas of research which will receive emphasis, quality judgments which might insult individuals or institutions, and fiscal information concerning salaries, subcontracts and other sensitive areas. Note that I stated we need the summation of this information for our purposes, not the individual bits and pieces.

This information system should be one which is useful to the middle manager who must generate the data. One hears more and more complaints from such people that they are "working for the computer". Generation of requirements not already in being should be avoided, and the impedance mismatch associated with inserting and extracting information should be minimized.

The information system should be useful to the middle manager in his own daily routine. He should control the input data, erase its memory, and make the decisions on output for his own uses. This information system should be a substitute for, rather than an addition to, his present record keeping activities.

Protection must be ironclad for the proprietary data in memory, if the system is to function effectively. For example, tentative decisions to support a particular research proposal should not be accessible on an individual basis to the legislative branch or to high level executive branch personnel. Totals, however, would be available. Appropriate controls could likewise be worked out concerning quality rankings, budgetary data and certain other sensitive items.

I should like to amplify my remarks on the "impedance matching" of the middle manager to the information system. As I understand it, our present system is hierarchical in nature to a degree which would make any medieval monarch proud to call it his own. Data input is accomplished by generating a requirement at the highest echelon, and standard forms are sent down through the chain of command. These are filled out from "hard copy" which is often generated specifically for this purpose, key punched by clerical employees, and inserted into memory. "Proofs" are then sent back for review by the middle manager who generated the data, and corrections are fed back into the system. Periodic updating is depended on to keep the information current.

The middle manager who wishes to utilize the information in the data store puts in his request, and gets a print-out at some later time.

There is a widespread feeling that the information in the system is for "someone else", not the middle management official who generates the data and manages the research and development programs. Furthermore, there is a reluctance to trust the accuracy of the information, because of its degradation during the input process. Finally there are subtle pressures to not use the system because of the cost of the hard copy output and the bother of going through channels.

I should like to propose for consideration a real-time information system which would overcome some of these drawbacks. Let me at the outset acknowledge that peripheral problems might arise if such a system as I propose were implemented. It is basically an in-house system, one for the use of the Federal government in managing its resources devoted to research and development. I realize that there may be demands for this information in the private sector, and that controversy over procedures for making it available might arise. I am happy to see that the Association is working on these problems of reconciling proprietary rights and the public interest in such matters.

The details of implementation I would leave to you, the experts in such matters. But I am confident that if you decide my suggestions will not work, or will be too expensive, you will come up with an even better system that will solve the problems which we all recognize.

This ideal system would be government wide in scope.

It would include both research and development activities.

It would contain both technical and fiscal information.

It would contain both "hard" and "soft" data useful in the decision-making process. For instance, tentative budget levels, quality judgments, and decisions to support, continue, or end projects would be included, even though subject to abrupt changes and revisions.

The information would be inserted, erased, updated, and to some extent extracted directly by the responsible middle management official, for example, the appropriate project scientist or program officer. He would perform these functions within broad guidelines in a manner which he sees fit.

In order to insure real-time characteristics a certain flexibility in input format and completeness would be necessary. For example, a typical research proposal to the NSF might be inserted with an appropriate title, abstracts, fiscal and manpower information. But suppose a particular proposal did not contain a suitable abstract. I would say that it is more important to go ahead and put in what is available—that is, leave out the abstract—since generating one from the text of the proposal could be too time consuming for the responsible but very busy program officer at the NSF.

I cannot give you a judgment regarding how to reduce these suggestions to a practical operating system, but I can make a few observations.

Direct access by responsible middle management personnel would require satellite input/output stations with visual display, and perhaps hard copy capability, "down the hall" from the middle management user.

Decentralized decision making on what is to be in memory would be necessary. That is, control over the content of certain "addresses" should be vested in those middle management officials who generate the information and who are the predominant users.

It would be nice to have the capability for

making a direct query of responsible middle management officials, putting their response directly into the system.

Let me explain what I mean by this. The question which I referred to earlier on academic science activities ending during a certain time period because of budget reductions could very well not be answered from existing information in such an ideal system. But why not have blank spaces in the addresses associated with each grant or contract, so that the program officer could furnish the information directly to the data bank in response to a phone call. The scenario might go something like this. A congressional inquiry is relayed to our information system, and an appropriate blank space set up in which to put the answer in the addresses associated with each grant or contract. The question is relayed to each agency, which in turn passes the question on to the individual project scientists or program officers. The project scientist or his secretary then goes to the nearest satellite input station, pushes the appropriate buttons for each grant or contract for which there is an affirmative answer. A null answer automatically appears in all other grants and contracts. The results are appropriately summed and the answer is available within a day.

In conclusion let me emphasize my belief that sound management practices are necessary if the U.S. is to continue its preeminent position in science and technology. We have done well in the past, but changing requirements call for changed organizational forms and administrative procedures.

We observe that changes are already in process in both the executive and the legislative branches of government. New demands for Technology Assessment, environmental quality, transportation, housing and other areas must be met. Pressures are building to reorganize our present governmental structure for the support of research and development in order to meet these needs.

Criticisms of the shortcomings in our present system of support for research and development, and desire on the part of the Congress and the public for an overview of our activities in this regard, assure us of further changes. We must take the necessary steps now to assure a dynamic and viable system for the management of Federally sponsored research and development in the future.

The basic ingredient for an effective and more efficient management of our scientific research and development is an information system which can furnish on a real-time basis that data basic to the decision making process. I would challenge you who have the necessary expertise and insight to provide us with such a system.

U.S. FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, some public issues seem to go on and on, without visible change from one administration to another. It is beginning to appear that such is the case with national trade policy and trade legislation growing out of the last series of Kennedy round negotiations. The Congress wisely failed to act upon the former administration's foreign trade proposals that included the abolishment of ASP. The same treatment deserves to be accorded the Nixon administration's trade bill. One very good rea-

son can be found in the manner in which the executive branch has failed to make available to the Congress essential information included in a 1966 Tariff Commission study on the probable damage to the U.S. chemical industry of abolishing the American selling price. The following article from Chemical & Engineering News aptly describes the administration's unreasonable and unjustified position:

NIXON KEEPS LID ON ASP REPEAL IMPACT STUDY

(By Louis A. Agnello)

Freedom of information—the public's right to know what its government is doing and why—has become something of a stock issue in Presidential campaigns of recent times. It was particularly so in the 1968 campaign with Presidential aspirant Nixon taking pot shots at Johnson's information policies and pledging himself to an "open" administration.

President Nixon's "open" administration is now in its 15th month. But if there has been any lifting of the information floodgates during that period, the signs are not readily apparent. A chemical case in point is the Nixon Administration's refusal to make available the 1966 Tariff Commission study of the probable effects on the U.S. chemical industry of the removal of the American Selling Price (ASP) system of customs valuation. The long-standing feud between the industry and the White House Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations (STR) over STR's continued refusal to release the report surfaced again earlier this month when Ronald A. Lang, executive secretary of the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association (SOCMA), demanded that STR make the report available before Congress begins its trade deliberations next month. Labeling the report "probably the single most important document in the present debate over ASP," Mr. Lang accuses STR of suppressing the commission's findings "because they could prove embarrassing in light of the ASP side agreement STR entered into during the Kennedy round of trade negotiations.

[Under the 1967 side agreement in question, EEC, the U.K., and Japan agreed to cut their chemical tariffs an additional 30% if the White House could prevail upon Congress to do away with ASP—the controversial system under which duties on benzenoid chemical imports are assessed on the basis of their U.S. selling price.]

Submitted to STR by the commission in October 1966, the commission's report has yet to see the light of day despite repeated efforts by the domestic industry, labor leaders, members of Congress, and newsmen to pry it loose. At first STR contended that the commission's conclusions were "not meaningful, and indeed hardly intelligible, without access to the confidential business information" relied upon by the commission and which the commission was prohibited by law from releasing. Later STR took the position that even the commission's conclusions contained confidential business information—which was hardly consistent with what it said initially or with then Special Representative for Trade Negotiations William M. Roth's own description of the commission's findings. "The commission advised whether particular concessions would or would not have an 'adverse effect' on domestic producers, i.e., whether 'this concession would or would not result in increased imports that would have significant effect on employment, profit levels, use of productive facilities, or on one or more of these economic factors,'" Mr. Roth said.

All this, of course, transpired under the information policies of the Johnson Administration that candidate Nixon assailed so

vigorously during the 1968 campaign. True to his word, President Nixon has revamped the information policies of his predecessor. STR still won't release the report. But now the reason is that the report is "privileged Executive Branch communication."

There can be little question of the "relevancy" of the commission's report to full consideration of the Administration's proposal to repeal ASP which is now pending in Congress. Moreover, neither the present Administration nor its predecessor has yet offered a reasonable justification for refusing to release the nonconfidential portions of the report.

EDITORIAL COMPARES CARSWELL WITH DOUGLAS

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Senate will tomorrow, April 8, vote on the confirmation of Judge G. Harrold Carswell to the U.S. Supreme Court. A timely editorial of April 1, 1970, deserving of attention, appeared in the Sun-Sentinel newspaper, Pompano Beach, Fla. I wish to insert that editorial at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

CONFIRM CARSWELL, OR IMPEACH DOUGLAS

(By William A. Mullen)

The Old Testament philosophy of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth may not have popular appeal in these kindly days when "human rights" are considered to be transcendent over property rights, irrespective of the intent or menace presented by the claimant of human rights against a fellow man seeking to protect his property rights.

There is, however, room for the "even-Steven" theory, no matter how much it may be opposed by an element which wants everything its own way, but which can see no justification in the other side gaining even the flimsiest of concessions.

It is on these grounds that there is merit to the proposition by Sen. Harry S. Byrd Jr., D-Va., that if the Senate fails to endorse Circuit Judge G. Harrold Carswell as an associate justice of the United States Supreme Court, then impeachment proceedings against Associate Justice William O. Douglas would be in order.

Indeed, the case against Mr. Justice Douglas has more substance than do the suppositions against Judge Carswell.

The Carswell antagonists reach far back into the past to pounce upon assertions that were in keeping with their times, to condemn the jurist until doomsday as a "racist," never willing to be forgiving because he has not renounced the sin of common sense to join their cause.

And when the racism allegation is refuted by Negroes or attorneys who otherwise might be regarded as the chattel of the liberal camp, then it is claimed that such endorsement results from pressure. The charge, of course, comes from a source that is intolerant and intransigent insofar as conflict of opinion is concerned, and a practitioner of pressure.

Coupled with the racism fabrications against Judge Carswell are the contentions that he does not measure up to the caliber of the type of appointee who should sit on the nation's highest bench.

There, we think, the Carswell foes have overplayed their hand and, regardless of how the battle is resolved, there should be a

definite attempt to ensure that the court measures up to the standards which the Carswell foes say are lacking in the President's nomination.

If personal conduct, respect for the court and intellectual responsibility are the criteria set by the Carswell opponents and claimed to be beyond his capabilities, then the same measurements must be applied to Mr. Justice Douglas as an incumbent who must be regarded as no longer fit to rule from the land's highest court.

Judge Carswell may be accused of mediocrity, which has not been proved. But he is not responsible for wild decisions that gave the edge to criminals in misguided overprotection of individual rights.

Judge Carswell may be accused of ineptness, but he is not an oftwedded and oftdivorced marital gadfly in position to rule unwisely against school prayers, on the matter of pornography, or law as it applies to American tradition.

Judge Carswell may be accused of not having written landmark decisions in singular prose during his long tenure in the courts. On the other hand, he has not written for sex-oriented publications involved in any case coming before his court. Nor has he written a book conceding the revolution may be necessary for dissidents to register their displeasure and to effect their desired upheaval.

If what he is falls short of being philosophically and intellectually qualified for the Supreme Court, then either our mores are all wrong, or Mr. Justice Douglas has no place in fabricating the law of the land.

And if the anti-Carswell liberal senators will not apply their exacting yardstick to such an incumbent; if they refuse to endorse Judge Carswell on separate and unequal terms, then they will have forfeited their privilege to advise and consent upon presidential nominations to the U.S. Supreme Court.

BYELORUSSIAN ANNIVERSARY

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, March 25 commemorated the 52d anniversary of that brief moment in 1918 when the Byelorussian National Council declared their independence from the Russian State.

The Byelorussian American Association's national headquarters is located in my congressional district, and I join with them in the fervent hope that these people attain their long-sought independence from Russian rule. Speeches and remarks by Members of Congress have served to remind the Russian people that we here in American still recognize their plight and are mindful of their unflinching great strength and never-ending hope for freedom.

In these tremulous times, when freedom's candle flicker more and more faintly in so many parts of the world, I would like to remind my colleagues of the Byelorussian people's long struggle for their freedom and their land.

Since the beginning of the 13th century, these courageous people have strained against repeated shackles of tyranny and bondage to preserve their sense of national honor and unity. They were content with the simple and mean

existence of the farmer on a vast and frigid land of 80,000 square miles which extends from the eastern borders of Poland to the Western approaches of Moscow. In 1795, their land was overrun by the Moscovites. When the czarist regime tried to obliterate all traces of nationalistic feeling among the Byelorussians, these rugged people resisted, finally seizing upon the chaotic conditions at the outbreak of World War I as a desperate opportunity to establish their own national independence.

The first all-Byelorussian Congress met much like the founders of our own country met, to establish a new nation free from the burdens and bondage of a stranglehold possessor nation. They adopted a resolution endorsing the right of nations to self-determination and overwhelmingly called for the establishment of a democratic government to shape the destiny of this new nation.

But the powerful Red army, sensing a threat to their interests, forcibly disbanded the Congress and attacked the new republic. The Byelorussians fought valiantly for nearly a year, only to finally fall under the heel of the Communist State. Their land was made a part of the Soviet Union, but these peoples indomitable spirit could not be crushed.

Today the Byelorussians still tend to their farms and simple customs in the heart of Russia. But they have not lost the hope for freedom nor the love of their land, and they live with the destiny of their little nation ever foremost in their minds and hearts. The Byelorussian national headquarters here in America strives to keep this spirit alive, to sustain the hope of their people. And today, on the behalf of this lost nation that scarcely uttered its first breaths before being crushed, I offer my fervent prayer that one day soon the words of their declaration of independence will again ring true and these people will again be free to create the covered destiny of their nation, Byelorussia.

THE UNITED STATES AND RHODESIA: WHERE DO WE STAND ON APARTHEID?

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 22, 1970, examines the United States' first Security Council veto in the 25-year history of the United Nations—a move which should make every American ask the disturbing question: "Where do we stand on apartheid?"

OUR FIRST UN VETO

The United States cast its first Security Council veto in the 25 year history of the United Nations over the touchy question of Rhodesia.

The practical reasons are hard to deny. The African-Asian resolution called for cutting all ties—political, economic, social, etc.—with the rebel, racist run country, which broke with Great Britain earlier this month and declared itself a republic. The

resolution condemned Britain for not using force to bring Rhodesia to heel.

Charles Yost, our ambassador to the UN, explained the support of the resolution would condemn American citizens in Rhodesia to isolation with no recourse to help. There are significant US economic interests at stake. The United States had an obligation to oppose condemnation of Britain.

The psychological effects of the veto on American relations with black Africa, however, may be serious. The recent closing of our consulate in Rhodesia becomes a meaningless gesture in the struggle against apartheid. The veto perils much of the goodwill won by Secretary of State Rogers on his 16 day tour of Africa. It makes suspect the Nixon administration's profession of a new US interest in the African continent.

As Diallo Telli of Guinea, secretary general of the Organization of African Unity, told Rogers in Addis Ababa; Rhodesia, South Africa and the Portuguese colonies "are the negation of everything that stands for human dignity."

This moral judgment is correct. How long can this country dodge the issue?

HOW TO BE SERIOUS AND FUNNY AT THE SAME TIME

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great pleasures of the Washington scene is the opportunity to read Art Buchwald in the Washington Post. His columns are consistently funny and, equally important, always strike directly to the heart of important problems.

A particular example was his recent column on the difficulties of utilizing credit card firm's computers while the mail strike was underway. While Mr. Buchwald creates a fantasy in which computers completely exceed the grasp of humans and spew out long lists of "deadbeats" in spite of unmechanized and ineffective attempts to make them understand the fact of the mail strike, a very serious problem does exist in real time. That is the inability of credit card holders to reach a human being in large automated firms.

Mr. Speaker, on March 3 of this year, I introduced H.R. 16266 and H.R. 16267 which provide that if a creditor refuses to make correction, or at least humanly acknowledge receipt of a consumer complaint, the consumer is relieved of the liability under discussion, and to forbid creditors from reporting disputed accounts to credit bureaus as delinquent. And I called for the inclusion of both of those provisions in the credit industry control bill now being considered by the Consumers Affairs Subcommittee, when I was its leadoff witness on March 17, 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert Mr. Buchwald's column in the RECORD at this point. Mr. Buchwald's style is very funny and it does not take away from his unique contribution to point out that for thousands of credit card holders, the subject under discussion is no laughing matter. The column follows:

MAIL STRIKE IS FRUSTRATING CONSCIENTIOUS COMPUTERS

(By Art Buchwald)

New York—There have been many repercussions over the mail strike. The most serious is that in a computer age, it's hard to explain to a computer what a mail strike is all about.

All large companies bill by computers and when the bills are paid, the computers check them off. For a week now it's been impossible for computers in New York to send out bills, or to receive money for outstanding debts. Therefore, the computers who are not concerned with the postal workers' grievances have become more frustrated and have been venting their anger on the list of people stored in their machine.

I was in the office of one of the major credit card companies in New York last week and the manager was in the computer room trying to talk to the computers.

The teletype of one computer kept printing: "Where is the money? Where is the money?"

Another computer was printing: "James is a deadbeat, Jincks is a deadbeat, Jist is a deadbeat, Johnson is a deadbeat, Jones is a deadbeat, Juniper is a deadbeat."

A third computer was teleprinting: "Attention! Attention! The credit of all people whose last name begins with 'A' through 'L' has been canceled."

The manager kept running from computer to computer teleprinting, "Rescind That Order," but the computers were working much faster than the manager.

I watched him feed into one machine, "There is a postal strike! Do not do anything drastic until it is over."

The machine immediately responded, "I am not concerned with postal strike. If people don't pay their debts, they must be punished."

The manager rushed to the next machine which was printing, "King is a deadbeat, Klotz is a deadbeat, Klutz is a deadbeat."

The manager typed out, "They are not deadbeats. They're victims of an act of God."

The machine printed back, "I do not believe in God. Lachman is a deadbeat, Lengel is a deadbeat, Longworth is a deadbeat."

"Please," the manager teletyped, "Don't come to any conclusions while the mails are not working."

"You're going soft," the machine teletyped back, "If you're not careful, you'll be a deadbeat, too."

The manager was in tears. "I can't stop them," he said. "We've trained them to be so efficient that they won't accept any excuses. At this rate they're going to mark every one who has a credit card lousy. We'll be out of business."

"Why don't you pull the electric plug on the computers?" I suggested.

"It's no good. They can work on auxiliary power. There's no way of stopping them."

A computer was teleprinting, "The following people should be immediately arrested and all property confiscated—Paine, Peace, Potter, Plunkett, Pruneau, Punter, Raskin, Roberts, Rogers..."

The manager typed back, "No, No, No, No. They're innocent."

The computer typed, "Get your filthy hands off the keys of my teleprinter."

The manager was white. "I have no choice. To save the company, I'll have to push the self-destruct button."

"You're going to blow up the computers."

"It's either them or us." He broke the glass on the wall, and pushed the red button.

There was a thunderous explosion followed by smoke. When the smoke cleared, I looked around. All the computers seemed to be working. One started teleprinting, "As I was saying before I was interrupted, Mayfield is a deadbeat, Minton is a deadbeat, Morgan is a deadbeat, Mullins is a deadbeat..."

OPEN THE DOOR WIDER

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, George E. Carlson, chairman of the board of the Minnesota Rubber Co., based in Minneapolis, Minn., has provided me with a thoughtful position paper stressing the need for a national comprehensive high school program. Mr. Carlson, who draws this conclusion in his capacity as chairman of the education committee of the National Fluid Power Foundation, makes a most compelling case for broadening the school program below the college level to include instruction in practical trades and other nonacademic subjects.

Certainly, many of us agree that there is a great need for more emphasis on vocational and technical education in this country. In fact, it was because of this need here in the Nation's Capital that I authored the legislation which created the Washington Technical Institute.

So I am pleased to draw Mr. Carlson's comments to the attention of my colleagues, and include his essay at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OPEN THE DOOR WIDER

Many of our students in our present junior and senior high schools are wandering about in an academic no-man's land. There is a lack of programs educating them to earn a living and become responsible citizens. Most of today's students are unhappy, frustrated and discouraged. This unrest must be stopped with a practical educational challenge.

Many students are violently opposing the pattern of life that formed this country. Followers of radical groups protest against our existing educational system with campus havoc. Frustrated students revert to drugs and crime. Drop outs are not challenged to seek out a goal in life because they have not been properly prepared by our present educational structure.

We quote Dr. Malcolm Moos, President of the University of Minnesota: "You ain't seen nothing yet—wait until you see their successors."

WHO IS TO BLAME?

Our schools are teaching as though 90% of our students should be professionals and college trained.

The Ohio census disclosed that only 7½% of industry's employment opportunities required a college degree. Yet, 81% of all the youths in their schools were enrolled taking a college preparatory program. Government reports show that 70% of our 82,000,000 employed are workers and craftsmen.

THE STATISTICS OF SCHOOL FAILURES

From government reports: Only 7½% of all students who enter the first grade will graduate from college. Of all those who graduate from high school, only 18% will complete college studies. There is no consideration for the 82% who will not graduate from college.

COMPULSORY ACADEMIC EDUCATION ONLY

Every state compels students to attend school until they are 16 years old. When they graduate from elementary school at sixth grade, or 12 years old, they must enroll in junior and senior high school. The program offered is exclusively academic and college oriented only. This lack of choice creates most of our youth problems. They become discouraged and drop out. (Presently, our drop out

rate is the highest percentage on record, and still rising.) Many high school graduates, too, tell us they are fed up and distrust further after-high-school education of any kind because of the academic emphasis.

OTHER CONTRIBUTING FACTORS

We have neglected to keep pace with the needs of our earlier maturing youth. Our accelerated environment has made the teens the decision making years, not the twenties. They are making lifetime decisions earlier than we expect. Our present educational system does not teach what they need to know early enough, especially a sense of responsibility and the ability to work.

Many of today's welfare recipients and unemployed are the product of the same neglect. Contributing to our problem is our lack of vocational training. Consider the fact that we had 500,000 in vocational training compared to Germany's 1,200,000 comprehensive school students. (From latest reports.)

EDUCATION COSTS

Our school system is the largest industry in the world with 46,000,000 students at a total tax expenditure of 64.7 billion dollars in 1968, or \$1348.00 per student annually. We are spending more money annually on education than do all the other countries in the world combined. The student cost of attending college is soaring. It becomes more difficult to go to college. More high school students will look for, and need a practical educational program.

The experts agree:

Carnegie Commission in their March 2, 1970 report stated: "We do not believe that each young person should of necessity attend college. Quite the contrary. Many do not want to and will not attend, and it can not be shown that all young people will benefit sufficiently from attendance to justify their time and the expense involved. Inequality of opportunity must not continue to sap the strength of our nation."

Mr. E. R. May, Dean of Harvard University said this month, in March 1970—"Harvard maps big changes in curriculums to open doors in vocational training."

Brown University is also changing its program.

Mr. Robert Finch, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare at the National School Principals' Convention in February, 1970: "The high schools are in a stage of breakdown whose symptoms are too clear—violence, drugs, dropouts, incredibly mobile and unhappy students of this dilemma."

The Federal Office of Education: "High school programs must be revised to reach the students that are not reached by academic programs only."

Dr. John Rankin, former president of M.I.T.—"We have to do something for our youth as public education should not only touch on general education, but certainly should include teaching of subjects covering practical life and trades."

Dr. C. M. Woodward, past president of Washington University: "Put the whole boy or girl to school—his hand and heart as well as his head."

Mr. Archie Moore, past world champion boxer: "A boy can—ABC, if we teach him how early enough to learn by doing."

THE PROVEN SOLUTION

The proven solution is a comprehensive high school program. Vocational training is combined with a full academic program to create a comprehensive high school. The student has his choice of a complete academic schedule, or part academic with vocational training. Either way, he has the necessary credits for college upon graduation. These schools offer training, such as: Tool and die, machinist, auto mechanic, hydraulic, electronic computer, nursing, cooking, sewing, cosmetology, stenography, drafting, bookkeeping, comptometer and many more.

BENEFITS AND POTENTIALS

The student receives the necessary skills for immediate employment upon graduation if he can not, or will not go on to college.

The value in attaining a skill provides the incentive to remain in school.

Industry's acceptance has been overwhelming—81% of the comprehensive high school graduates are successfully employed in the trade they've studied. Many are recruited by industry before graduation.

Journeyman status is obtained by many graduates after just one year in the field.

Dropouts have been reduced substantially in all these schools. A comprehensive school in Pennsylvania reports a reduction from 28% to 4%.

Students have a greater desire to go on to college for further training in engineering and technical skills. (The enrollments in these courses have been decreasing at an alarming rate which has college faculties and industry worried.)

This program gives every person a chance to fulfill his personal goals and earn a living regardless of his background, especially the blacks, ghetto residents and other minority groups. We have found the student will attend any school when he knows he will receive practical training for steady employment.

HOW AND WHERE

The comprehensive school has, and can be, tailored to meet the needs of the community. The vocational and academic divisions are located in the same building when the school is large enough. Some in additions to present buildings; others use separate vocational buildings centrally located to serve the needs of three or four high schools in a comprehensive effort. Some of the present vocational school facilities have been successfully converted to comprehensive high school operation.

When a student enrolls in junior high school he is assigned certain periods in the vocational division to allow experimenting in various trades. He receives counseling guidance to find the trade which best fits his ability. He then proceeds with his four year training program.

The program is basically economical. The saving in support costs alone makes it worthwhile. The unskilled person and his family will be removed from welfare. Complete plans for implementing this program are available.

Many school bond issues have been rejected lately but every bond issue incorporating this comprehensive high school program has been passed with a good margin.

In most cases, the comprehensive school has a 16 hour day. Classes are offered to all the residents of the community—students, adults and dropouts.

The comprehensive high schools have been operating successfully in many communities from coast to coast. A few are—Cleveland, Ohio; Kansas City, Kansas; Denver Colorado; Kenosha, Wisconsin; Erie, Pennsylvania; Camp Springs, Maryland and Millville, New Jersey. The Newton, Massachusetts public schools have one technical school serving two comprehensive schools under a grant made by the Ford Foundation. (A complete list of many more is available.)

Thirteen suburban school districts on the western perimeter of Minneapolis have announced plans to build two schools to serve as a vocational division for their thirteen comprehensive high schools.

Many of these school districts in the states that are operating now are expanding the operation as fast as money is available; the program is spreading.

PUBLIC OPINION FAVORS COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Polls taken by newspapers, regional reports and government reports indicate endorsement as follows:

	Percent
Parents	94
Voters	78
High school students.....	57
Industrial manufacturers.....	89
Union membership stating that it is the school's responsibility	76

This practical program needs the help of people like you with experience and knowledge. We feel this program should become a national concept. Our only goal . . . helping solve the problems of today's youth.

How can you help? Let us know.

—GEO. E. CARLSON.

TERRORIZING THE GREEK PRESS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, when an unconstitutional, totalitarian military junta grabbed power in Greece in April 1967, one of its first acts was to close down the 15 Athens newspapers.

When the press was allowed to resume publication, the most prominent conservative publisher, Mrs. Eloni Vlachou, defiantly refused to publish the junta's handouts, closed her papers, was placed under house arrest, and later escaped to make her way to England. The remaining papers operated under a cloud of censorship and harassment.

Only one, the Ethnos, dared to test the claim of the junta that it recently had restored partial freedom of the press. In the last week we have witnessed the result: The top five editors of Ethnos were arrested, tried by a military court, and sentenced to prison terms of up to 6 years. Their crime? They published an article by a former Member of Parliament, Ionnis Zigdis, calling for a return to democracy. Thus it was that Ethnos, founded in 1913 and closed only once before in its history—during the Nazi occupation—was forced to go out of business.

Our own policymakers have often been insensitive to the moral and political implications of United States association with the repressive junta. In the view of many, the junta could not survive without the implicit and explicit support it receives from American military figures in NATO and the Pentagon. It is a situation which should make the Statue of Liberty weep.

For nearly 3 years tragedy has followed tragedy in that ancient land. It may yet not be too late for us to change our course. I hope we do.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, a series of articles describing the Ethnos tragedy follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1970]

GREECE: STUDIES IN COURAGE

Greek democrats continue to fight back against the spreading tyranny of the ruling army junta with a stubborn courage that leaves free men everywhere heavily in their debt. Ten of 34 distinguished Athenians on trial for sedition by a military court have now repudiated earlier confessions, saying

these were extracted by brutality and torture.

As a result of this brave refusal to follow the regime's carefully prepared courtroom script, the military tribunal has refused to hear any more statements by defendants alleging torture and has ordered Greek newspapers not to print any such charges. Thus another remnant of press freedom and another fixture of fair trial procedure disappear in Greece.

Press freedom was also quashed in a second military trial being held simultaneously in Athens. The editor of the newspaper Ethnos was sentenced to five years in prison and fined \$8,300; a former Cabinet minister was sentenced to four-and-a-half years. Ethnos had published an interview in which the ex-Minister called for restoration of democracy.

The most dramatic moment in either trial came when former Premier Panayotis Canelopoulos, testifying for the 34, warned the ruling colonels that their ever-increasing repression made a revolutionary upheaval inevitable.

ATHENS JAILS SIX FOR PUBLISHING ELECTIONS PLEA

ATHENS.—A military court sent an opposition politician and five newspaper executives to jail today on charges of spreading false rumors. Another politician promptly called the sentence an attempt to "terrorize the press" and a shame for the Greek army.

The court convicted former Industry Minister Ioannis, Zigdis, three publishers and two editors of the newspaper Ethnos of spreading false rumors and propaganda. The case stems from publication of an interview in which Zigdis called for a return to democratic rule. The court sentenced the six men to prison terms ranging from 13 months to 5 years.

"These sentences are part of an effort to terrorize the press, which is now operating in a state of merely theoretical freedom," former Foreign Minister Evangelos Saveroff said in a statement to foreign newsmen.

"Newspapers are no longer accepting articles by myself or other politicians. This proves that the efforts have brought fruit."

The Ethnos trial ended early today in the same courthouse where another military tribunal was trying 34 persons on charges of trying to overthrow the government of Premier George Papadopoulos. These charges carry possible death sentences.

The six men were each fined \$6,600. The newspaper that carried the interview with Zigdis, lost its right to tax-free newsprint for five months.

Halamaras gave Zigdis 4½ years, Ethnos Chief Editor Ioannis Kapsis five years, Publisher Constantinos Kyriazis four years, Assistant Publishers Achilles Kyriatis and Constantinos Nicolopoulos three years and Managing Editor Constantinos Economidis 13 months.

GREEK PAPER SUSPENDS AFTER EDITORS ARE JAILED

ATHENS.—The daily newspaper Ethnos stopped publication today for an indefinite period because its publishers and top editors were convicted and imprisoned yesterday for violating martial law.

The staff was advised of the shutdown after the paper went to press today for the last time.

The decision to stop publishing was made by the imprisoned publishers in consultation with their lawyers.

The employees felt they could no longer run the paper on their own without someone being responsible for its editorial content, as the law requires.

An announcement tacked to a board in the paper's second-floor editorial room advised the 100 employees: "After today's decision of

the copublishers, as of Saturday, the paper suspends publication indefinitely."

There was no immediate government comment on the paper's decision to suspend publication.

Convicted and jailed were the Constantine Nicolopoulos, Achilleas Kyriazis, his brother Constantine, chief editor John Kapsis and managing editor Constantine Economides, and ex-cabinet minister John Zigidis.

In an interview published by Ethnos on March 24, Zigidis called for a national unity government to replace the army-backed regime.

Ethnos, founded in 1913, had suspended publication only once before in its history—during the Nazi occupation of Greece from 1941 to 1944.

The paper had become an outspoken critic of the present Athens regime since press censorship was lifted in November.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 3, 1970]
EFFORT TO TERRORIZE PRESS LAID TO ATHENS

ATHENS, April 2.—A former Foreign Minister of Greece, Evangelos Averoff-Tossizza, accused the military-backed regime today of trying to "terrorize" the Greek press through harsh court-martial sentences on journalists.

The former minister deplored the heavy prison terms and fines imposed by a special military tribunal on three publishers and two editors of the Athens daily Ethnos for printing an interview that urged restoration of democracy in Greece.

Ethnos, the only defiantly antiregime daily of the ten printed in Athens, may have to shut down this week following the sentencing of its executives to terms ranging from 13 months to five years. Fines totaling \$45,000 were imposed on the debt-ridden paper.

The Ethnos executives sentenced were Yiannis Kapsis, the editor; Constantine Economides, the managing editor, and the publishers, Constantine Kyriazis, Achilles Kyriazis and Constantine Nikolopoulos. Also fined and sentenced was Ioannis Zigidis, a former Cabinet minister who gave the interview.

PRESS FREEDOM CALLED NOMINAL

The newspaper, which was founded in 1913, has been put out by its junior staff since March 24, when the publishers and editors were arrested on charges of "spreading false reports likely to cause anxiety to citizens."

Mr. Averoff-Tossizza said: "The heavy sentences passed on Ethnos are related to nothing except to the attempt to terrorize the press while maintaining nominal press freedom."

"I am deeply sorry that those degrading sentences were imposed by men wearing the honored uniform of Greek officers, who have always been on the forefront of the fights for freedom."

Mr. Averoff-Tossizza, Foreign Minister from 1956 to 1963 added, "I am even more grieved because the present tactics—which may change the appearance of the newspapers though not the proud Greek spirit, appear to condemn the efforts of those who had wished for a gradual, normal evolution, painless to all."

None of the other Athens dailies commented today on the Ethnos verdict.

OTHER TRIAL CONTINUES

Meanwhile, at another Athens trial, 28 witnesses testified for the defense of 34 Greeks charged with having attempted to topple the "political system and existing social order."

One defense witness, a former Supreme Court judge, said it was absurd to try the defendants under a 23-year-old antisedition law that was intended to protect democracy from "the sort of things that is happening in Greece."

Another witness, Mrs. Amalia Fleming, the Greek-born widow of Sir Alexander Fleming,

discoverer of penicillin, said the bombs the defendants are accused of having exploded were in fact firecrackers meant as an "acaustic protest" against the regime.

The military court adjourned until tomorrow, when it will continue to hear defense witnesses.

JURISTS PROTEST TRIAL BAR

GENEVA, April 2.—The International Commission of Jurists said today that the Greek authorities had "once more publicly demonstrated their indifference to the rule of law" by barring foreign observers from a military court now trying 34 persons on charges of subversion.

Two representatives of the commission, a private agency, were among the foreign lawyers who protested Monday that they had been denied access to the Athens courtroom.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 3, 1970]

DEFIANT GREEK EDITOR—JOANNIS KAPSIS

ATHENS, April 2.—Joannis Kapsis will be unable to address the Overseas Press Club in New York tomorrow on Present-Day Working Conditions for Greek Journalists, as he had been invited to do.

The Athens military court spoke first and exhausted the topic early today when it sent Mr. Kapsis to jail for five years for printing in Ethnos, his defiant newspaper, an interview calling for the restoration of democracy in Greece.

What infuriated the 41-year-old editor was that for the last five months he had been nettling the country's military-backed regime with defiant double-meaning headlines and cartoons, yet the military judges convicted him for having printed an interview with someone else.

The latest, if not the last, installment of "Let There Be Freedom," one of Mr. Kapsis' historical novels, appeared in Ethnos today as he began his sentence.

It was uncertain whether the newspaper, whose circulation had risen from 17,000 to 42,000 in the last few months, could survive the imprisonment of its three publishers and two chief editors and the fines of the equivalent of \$50,000 that the military court imposed. The men were all arrested nine days ago.

ARRESTS NOT UNEXPECTED

The possibility of arrest was something Mr. Kapsis and the management of Ethnos had lived with for months. Mr. Kapsis, with Constantine Kyriazis, the copublisher who took the most active role in setting editorial policy, had turned Ethnos into the only Athenian newspaper defiantly hostile to the military-backed regime.

Mr. Kapsis, a sturdily built man with steel-blue eyes and graying hair who gives the impression of having an inexhaustible supply of energy, took over as editor in chief last fall after the regime had proclaimed "freedom of the press."

When Mr. Kapsis speaks of freedom of the press it is with passionate conviction. With the backing of Mr. Kyriazis, he began probing the legal limits set for the press in Greece. His first defiant headline became a classic in Greek journalism. Spread across the front page in three-inch-high letters, it read: "More Democracy." Above it in tiny print was: "Chancellor Brandt Pledges—"

Many Athenians would open their copies of the newspaper asking, "What are they up to today?" Sometimes it would be a quip or a cartoon. Other days it would be something like the text of the International Press Institute report on the problems of the Greek press or the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee's hearing on Greece with words such as "torture" or "dictatorship" replaced by talltale dots.

Mr. Kapsis has been in journalism almost all his adult life. His father, Pantelis Kapsis, was a journalist who fled to Greece as a

refugee from Asia Minor in 1922. One of his son's best-selling historical novels was "The Lost Fatherland," about the mass migration of Greeks from the Turkish coast of the Aegean.

The son was born in Athens in 1929 and studied at the American-run Athens College. He started with Ethnos in 1929 as a translator of dispatches from foreign news services.

Spotted as a bright young man, he worked his way up through the ranks. By the time he reached the editorship, there was not a job on the paper he could not do.

Mr. Kapsis finds nothing unusual in a 20-hour workday and has a reputation of pitching in and doing any job that needed doing to get the paper out. He writes almost as quickly as he talks and does both effectively.

ACCUSER OF PAPANDEOUS

Politically, Mr. Kapsis was a follower of the late George Papandeous's Center Union and was a close friend of his son, Prof. Andreas Papandeous, the expatriate former minister who leads the Pannhellenic Liberation Movement.

Mr. Kapsis deplores communism and speaks with angry eloquence of the fate of the press under Communist regimes.

When the military seized power in Greece three years ago, Mr. Kapsis was arrested, but was released after nine days. He was detained by security police again for 24 hours last summer.

He had made a special application for a passport to address the Overseas Press Club. Although Greeks arrested for any reason are usually barred from leaving the country, he had high hopes of getting out. "He was looking forward to the trip with boyish enthusiasm" a colleague said.

His wife, Eleftheria (the name means "freedom"), holds down a bank job as well as making a home for their sons, aged 15 and 10. She and her eldest son, Pantelis, watched the two-day court-martial until the verdict came at 1:30 this morning. "He's in jail by mistake," she said.

"When I was arrested," Mr. Kapsis told the military judges, "it was a complete surprise. I said to myself: 'Gosh I must have forgotten to pay the taxes again!'"

Two officers of the press section of security police told the court believed Mr. Kapsis was behind all this "antinational propaganda."

"He is an exceptionally capable journalist," one of them said.

This unwelcome praise was reflected in Mr. Kapsis's sentence, the heaviest of the six defendants.

Ioannis Zigidis, the former minister who gave the interview, was sentenced to four and a half years. Mr. Kyriazis received four years and his two co-publishers, Achilles Kyriazis and Constantine Nikolopoulos, three years each. The managing editor, Constantine Economides, was sentenced to 13 months.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

(By S. Christopher)

ATHENS.—One of Greece's oldest dailies has suspended publication indefinitely because it ran afoul of the Army-backed regime.

Its three copublishers and two of its top editors have been sentenced by a court-martial to stiff jail terms ranging from 13 months to 5 years.

Ethnos, an afternoon daily, is the seventh Greek newspaper to cease publication since the military coup in Greece three years ago this month.

The Athens morning daily Kathimerini and afternoon Mesimvri of conservative Eleni Vlachou closed down shortly after the April, 1967, coup. So did the Athens daily Eleftheria of liberal Panos Kokkas. Both Mrs. Vlachou and Mr. Kokkas have since escaped to Europe where they presently live in exile.

Also closed since the revolution are the

Communist Augi, the leftist Dimokratiki Alagi, and the centrist Athenaki.

Against the seven closed, two new dailies have sprung up—the Nea Politela and Simerina, both progovernment.

LIBERAL CENTER BACKED

Ethnos started publication in 1913 as a staunch supporter of Greece's leading modern statesman, Eleftherios Venizelos. Since then it has mostly supported the liberal center. It was one of the few Greek newspapers to suspend publication during the Nazi occupation.

The newspaper's publisher's and editors were charged with violating a criminal law springing from the recent press law and a military decree. On trial with them was John Zigidis, former minister of industry and Center Union Party deputy.

Specifically the six men were accused of disseminating false news, of inciting fear among the citizens capable of undermining confidence in government authority in the armed forces, and in the currency and of propagating unpatriotic propaganda.

The charges arose out of an interview with Mr. Zigidis which appeared in Ethnos March 24 under the heading "Government of national unity." The interview was featured as the first in a series giving answers from the political world to questions on the latest Cyprus crisis and suggesting possible solutions.

After its appearance Ethnos copublishers Kostas and Achilles Kyriazis and Nicholas Nikolopoulos, editor-in-chief John Capsis, managing editor Constantine Oikonomidis, and Mr. Zigidis were promptly arrested and brought before a five-man court-martial.

According to the law the publishers of a newspaper and the managing editor are liable to prosecution on such charges. But nonetheless Mr. Capsis also was arrested.

The military on the bench handed down sentences even harsher than those demanded by the prosecution. Mr. Capsis was given five years' imprisonment, the publishers received terms of from three to four years, and Mr. Zigidis 4½ years. The octogenarian and ailing Mr. Oikonomidis, one of the oldest working journalists in Greece today, received 13 months.

All the defendants also received fines. Finally, the duty-free newsprint privileges of Ethnos were suspended for five months.

REMARKS INTERPRETED

The essence of the opinion expressed by Mr. Zigidis in the interview was this: "The recent tragic events on Cyprus show that the Greeks on Cyprus are threatened by fratricidal division. The bonds which unite Cyprus to Greece are being put to the test. Cyprus, now more than ever before, needs the affection, guidance, and assistance of Greece, all of which can best be extended through a political government. It is therefore recommended a government of national unity [in Greece] through the return to democratic order."

The defendants, their attorneys, and prominent witnesses vainly contended that the remarks of Mr. Zigidis constituted opinion and not news, and that the law refers only to news. They presented excerpts from many newspapers which they argued were presented as news and might inspire fear and loss of confidence. Managing publisher Kostas Kyriazis took the sole responsibility for the interview.

Mr. Oikonomidis stated that he was in no way involved with the story. So did Mr. Capsis and the other two publishers.

Said Mr. Zigidis in his testimony, "The charge is in no way connected with the administration of justice. It aims at scaring John Zigidis and the Greeks. It even does no justice to the regime since it pictures it as trembling."

The prosecution had different views. "Freedom of the press should not be confused with irresponsibility," said the prosecutor, and he

then went on to argue that the interview was news and not opinion.

He based his conclusions mostly on the deposition of police officers and of some little-known individuals. He took the view that both the paper and Mr. Zigidis had sought to belittle the present government.

After announcement of the sentences one journalist commented: "This is not justice but vindictiveness against the regime's most outspoken newspaper and the free press."

JOHN J. RHODES REPORTS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, periodically I send a newsletter to my constituents in the First Congressional District of Arizona regarding current congressional activities. I am including the report of March 23, 1970, at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of those who may be interested:

JOHN J. RHODES REPORTS

ENVIRONMENT

In his State of the Union address last January, President Nixon voiced the concern of millions of Americans. "In the next ten years," the President said, "we shall increase our wealth by fifty percent. The profound question is—does this mean that we will be fifty percent richer in the real sense, fifty percent better off, fifty percent happier?" Or, will we as a people be choked by traffic, suffocated by smog, poisoned by water, deafened by noise, terrorized by crime and corrupted by spirit?

The true wealth of this country cannot be measured in economic terms. Among other things, the well-being of all Americans is directly related to the quality of our air, our land and our water. For too long we have ignored the adverse effects that a burgeoning population and a rapidly changing technology have had upon our way of life. Today, the problem of pollution has become a matter of national concern and, belatedly, occupies stage center.

On February 10, President Nixon sent to the Congress a special message on the environment. This was one of the longest and most comprehensive messages received by the nation's lawmakers from the White House. It outlined a 37-point environment program, including 23 specific legislative requests and 14 new measures to be taken by administrative action. I was pleased to cosponsor the introduction of this legislation in the House of Representatives where hearings are now in progress.

Briefly, the President's program consists of five major sections dealing with water pollution control, air pollution control, solid waste management, parklands and public recreation, and organization for action. The Chief Executive has already taken several steps in this latter category by creating a Council on Environmental Quality and a Cabinet Committee on the Environment.

The challenge to our environment has produced a certain bandwagon phenomenon that can either be the needed impetus for constructive action or the catalyst for unwise and irresponsible proposals. Just as we cannot afford to sacrifice our precious natural resources to an unbridled economic growth neither can we naively ignore the demands of 250 million Americans for food, housing, transportation and recreation.

Because of our large and increasing population, the day of absolute environmental pur-

ity may be past. However, the conservation challenge of the seventies requires that we seek a reasonable balance between the demands of our technology and the preservation of our environment.

President Nixon has presented a sound and realistic program to the Congress which seeks to achieve this balance. But the challenge cannot be met by the federal government alone. It is for this reason that the President has called for a major national effort which would enlist the support of private industry, state and local governments and, most importantly, individuals to combat the assault upon our environment. It is a cause worthy of our dedication.

DEFENSE SPENDING

To hear some people tell the story, this Administration is spending unprecedented amounts for military purposes with the result that domestic needs are being seriously shortchanged. The budget is tight, it is said, because of tremendous increases in defense spending benefiting no one but the infamous "military-industrial complex."

Let's separate fiction from fact: the fact is that President Nixon's Budget for this year reduces the percentage of funds spent for national defense to the lowest level since 1950. The fact is that the President's Budget reveals a major shift in national priorities. For example, under the two previous Democratic Administrations (1960-1968) defense spending was increased by 75%. For the current three-year Budget period (1968-1971) defense spending has been cut by 10%, freeing funds for important domestic needs. For the record, total spending for national defense is estimated to drop to \$73.6 billion in 1971; \$5.8 billion below 1970 and \$7.7 billion below 1969.

A good part of this savings has come about through the reduction of waste and inefficiency in the Department of Defense. Secretary Laird has seen his task as one of insuring that every tax dollar invested in national defense is spent wisely. As a result, no part of the Defense Budget has been exempt from his cost-cutting pencil.

In a move that should have been taken years ago, the Secretary has announced the closing of 371 obsolete and unnecessary military bases and other military installations at a projected savings of approximately \$914 million. This brings to 718 the total number of base closings since the Nixon Administration took office just over a year ago. Military bases in Arizona, incidentally, have not been affected by these cutbacks. Williams Air Force Base will experience a net gain in personnel, primarily pilot instructors, in order to augment its flight training program. The Army Intelligence School will be moved from Fort Holabird in Baltimore, Maryland to Fort Huachuca before the end of this year.

It is clear that these reductions in the level of defense spending, even in the midst of an expensive war, are warranted. It is equally clear that this country cannot safely indulge itself in the indiscriminate cutting of funds necessary to our national defense. Many persons today are apparently in favor of a wholesale dismemberment of America's defense capability. This Administration has rejected that course of action, while continuing to scale down military expenditures at a pace consistent with our national security.

LAOS

In recent weeks it has been darkly hinted that the United States is deeply involved in a "secret war" in Laos; that our present involvement in that country is merely the opening scenario to "another Vietnam."

On March 6, President Nixon set the record straight. "The total number of Americans directly employed by the U.S. government in Laos is 616. In addition, there are 424 Americans employed on contract," making a total of 1040. U.S. personnel in Laos has not been increased during the past year and no such

increase is planned. American air operations in Laos, a matter of public record for five years, have been continued.

The United States has provided logistical and air support at the request of the Royal Laotian Government. This government was established in 1962 when fourteen nations, including Communist China and North Vietnam, signed the Geneva Accords providing for the "neutralization" of Laos. Before the ink had dried on these documents, the North Vietnamese began violating them.

Air operations in Laos are of utmost importance to help save the lives of American soldiers in Vietnam who are threatened by the continued infiltration of troops, weapons and supplies through the Laotian corridor into South Vietnam. However, ground combat troops are not contemplated. In short, there is no "secret war" in Laos but only an ill-starred attempt to discredit the Administration's policy in Vietnam.

LABOR BILL

The national consequences of long-term work stoppages are becoming more serious and intolerable. Ours is a complex and interdependent economy in which work stoppages in certain industries can seriously affect the health, safety and welfare of millions of innocent Americans. At the same time, our institutional machinery for the settlement of labor disputes is woefully inadequate.

The railroad industry, operating under temporary legislation for 37 days, is a case in point. All emergency procedures have been exhausted and it looks as though Congress, for the third time in seven years, will be required to legislate a labor contract in order to avoid a nationwide rail shutdown. Congress is ill-equipped for this task and should address itself to the larger problem of how to avoid similar work stoppages in this and other major industries in the future.

What is needed, in my opinion, is a separate and permanent procedure for the determination of disputes which the parties themselves, after exhausting all other procedures, are unable to resolve. On February 18, I introduced legislation that would expand our machinery for dealing with such disputes. The bill would establish a United States Court of Labor-Management Relations which would serve as a backstop in the collective bargaining process and protect the public interest against the devastating consequences of a protracted work stoppage in industries affecting the general welfare, health or safety.

On February 27, the President sent a message to Congress recommending the enactment of emergency strike legislation restricted in application to the transportation industry. Of course, the consequences that would accompany any nationwide transportation shutdown would be most serious. Other industries, however, have a similar importance to our economy and I believe that legislation addressed to the problem of work stoppages should be broader in scope. Hopefully, these important measures will receive the close attention of the 91st Congress this year.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

If there are any changes that should be made in your name or mailing address, I would appreciate it if you would tear off the address on the brown envelope and return it to me with the applicable changes indicated thereon. (Congressman John J. Rhodes, 2312 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515).

VISITORS

Phoenix—W. J. Eden, Charles Martin, Emral Ruth, Bill Davis, J. C. Wetzler, Arthur M. Lee, C. A. Clements and Margaret, John M. Hazelett, Verne McCutchan, Stephen W. Pogson, Allan B. Starr, Dan Scarponi, Louis C. Reynolds, Mr. and Mrs. Merton E. Marks, Charles B. Harrison, Mike McCormick, R. E. McCullar, Robert T. Moore, Stephen Morris, Clayton Lorenzen, O. F. Whelan, Roger

Ernst, J. A. Riggins, Jr., George F. Miller, Armando de Leon, Honorable John D. Driggs, Chuck Simmers, Robert Esterbrook, John Hart Oliver III, Dan Mardian, Mr. and Mrs. Joe L. Keyes, Mr. and Mrs. Roy H. Lotterhos, Mr. and Mrs. A. E. Bayne, Harold L. Perry, Gordon Marshall, Mr. and Mrs. Peter Klewit, Jr., William F. Mahan, R. N. Young, Steve Zozaya, Chick McDowell.

Mesa—John H. Tedrick, F. A. Stone, Sam Q. Ball, Scott S. Parker, LaMar Shelley, Jana and Mary, James W. Colasanti, Duncan Scott.

Tempe—Dave Pilcher, Wade Lacy, Shirley A. Lacy, and Kathy S. Lacy, Merwin Deever, Lauren Freedman, Carl Shipley, M. D. Burdick, Ken McDonald, James E. Stieber, Dick Neuheisel.

Scottsdale—John Armstrong, E. H. Peplow, Jr., E. F. Suarez, Joe Prekop, Ralph W. Elsner, Charles Montooth, W. L. Lockhart, Louis Sullivan, Alvin Wood, William V. Donaldson, Honorable B. L. Tims.

Tucson—Al McGinnis, Donald G. Shropshire, Harold E. Kosanke, M.D., Robert Anderson, Benjamin F. Davis, Richard B. Arrotta, Clifford V. Levy, J. Jeffrey Matthew, Richard Hukey.

Chinle—Mr. and Mrs. Justin LaFont, Mr. and Mrs. Gerald LaFont.

Chandler—Marshall Humphrey.

Wellton—C. C. Tabor.

Globe—Louis P. Horrell, Steve Bixby.

Casa Grande—Al Nader.

Mayer—Brad Stewart.

Coolidge—Marvin Caudill, Nelson Grace.

Paradise Valley—Jack W. Coursey.

St. Johns—Darwin D. Grant, Keith Shreeve, Merwin D. Grant.

Yuma—Robert E. Thompson, Tom Choules.

Guadalupe—Frank S. Luera.

Sacaton—Burdette Morago.

Sedona—Duane D. Miller.

Payson—T. L. Meredith.

Clifton—Fred J. Fritz.

Kearney—Joe Mortimer.

GREYHOUND CORP. PROMOTES AMERICANISM

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, two hon-ors have come to the Greyhound Corp. for its public-service efforts in behalf of the Nation's schoolchildren, as well as civic organizations and private individuals.

The Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., has awarded Greyhound its third George Washington Honor Medal in succession for its 1969 Americanism activities.

And Public Relations News, the international public relations weekly for more than 200,000 executives around the world, has selected Greyhound's long-standing patriotism program as one of the 25 best public relations efforts of the last quarter century.

Keystone of this fine company's program is a 24-page, 9-inch-square, full-color brochure entitled, "This Land of Ours." The public-service brochure was introduced during the 1967 4th of July holiday, and has been reprinted three times. To date, more than half a million free copies have been given out.

The booklet says patriotism is not "short, frenzied outbursts of emotion, but the tranquil and steady dedication of a lifetime." The booklet continues:

No man can take from me my share of America, for it is my birthright. But—and this is the message in *This Land of Ours*—I can give it away. I can lose it through indifference, through laziness, through ignorance.

Joint ownership means joint responsibility. So we dare not only glory together in our country's triumphs. We must endure together its problems as well. We must guide it with reason, defend it with vigor, nourish it with great care.

"This Land of Ours" continues in this vein—a notable effort to instill in our Nation's youth a love and respect for this great land of ours.

In addition to the patriotism brochure, Greyhound has offered schools throughout the country, as well as civic groups and private citizens, a brochure, *Amazing America*, containing patriotism-inspiring four-color photographs of the beauty of our country. More than 200,000 copies have been given out free of charge in the last 2 years, and 50,000 additional copies are being printed now.

Mr. Speaker, Greyhound's Americanism activities also include distribution of a 1-minute public service TV film based on the patriotism brochure that was sent 100 TV stations for repeat usage. And a patriotic/travel show, complete for a 92-piece marching band—for use by high school and college groups—was introduced 2 years ago and used throughout 1969. It is also being redone this year.

It is significant that, at last count, more than 50,000 letters of commendation—from schoolteachers, from parents, from the children themselves—have been received by this Illinois company.

This is an effort that well deserves being called to the Nation's attention.

LAYPROCON

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who live and work in Arkansas are in the midst of a study of a recommended new State constitution and we have a new tool to help us study the proposals of the constitutional convention.

The Garland Chapter of Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity at the University of Arkansas, of which I am an honorary member, has organized a team of students to take its study of the constitution, a study which tries to present an accurate picture without either supporting or opposing adoption of the proposed constitution, to meetings throughout the State. Through those meetings and through cooperation with various media, the project known as LayProCon seeks to present an accurate picture of what the new constitution proposes to the Arkansas electorate.

For the benefit of everyone interested I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a report on the project published in the Arkansas Lawyer:

"LAYPROCON"—ARKANSAS'S ANSWER TO DABBY O'GILL AND THE LITTLE PEOPLE
The Arkansas's Constitutional Convention completed its monumental task on February

10, 1970. Final judgement on its work—the proposed 1970 Arkansas Constitution—is reserved for the Arkansas voters at the November, 1970 polls.

As pointed up in the editorials, the intervening nine months afford all voters the opportunity to make a comprehensive study of the new document.

To assist in this study, the Garland Chapter of the Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity of the University of Arkansas has developed a particularly interesting orientation program—Project "LAYPROCON". Mr. J. Steven Clark, President of the Garland Chapter, undertakes to spell out Project's procedures and aims in the following article:

This year St. Patrick's Day will be especially significant to a group of 70 or so students at the University of Arkansas Law School. The reason is a project known as "LayProCon." "LayProCon" stands for Learn About Your Proposed Constitution. It is a public service project initiated this Spring semester by the Brothers of Garland Chapter of Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity.

The purpose of the project is not to advocate acceptance or rejection of the proposed constitution, but rather to explain the provisions of this most important document. The idea originated as the result of concern among these law students that the Arkansas populace didn't fully understand many of the provisions of the proposed document such as the county council, right to work, and the voting age provisions. The goal of the project is to assist the citizens of Arkansas in becoming aware of the advantages and the drawbacks of the various provisions. This information will allow them to exercise an informed judgment in voting to accept or reject the proposed document based on its merits. "LayProCon" will not provide all the answers, but it will answer many of those questions posed.

The project will begin March 15th with a program on KTHV Channel 11's "Face the State" originating from Little Rock. Also the week of March 16th through the 22nd will be designated "LayProCon Week" by an official proclamation issued by Governor Winthrop Rockefeller. In addition, civic organizations throughout the state as well as being invited to be a part of the program at the Arkansas Meat Processors and Locker Association's state convention in Little Rock.

The basic plan of the project is to send 5 member-teams out across the state throughout the Spring. The men composing these teams will be law students who are residents of the respective areas they will be visiting. The state has been divided into 14 geographical areas centered around the state and private supported universities, colleges, and junior colleges. These teams will spend a three-day weekend in each of these areas speaking to as many groups as possible. The weekend will be high-lighted by a public forum held at the visited institution plus radio and television appearances. The dates the teams will be in each area are as follows: March 20, 21, 22—Arkansas State University; April 17, 18, 19—Harding College, Henderson State College, Ouachita University, and University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Philander Smith College, Shorter College; April 24, 25, 26—Arkansas College, State College of Arkansas, Hendrix College, and Arkansas Tech, College of the Ozarks; May 8, 9, 10—Arkansas A&M, Southern State College, and Westark Junior College; and May 15, 16, 17—University of Arkansas.

In order to prepare the participants for their involvement in the project four "LayProCon" Training Sessions have been set up. These sessions will be led by Dr. Robert A. Leflar, President Constitutional Convention; Miss Kay Colett, Government instructor University of Arkansas; and the Benton and Washington County Convention delegates. The Sessions will be used to provide those participants in the project with insights and

reasons as to why the convention enacted certain provisions and how they differ from other provisions suggested and the 1874 constitution. Each of the participants will have had a minimum of 10 hours instruction dealing with the proposed constitution.

The project has already received state-wide publicity of its efforts in a front page article in the January 24th issue of the Arkansas Gazette plus a similar story circulated by the Associated Press to all Arkansas newspapers. Also "LayProCon" was featured on a special presentation on KARK Channel 7 television in Little Rock concerning its efforts. In addition, Garland Chapter has received complete backing from the national organization of Phi Alpha Delta and a letter of commendation from Congressman Bill Alexander for its efforts.

If you know an organization that would like to have a speaker either during the visit of one of the teams to that area or at any other time, please contact Steve Clark, President Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity, University of Arkansas Law School. Every effort will be made to provide those speakers requested. As the Spring rolls around, remember that this is one year Darby O'Gill and his Little People will have competition from Arkansas's own "LayProCons."

AMERICAN COLLEGE THEATER FESTIVAL

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, for the second straight year a Lea College production has been selected to compete in the second annual American College Theater Festival under the auspices of the John F. Kennedy Center.

The original production of "The Sound of Bread Breaking," will be the opening performance of the festival to be presented at 7:30 p.m. on April 27 at the University Center Theater of George Washington University here.

This original play by Dr. Kenneth Regenbaum, director of the Theatre Arts Co. of Lea College on Lake Chapeau at Albert Lea, Minn., uses music and audience interaction to describe the early events in the life of Mohandas Gandhi. The play traces the development of his philosophy and the beginning of the militant, nonviolent movement that liberated India.

This production is one of the 10 national finalists in nationwide competition among college theater groups.

John Cromwell, one of the regional judges and himself a noted director, said after viewing the Lea College production that he was "spellbound by the sheer truth of a compelling and fascinating performance of a truly inspired production. It would be a great pity if this truly original effort were denied exposure nationally."

What is even more unusual about this production is that it is enacted by students, many of whom have never previously acted on any stage, from a new college that caters entirely to the so-called "late-bloomers."

I congratulate the Lea College Theater Arts Co. on its distinction in becoming

one of the national finalists in this competition; in particular its director, Dr. Regenbaum, for writing and producing an exceptional play.

The following list of students comprise the staff:

Courtney Jackson, Philadelphia, Pa.; Joseph Lee, Washington, D.C.; Ron Dominguez, Forest Hills, N.Y.; Craig Eastlund, Albert Lea, Minn.; Charles Boentgen, Pennsauken, N.J.; Judy May, Philadelphia, Pa.; Carl Apollo, Monsey, N.Y.

Jim Nelson, Elgin, Ill.; Ehren Qual, Albert Lea, Minn.; Reginald Witherspoon, Philadelphia, Pa.; George Lindenberg, New York City; Linda Dawson, St. Paul, Minn.; Ann Wick, Hayward, Minn.; Barbara Witter, East Orange, N.J.

Mark Weinstein, Boston, Mass.; Bill Birkett, Wabash, Ind.; Judith Alonson, Yonkers, N.Y.; Sherleen Britten, Schenectady, N.Y.; Lynn Bentson, Lakeville, Minn.

Michael Mamber, New York City; Chris MacEachen, Hyde Park, N.Y.; Mike Weidman, Milwaukee, Wis.; Vin Gorman, Rye, N.Y.; and Barry Bergle, Albert Lea, Minn.

PRAYER

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1970

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1970, I held my annual luncheon in honor of our illustrious Speaker. On this occasion, the invocation was given by the Reverend John A. Hamrick, president of the Baptist College at Charleston. This prayer was so appropriate and so beautiful that I wanted to be able to share it with the other Members of this body, so I asked Dr. Hamrick to provide me with a copy in order that I might place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have now obtained that copy and it follows herein:

PRAYER

INVOCATION OFFERED BY JOHN A. HAMRICK, PRESIDENT OF THE BAPTIST COLLEGE AT CHARLESTON, TO A MARCH 12, 1970 LUNCHEON, GIVEN BY CONGRESSMAN L. MENDEL RIVERS TO HONOR JOHN W. MCCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

We are so deeply grateful for these United States, for those who conceived this Union and for those who perpetuate it.

For the sacrifice that have been made and are being made today to keep men free.

For the House of Representatives that is our greatest assurance of government with the consent of the governed.

For the Speaker of the House, John McCormack, who exercises leadership in a day when it is not only most difficult and demanding to lead, but in a day in which it is essential to have right leadership.

For our host, L. Mendel Rivers, who in humility seeks wisdom and who carries it out with fearless courage and unshamed boldness.

We invoke thy blessings upon this group of leaders from many walks of life upon whom so much depends for the future of our world.

We pray that thou wilt grant us the wisdom, courage, and leadership that our day demands.

Not only that our Nation may survive with strength, but that it shall provide the greatest opportunity for living the world has ever known. Amen.